

---

Subject: De jure region of residence (v139) - Kenya 2014

Posted by [dperezme](#) on Fri, 10 May 2024 03:12:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear all,

I am currently working on a project on the evolution of the nutritional status of children under 5 in Sub-Saharan Africa and its determinants. For this, I am using all available SSA countries from DHS-V to DHS-VIII. For my analysis, I include regional fixed effects, using for that the variable v139, de jure region of residence. However, in the case of Kenya, the following is happening: a) in the DHS-V, the categories of this variable correspond to the regions in which the country is divided, so that it is ok; b) in the DHS-VIII, the same occurs but disaggregated into counties, so it's ok.

However, in the DHS-VII, Kenya 2014, the categories correspond neither to the regions in aggregate form (as in DHS-5) nor in county form (as in DHS-8), but only to a few counties (8 to be precise), several of which belong to 2 or 3 regions only. What is happening in this case? This is the first time I see this in the DHS, and I don't know how to proceed to homogenise the fixed effects between waves (e.g., we can group the DHS-8 counties to get the DHS-5 regions, but I cannot do the same with the small number of counties in DHS-VII).

What is the reason for this "error" in DHS-VII? What would you recommend me to do in this case? Use de facto region v024? Although I know that v024 and v139 have a different nature: v024 is where the mother was interviewed and v139 is where she actually lives.

Thank you very much for your attention and reply

---