

---

Subject: Re: June 3rd Webinar Analyzing DHS Data: Weights and other adjustments for the survey design

Posted by [colinodden](#) on Thu, 28 May 2015 14:46:26 GMT

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

---

Dear DHS Panel,

I'd be grateful if you could address the following, which dovetails with a previous poster's question (pooling surveys within country). Many thanks in advance for whatever advice you're able to provide in the limited time you have during the webinar.

(1) The birth histories are very valuable. However, weights are intended to make respondents representative of the population at time of interview, yet births are not occurring at that time. Is this problematic for birth history analyses, and is there a clear resolution? Further, births are not 1:1 with respondents, so the mean weight of births (when applying the respondent's weight to each birth) will not equal 1. On face it seems sensible to weight births by the respondent's weight divided by parity of time at interview, but this of course down-weights births to higher-parity respondents.

(2) Another poster raised the question of how to weight when pooling surveys within country. Pooling surveys within country compounds the benefits of the birth history data, too (we can obtain birth histories spanning up to several decades), but perhaps compounds the problem I indicate in #1 above. In fact, pooling surveys can (and often does) lead to overlapping birth histories, that is, births within an historical period occurring to women in different surveys. Do you have recommendations for how to sensibly weight births when histories overlap surveys?

Cheers!

Colin Odden

Ohio State University

---