
Subject: Re: India NFHS-3 - slum coding
Posted by [soniwe](#) on Thu, 23 Feb 2017 09:14:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi again,

I have realised why I was having those counter-intuitive results. I had recoded the missing values and included them as "non-slum". The majority of these were from rural populations, which have much lower coverage of health interventions even than urban slums, and this was skewing the results. I now want to recode into three categories: "Urban non-slum" "Urban slum" "Rural". Is it ok to re-code the missing as "Urban non-slum" if v025 is 1 (urban) and as "Rural" if v025 is 2 (rural) (see code below)? Are those participants categorised as "non slum" in the variable sslumc equivalent to other urban dwellers categorised as 1 in v025 - i.e. does it make sense to combine these two groups?

Sonia

```
recode sslumc (.=2) if v025==1  
recode sslumc (.=3) if v025==2  
label define slum 1 "Urban slum" 2 "Urban non slum" 3 "Rural"
```
