



# NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

*Data Resources Program*

## Community Crime Prevention and Intimate Violence in Chicago, 1995–1998

ICPSR 3437

Carolyn Rebecca Block and Wesley G. Skogan

*User Guide and Codebook*



Inter university Consortium for Political and Social Research



Community Crime Prevention and Intimate Violence in Chicago,  
1995-1998

(ICPSR 3437)

Principal Investigators

Carolyn Rebecca Block  
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

Wesley G. Skogan  
Northwestern University

First ICPSR Version  
January 2003

Inter-university Consortium for  
Political and Social Research  
P.O. Box 1248  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106



## BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Block, Carolyn Rebecca, and Wesley G. Skogan.  
COMMUNITY CRIME PREVENTION AND INTIMATE  
VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO, 1995-1998 [Computer file].  
ICPSR version. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal  
Justice Information Authority/Chicago, IL:  
Northwestern University [producers], 2002. Ann  
Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for  
Political and Social Research [distributor],  
2003.

## REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Please indicate in a cover letter which data were used.

## DATA DISCLAIMER

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary .....	1
General Study Overview .....	3
Study Identification .....	3
Purpose of the Study .....	3
Methods .....	4
Study Design .....	4
Sources of Information .....	6
Sample .....	6
Response Rates .....	6
Dates of Data Collection .....	6
Summary of Contents .....	6
Description of Variables .....	6
Presence of Common Scales .....	7
Unit of Observation .....	7
Extent of Processing .....	7
Extent of Collection .....	7
Data Collection Notes .....	8
File Specifications .....	8
Related Publications .....	8
Final Reports and Other Publications .....	10
Data Resources Program on the Internet .....	10
Data Completeness Report .....	13
Codebook Notes .....	15
Codebook .....	17





## SUMMARY

This study sought to answer the question: If a woman is experiencing intimate partner violence, does the collective efficacy and community capacity of her neighborhood facilitate or erect barriers to her ability to escape violence, other things being equal? To address this question, longitudinal data on a sample of 210 abused women from the CHICAGO WOMEN'S HEALTH RISK STUDY, 1995-1998 (ICPSR 3002) were combined with community context data for each woman's residential neighborhood taken from the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) evaluation, LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION OF CHICAGO'S COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM, 1993-2000 (ICPSR 3335). The unit of analysis for the study is the individual abused woman (not the neighborhood). The study takes the point of view of a woman standing at a street address and looking around her. The characteristics of the small geographical area immediately surrounding her residential address form the community context for that woman. Researchers chose the police beat as the best definition of a woman's neighborhood, because it is the smallest Chicago area for which reliable and complete data are available. The characteristics of the woman's police beat then became the community context for each woman. The beat, district, and community area of the woman's address are present. Neighborhood-level variables include voter turnout percentage, organizational involvement, percentage of households on public aid, percentage of housing that was vacant, percentage of housing units owned, percentage of feminine poverty households, assault rate, and drug crime rate. Individual-level demographic variables include the race, ethnicity, age, marital status, income, and level of education of the woman and the abuser. Other individual-level variables include the Social Support Network (SSN) scale, language the interview was conducted in, Harass score, Power and Control score, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) diagnosis, other data pertaining to the respondent's emotional and physical health, and changes over the past year. Also included are details about the woman's household, such as whether she was homeless, the number of people living in the household and details about each person, the number of her children or other children in the household, details of any of her children not living in her household, and any changes in the household structure over the past year. Help-seeking in the past year includes whether the woman had sought medical care, had contacted the police, or had sought help from an agency or counselor, and whether she had an order of protection. Several variables reflect whether the woman left or tried to leave the relationship in the past year. Finally, the dataset includes summary variables about violent incidents in the past year (severity, recency, and frequency), and in the follow-up period.



## GENERAL STUDY OVERVIEW

## STUDY IDENTIFICATION

Community Crime Prevention and Intimate Violence in Chicago, 1995-1998

Carolyn Rebecca Block  
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

Wesley G. Skogan  
Northwestern University

Award No. 98-WT-VX-0022

## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Intimate violence is seldom a single event, but rather a continuing relationship punctuated by verbal and physical abuse. Empirical evidence indicates that previous violent events cumulate to determine the development of each succeeding event, though escalation is not inevitable. Efforts at prevention or intervention, if they are to be effective, must take into account not just one event or circumstance, but also the pattern of repetition. These violent events take place at a location. That location lies within a neighborhood context. Research has suggested that a neighborhood's collective efficacy and capacity to solve problems are linked to neighborhood violence. Collective efficacy and community capacity are each a "social good" -- a resource for the entire neighborhood, derived from the social interaction of neighborhood residents. Community capacity to solve problems includes collective efficacy as well as social resources that result from neighborhood organizations and the neighborhood's clout in the city. There are many avenues through which a woman's neighborhood can provide resources and support for help-seeking and the reduction of violence. They include, but go beyond, the physical availability and cultural accessibility of nearby support services. Intervention from a public health, public safety, or helping agency may not be sufficient or even necessary for a woman to escape a dangerous situation. Formal interventions occur in a context of interventions initiated by the woman herself with the support of natural helping networks. Research indicates that an abused woman's ability to mobilize social control effectively is an interactive process related to her resources and individual situation, as well as to the availability of services. Therefore, support from informal social networks may be as vital as support from formal community services. The vast majority of research on collective efficacy and

violence has focused on street crime, not on violence committed within the family. The few studies that exist suggest that, when a neighborhood enjoys greater collective efficacy, the violence-reduction benefits may accrue not only to those who are victimized on the street or in public places, but also to those who are victimized behind closed doors. However, because of methodological limitations in those studies, it is difficult to examine the processes underlying the association. To study the effect of the neighborhood context on an abused woman's ability to escape further violence, it is necessary to follow the experiences of individual abused women over time. Though many agree that analysis of the contextual effect of the community on an abused woman's help-seeking and on violence reduction is sorely needed, such an analysis is not simple. It requires longitudinal data on women being physically abused by an intimate partner, and data on the efficacy and capacity of the neighborhoods where each woman lives. Together, the Chicago Women's Health Risk Study (CWHRS) and the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) evaluation can provide this information. This study sought to answer the question: If a woman is experiencing intimate partner violence, does the collective efficacy and community capacity of her neighborhood facilitate or erect barriers to her ability to escape violence, other things being equal? To address this question, longitudinal data on a sample of 210 abused women from the CHICAGO WOMEN'S HEALTH RISK STUDY, 1995-1998 (ICPSR 3002) were combined with community context data for each woman's residential neighborhood taken from the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) evaluation, LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION OF CHICAGO'S COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM, 1993-2000 (ICPSR 3335).

## METHODS

### STUDY DESIGN

This study linked two unique Chicago datasets, (1) the CHICAGO WOMEN'S HEALTH RISK STUDY (CWHRS) (ICPSR 3002) and (2) the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) evaluation. The CWHRS was designed to give nurses, beat officers, and other primary support people information they need in order to help women experiencing violence at the hands of an intimate partner to lower their risk of life-threatening injury or death. The CWHRS was designed around the comparison of a sample of all intimate partner homicides involving a woman aged 18 or older that occurred in Chicago over a two-year period, and a clinic/hospital sample of detailed, longitudinal interviews with women sampled as they came into hospitals and clinics in Chicago neighborhoods in which the risk for intimate partner violence was high. The purpose of the CAPS evaluation was to evaluate the long-term organizational transition of the Chicago Police

Department (CPD) to a community policing model. CAPS is an ambitious plan to reorganize the CPD, restructure its management, redefine its mission, and forge a new relationship between police and city residents. From its inception, the CAPS evaluation included important geographic components. Information from a number of sources, including the Census, police reports, traffic, schools, and housing, was geocoded into area boundaries that were consistently maintained throughout the evaluation period, and the datasets collected by the evaluation were also geocoded into the same boundaries. The CAPS evaluation conducted citywide random-digit dialing surveys of city residents in English or Spanish. Because the residential address of each CAPS survey respondent could be geocoded, CAPS survey data were available for almost all larger areas (such as Chicago community areas or police districts) and for many smaller areas (such as police beats). From the CWHRS study, researchers used only the clinic/hospital sample. From the CAPS evaluation, researchers used (1) the geographic database including Census data, crime indicators, neighborhood disorder, and voter turnout, and (2) neighborhood collective efficacy and community capacity data from the citywide surveys that the CAPS evaluation conducted annually from 1995 to 1998. The CAPS evaluation surveys also were the source for three of the four community context indicators used in the combined dataset -- informal social control, organizational involvement, and station protest (one of the two downtown connections indicators). The second downtown connections indicator, voter turnout, is from the CAPS geographic database. The unit of analysis for the combined dataset is the individual abused woman, not the neighborhood. The study takes the point of view of a woman standing at a street address and looking around her. The characteristics of the small geographical area immediately surrounding her residential address form the community context for that woman. Although there may be similarities among women living in the same neighborhood or in neighborhoods with similar community contexts, each woman responds to her context in a unique way, depending on her individual situation. To link each woman to the community where she was living at the time of the initial CWHRS interview, researchers geocoded her residential address (determined its longitude and latitude) at the initial interview. It was then possible to overlay the woman's geocoded address on a Chicago map showing various area boundaries, such as Chicago community areas, census tracts, census block groups, Chicago police districts, and Chicago police beats. Researchers were therefore able to determine the area in which each woman was living at the time of the initial CWHRS interview. Researchers evaluated a large variety of alternative area definitions for residential neighborhood and chose the police beat as the best, because it is the smallest Chicago area for which the most reliable and complete data are available. The characteristics of the woman's police beat then became the community context for each woman.

## SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Data were collected from personal interviews with physically abused women (CHICAGO WOMEN'S HEALTH RISK STUDY (ICPSR 3002)), telephone interviews with Chicago residents, and official records from the United States Census Bureau, Chicago Police Department, Cook County Department of Public Aid, and the Sanford Files of land use (Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) evaluation (ICPSR 3335)).

## SAMPLE

The sample for this study is comprised of those women who had been identified in the Chicago Women's Health Risk Study as having experienced physical violence at the hands of an intimate partner in the previous year, who had a Chicago residential address at the initial interview, and who had been reinterviewed at least once in the CWHRs follow-up.

## RESPONSE RATES

Not applicable

## DATE(S) OF DATA COLLECTION

1995-1998

## SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

## DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

Demographic variables include the race, ethnicity, age, marital status, income, and level of education of the woman and the abuser. The beat, district, and community area of the woman's address are present. Neighborhood-level variables (for police beats) include voter turnout percentage, organizational involvement, percentage of households on public aid, percentage of housing that was vacant, percentage of owned units, percentage of feminine poverty households, assault rate, and drug crimes rate. Individual-level variables include the Social Support Network (SSN) scale, language the interview was conducted in, Harass scale score, Power and Control score, Post-

Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) diagnosis, and other data pertaining to the woman's emotional and physical health. Also included are details about the woman's household, such as whether she was homeless, the number of people living in the household and details about each person, the number of her children or other children in the household, details of any of her children not living in her household, and any changes in the household structure over the past year. Help-seeking in the past year includes whether the woman had sought medical care, had contacted the police, or had sought help from an agency or counselor, and whether she had an order of protection. Several variables reflect whether the woman left or tried to leave the relationship in the past year. Finally, the dataset includes summary variables about violent incidents in the past year (severity, recency, and frequency), and in the follow-up period.

#### PRESENCE OF COMMON SCALES

Several Likert-type scales were used as well as the Medical Outcomes Study (MOS) scale of depression (Hayes et al., 1995, Stewart et al., 1988), the Power and Control scale (Johnson, 1996), the HARASS scale of stalking and harassment (Sheridan, 1998), a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Johnson, 1996), the Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) Symptom Scale (Foa et al., 1993), the Campbell Danger Assessment (Campbell, 1993), and the Social Support Network (SSN) scale (Block et al., 2000).

#### UNIT OF OBSERVATION

Individuals.

#### EXTENT OF PROCESSING

ICPSR checked for undocumented codes, produced a codebook, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, and reformatted the data.

#### EXTENT OF COLLECTION

This data collection contains one data file with a PDF user guide and codebook, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements.

## DATA COLLECTION NOTES

(1) The data providing the community context taken from the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) evaluation are contained in the ICPSR study, LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION OF CHICAGO'S COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAM, 1993-2000 (ICPSR 3335). Users should refer to the original study for the data collection instruments. (2) The data from the personal interviews with abused women are contained in the ICPSR study, CHICAGO WOMEN'S HEALTH RISK STUDY, 1995-1998 (ICPSR 3002). Users should refer to the original study for the data collection instruments. The National Archive of Criminal Justice Data has created an online Resource Guide for the CHICAGO WOMEN'S HEALTH RISK STUDY, 1995-1998 (ICPSR 3002) in order to provide important information about the complexities of the data collection. Users are strongly encouraged to carefully review the information in the Resource Guide before referring to the Chicago Women's Health Risk Study. The Resource Guide is available at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/HELP/faq3002.html>. (3) The user guide and codebook are provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) file. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

## FILE SPECIFICATIONS

PART NUMBER: 1  
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular  
CASE COUNT: 210  
VARIABLE COUNT: 170  
RECORD LENGTH: 545  
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

## RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Block, Carolyn Rebecca. "Intimate Partner Homicide in Chicago Over 29 Years." NCJ 159892. CRIME & DELINQUENCY 41,4 (1995), 496-526.

Block, Carolyn Rebecca. "The Chicago Women's Health Risk Study: Project at a Glance." NCJ 187781. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 2000.

Block, Carolyn Rebecca. "The Chicago Women's Health Risk Study: What Does It Tell Us About Reducing the Risk of Serious Injury or Death in Intimate Partner Violence?" Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, forthcoming 2002.



Block, Carolyn Rebecca, and Wesley G. Skogan. "Do Collective Efficacy and Community Capacity Make a Difference 'Behind Closed Doors'?" (Final Report). NCJ 194711. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, December 2001.

Block, Carolyn Rebecca, et al. "The Chicago Women's Health Risk Study: Risk of Serious Injury or Death in Intimate Violence." NCJ 184511. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, 2000.

Campbell, Jacquelyn C., et al. "Nursing Care of Abused Women." In Jacquelyn C. Campbell and Janice Humphreys (eds.), *NURSING CARE OF SURVIVORS OF FAMILY VIOLENCE*, 2nd edition. St. Louis: Mosby, 1993.

Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium. "Community Policing in Chicago, Year Five and Six: An Interim Report." NCJ 180506. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1999.

Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium. "Community Policing in Chicago, Year Four: An Interim Report." NCJ 172221. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1997.

Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium. "Community Policing in Chicago, Year Three." NCJ 171644. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1996.

Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium. "Community Policing in Chicago, Year Two: An Interim Report." NCJ 156071. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1995.

Foa, Edna B., David S. Riggs, Constance V. Dancu, and Barbara O. Rothbaum. "Reliability and Validity of a Brief Instrument for Assessing Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder." *JOURNAL OF TRAUMATIC STRESS* 6,4 (October 1993), 459-473.

Hayes, Ron D., Cathy Donald Sherbourne, and Rebecca M. Mazel. "User's Manual for the Medical Outcome Study (MOS) Core Measures of Health-Related Quality of Life. RAND publication MR-162-RC. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1995.

Johnson, Holly. *DANGEROUS DOMAINS: VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IN CANADA*. Toronto: Nelson Canada, 1996.

Sheridan, Daniel J. "Measuring Harassment of Abused Women: A Nursing Concern." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Nursing, Oregon Health Sciences University, 1998.

Skogan, Wesley G., and Susan M. Hartnett. COMMUNITY POLICING, CHICAGO STYLE. NCJ 175951. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Skogan, Wesley G., et al. "Community Policing in Chicago, Year One: An Interim Report." NCJ 161473. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 1994.

Skogan, Wesley G., et al. ON THE BEAT: POLICE AND COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING. NCJ 183766. Boulder, CO: Westview Publishing Co., 1999.

Skogan, Wesley G., et al. "Problem Solving in Practice: Implementing Community Policing in Chicago." NCJ 179556. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, 2000.

#### FINAL REPORTS AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS homepage is:

<http://www.ncjrs.org>

#### DATA RESOURCES PROGRAM ON THE INTERNET

The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960 or 734-998-9825. The URL for the NACJD homepage is:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD>



DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3437

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values\*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=210)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
-----	
74.7% (127 of 170 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
12.4% (21 of 170 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
3.5% (6 of 170 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
2.4% (4 of 170 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
2.4% (4 of 170 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
L20JOB1 [NAME] CURRENTLY HAVE JOB/VOLUNTEER WOR	5.2%
L20UNEMP IS [NAME1] UNEMPLOYED	5.7%
GUNS GUNS IN THE HOME AT INITIAL INTERVIEW?	5.7%
GUNSR IS THERE A LOADED GUN IN THE HOUSE?	5.7%
0.6% (1 of 170 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
HINCOMER RECODED HOUSEHOLD INCOME	16.2%
0.0% (0 of 170 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
4.1% (7 of 170 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
SEVERE23 MOST SEVERE INCIDENT ON FOLLOWUP	42.9%
DAYSTOT DYS FROM INIT INTERVIEW-1ST FOLLOWUP IN	42.9%
T2STATUS ABUSE STATUS OF [NAME1] AT FOLLOW-UP	44.3%
L28BYHIM NUMBER OF CHILDREN R HAS HAD BY PARTNER	53.8%
E8CONDTN EMOTIONAL CONDITION WHICH LIMITS R	58.1%
H25DIVRC H25-PAST YR, PARTNER REFUSED DIVORCE	68.6%
M24TELL DID R TELL THEM WHAT HAPPENED?	79.0%
=====	

\*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.  
 Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected  
 in the data as coded.



## ICPSR CODEBOOK NOTES

1. ICPSR recoded system missing values to a 9-series and labeled them "Unknown." All other missing value designations were supplied by the Principal Investigators.
2. The Principal Investigators used several conventions to indicate a missing value. Many of these additional missing values are not present in the data, but their missing value designations are retained in the codebook.
3. ICPSR was unable to verify value labels for some categorical variables in this collection. All such values are labeled "Undoc code."
4. During the initial interviews, when respondents provided a name of an intimate partner, interviewers would refer to the partner by name throughout the interview. The Principal Investigators later removed all occurrences of actual names. Any names or specific locations mentioned during an interview will appear as [name], [state], or [location] in the data, codebook, and data definition statements.

## ICPSR CODEBOOK NOTES (Continued)

5. The Principal Investigators provided additional explanations for the following four variables, which were taken from the Chicago Women's Health Risk Study questionnaire, Section F:

ACCESS - The Access to and Knowledge of resources scale is a count of "support" responses to three variables, F3LNGUAG (negative), F10HELP (positive), and F11DCFS (negative). It ranges from 0 to 3.

ACCESS2 - The Access2 scale is a revised version of the Access scale. In Access2, only responses that indicate the woman was referring to a language problem, not a communication problem, are counted. It ranges from 0 to 3.

EMERHELP - The Emergency Help scale is a count of "support" responses to four variables, F6EMRGNC (positive), F8DANGER (positive), F12TRUBL (positive), and F13MONEY (positive). It ranges from 0 to 4.

SUPPORT - The Acceptance and Support scale is a count of "support" responses to five variables: F1CNFDNT (positive), F2TALK (positive), F4PROBLM (positive), F5STNDBY (positive), and F7DECISN (positive). It ranges from 0 to 5.

6. The variable REEXPER (REEXPERIENCING TOT, 1,2,3,4) is comprised of the sum of 'yes' responses for questions 1-4 from the Chicago Women's Health Risk Study Questionnaire, Section K, which is contained in the PDF codebook for ICPSR study 3002.

The variable AVOIDANC (AVOIDANCE TOT, 6,7,8,9,10,11,12) is comprised of the sum of 'yes' responses for questions 6-12 from the Chicago Women's Health Risk Study Questionnaire, Section K.

The variable AROUSAL (AROUSAL TOT, 5,13,14,15,16,17) is comprised of the sum of 'yes' responses for questions 5, and 13-17 from the Chicago Women's Health Risk Study Questionnaire, Section K.

7. The following abbreviations were used in many of the value and variable labels:

NAW = Non-abused woman	AW = Abused woman
R = Respondent	HH = Household
INIT = Initial	INC = Incident
PTSD = Post Traumatic Stress Disorder	



## CODEBOOK FOR ICPSR 3437

COMMUNITY CRIME PREVENTION AND INTIMATE VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO, 1995-1998

PLEASE NOTE: The "M" between the code and the code label indicates  
the code has been designated as a missing value.

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
ID	ID	1	6	F6
KIND	WHICH ADDRESS IS USED TO GEOCODE?	7	9	F3
	1 R's address, initial interview			
	2 R's address, first follow-up interview			
	3 Safe address at initial interview, friend or r			
	5 Contact address, initial interview			
	6 Safe address, second follow up			
	7 Safe address, first follow-up			
	10 Shelter/center/homeless at initial interview			
	11 In shelter, center with home address			
	12 Shelter or center, home address, no followup			
	13 Contact phone only, initial interview			
	998 R gave only a telephone number or po box			
	999 R did not give any contact information			
DISTBEAT	BEAT AND DISTRICT OF ADDRESS	10	13	F4
BCASES	NUMBER OF CASES	14	15	F2
COMAREA	COMMUNITY AREA	16	17	F2
	1 Rogers Park			
	2 West Ridge			
	3 Uptown			
	4 Lincoln Square			
	5 North Center			
	6 Lakeview			
	7 Lincoln Park			
	8 Near North Side			
	12 Forest Glen			
	14 Albany Park			
	16 Irving Park			
	19 Belmont Cragin			
	20 Hermosa			
	21 Avondale			
	22 Logan Square			
	23 Humboldt Park			
	24 West Town			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
COMAREA (cont.)				
	25 Austin			
	26 West Garfield Park			
	27 East Garfield Park			
	28 Near West Side			
	29 North Lawndale			
	30 South Lawndale			
	31 Lower West Side			
	32 Loop			
	34 Armour Square			
	35 Douglas			
	38 Grand Blvd.			
	40 Washington Park			
	42 Woodlawn			
	43 South Shore			
	44 Chatham			
	46 South Chicago			
	47 Burnside			
	48 Calumet Heights			
	49 Roseland			
	50 Pullman			
	51 South Deering			
	53 West Pullman			
	54 Riverdale			
	58 Brighton Park			
	60 Bridgeport			
	61 New City			
	63 Gage Park			
	66 Chicago Lawn			
	67 West Englewood			
	68 Englewood			
	69 Greater Grand Crossing			
	70 Ashburn			
	71 Ashburn Gresham			
	72 Beverly			
	73 Washington Heights			
	75 Morgan Park			
SOURCE	SOURCE OF SURVEY DATA	18	18	F1
	1 Beat			
	2 Community area			
	3 Sector			
TURNOUT	% TURNOUT 1995 GENERAL MAYORAL ELECTION	19	23	F5.2

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
TURNOUTR	VOTER TURNOUT, RECODED	24	24	F1
	0 Under 20%			
	1 20% to 39% of adults			
	2 40% or more of adults			
STATION	INTERVENE IF POLICE STATION WERE CLOSING	25	30	F6.4
STATIONR	RECODED-INTERVENE POLICE STAT CLOSING	31	31	F1
	1 3.0 and lower			
	2 3.01 to 3.25			
	3 3.26 to 3.4			
	4 3.41 and higher			
INFSCONT	INFORMAL SOC CONTROL SCALE (BCONTROL)	32	36	F5.3
INFSCONR	RECODED: INFORMAL SOCIAL CONTROL	37	37	F1
	1 1.92 to 2.74			
	2 2.75 to 2.99			
	3 3.00 to 3.24			
	4 3.25 to 3.69			
ORGINVOL	MEAN ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT-BINVOLVE	38	41	F4.2
ORGINR	ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT, RECODED	42	42	F1
	1 Zero to .5			
	2 .51 to .75			
	3 .76 to 1.0			
	4 1.01 to 1.82			
RACER	R'S RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP, RECODED	43	43	F1
	1 Black			
	2 Latina			
	3 Other			
	9 M Multiracial or missing			
LATINA	LATINA/HISPANIC?	44	44	F1
	1 Yes			
	2 No			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
B67LAT	LATINA/HISPANIC WOMEN, ALL INFORMATION	45	45	F1
	0 No			
	1 Born in Puerto Rico, or says ethnicity is Puerto Rican			
	2 Born in Mexico, or says ethnicity is Mexican			
	3 Latina/hispanic, but not Mexican or Puerto Rico			
	9 No information			
BLACK	AFRICAN/AMERICAN/BLACK	46	46	F1
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
SAMESEX	SAME SEX RELATIONSHIP WITH [NAME]	47	47	F1
	0 [Name] is male			
	1 Same sex relationship			
B7BIRTH	WAS R BORN IN THE US?	48	50	F3
	1 U.S.			
	2 Outside of U.S.			
	888 M Don't know			
	997 Refused			
	998 Not asked			
	999 M Missing			
B7PLACER	PLACE OF BIRTH, RECODED	51	53	F3
	1 Illinois			
	2 US south			
	3 US east			
	4 US west			
	5 US other midwest			
	6 US Puerto Rico			
	7 US, place not given			
	10 South America			
	15 Central America			
	20 Europe			
	25 Middle east			
	30 Africa			
	40 Asia			
	997 Refused			
	998 Not asked			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
B7PLACER (cont.)				
	999 Missing			
CHICAGO	F14: HOW LONG HAS R BEEN IN CHICAGO?	54	56	F3
	1 All her life			
	2 Many years			
	3 Three to four years			
	4 One to two years			
	5 Moved here in the past year			
	6 Other (e.g. two residences)			
CHICR	HOW LONG LIVED IN CHICAGO-RECODED	57	57	F1
	1 All her life or many years			
	2 Up to four years			
SPANISH1	INITIAL INTERVIEW CONDUCTED IN?	58	58	F1
	1 Spanish			
	2 English			
B1AGE	R'S AGE, INITIAL INTERVIEW	59	61	F3
AGER	R'S AGE, RECODED	62	62	F1
	1 18-20			
	2 21-25			
	3 26-30			
	4 31-40			
	5 41-50			
	6 51-67			
AGERR	AGE, SECOND RECODING	63	63	F1
	1 Under age 30			
	2 30 to 39			
	3 40 to 49			
	4 50 and older			
L17AGE	WHAT IS PARTNER'S AGE?	64	66	F3
	888 Don't know			
	999 Missing			
AGEDISP	AGE DISPARITY, [NAME] AND R	67	69	F3
	1 Same age within 5 years			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
AGEDISP	AGE DISPARITY, [NAME] AND R	67	69	F3
	1 Same age within 5 years			
	2 R is older by 5 to 9 years			
	3 R is older by 10 to 20 years			
	4 [Name] is older by 5 to 9 years			
	5 [Name] is older by 10 to 20 years			
	6 [Name] is older by 21 to 42 years			
	999 M Missing			
B2EDU	B2-HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUC R HAS COMPLETED	70	72	F3
	1 No schooling			
	2 Elementary school			
	3 Some high school			
	4 High school grad/ged			
	5 Some college/vocational school			
	6 Junior/community college or trade/vocational school			
	7 Four year college			
	8 Some grad school			
	9 Grad or professional degree			
	888 Don't know			
	999 Missing			
HIGHSCHL	HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION OR MORE?	73	73	F1
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
EMPLOYR	R'S EMPLOYMENT, RECODED	74	74	F1
	1 Full or part time job			
	2 Homemaker			
	3 Student			
	4 Unemployed			
	9 Missing			
UNEMPLOY	WAS R UNEMPLOYED AT INITIAL INTERVIEW?	75	76	F2
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	99 M Missing			
HOMEMAK	MAIN EMPLOYMENT IS HOMEMAKER	77	77	F1
	0 Other			
	1 Yes			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
L20JOB1	[NAME] CURRENTLY HAVE JOB/VOLUNTEER WORK	78	80	F3
	1 Works more than full time			
	2 Works full time			
	3 Works part time			
	4 Volunteers			
	5 Works out of home			
	6 Homemaker			
	7 Student			
	8 Unemployed, but looking for work			
	9 Not employed, not looking for work			
	10 Other			
	11 In a training program			
	12 Employed, but on leave of absence			
	13 Self-employed			
	14 In jail/ prison			
	15 Drug dealer			
	16 Retired			
	17 Disabled, unable to work			
	18 Deceased			
	19 Laid off			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 Missing			
L20UNEMP	IS [NAME1] UNEMPLOYED	81	83	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	9 M Deceased			
	999 M Missing			
B8MARITL	R'S MARITAL STATUS	84	86	F3
	1 Single			
	2 Married			
	3 Common law marraige			
	4 Separated			
	5 Divorced			
	6 Widowed			
	7 Other			
	8 Engaged			
	998 Not asked			
	999 Missing			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
MARRIED	MARRIED?	87	89	F3
	0 Other			
	1 Yes			
	999 M Missing			
SINGLE	SINGLE?	90	92	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	999 M Missing			
RELANAME	RELATIONSHIP W/ [NAME1]-C FOR NAW-RECODE	93	96	F4
	1 Current husband			
	2 Ex- or former husband			
	3 Current commonlaw			
	4 Ex- or former commonlaw			
	5 Current boyfriend or fiance			
	6 Ex- or former boyfriend or fiance			
	7 Current same-sex partner			
	8 Former same-sex partner			
	9 Current other (friend, lover, child's father)			
	10 Former other (friend, lover)			
	11 Child's father (ex-intimate partner)			
	999 Missing			
	9999 Naw			
RELAEXFO	EX OR FORMER RELATIONSHIP?	97	99	F3
	0 No, current			
	1 Yes, ex or former			
	999 Missing			
LIVEWITH	[NAME] LIVE IN SAME HOUSEHOLD WITH R?	100	102	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	2 R lives with an intimate partner, but not [nam			
	555 Refusal			
	999 Missing			
LIVEWR	RECODED, DOES R LIVE WITH [NAME]?	103	103	F1
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	9 Missing			



NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
LIVETOT	L23: [NAME] & R LIVE SAME PLACE DURING	104	106	F3
	1 Yes, entire year			
	2 Yes, but now living apart			
	3 Yes, recently moved in together			
	4 No, but lived together in prior year(s)			
	5 No, never			
	888 Don't know			
	999 Missing			
LIVNEVER	R AND PARTNER NEVER LIVED TOGETHER	107	109	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes, never lived together			
	999 M Missing			
LIVALLYR	R AND PARTNER LIVED TOGETHER ALL YEAR	110	112	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	999 M Missing			
L24APART	PAST YR, R LEAVE/STAY APART FROM PARTNER	113	115	F3
	1 Yes, left/stayed away			
	2 Yes, asked partner to leave or stay away			
	3 Asked, but partner refused to leave or stay away			
	4 No			
	999 Missing			
APARTR	WOMAN LEAVE/TRY END RELATIONSHIP-RECODE	116	118	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	999 M Missing			
SHELEFT	DID SHE LEAVE, OR ASK ABUSER TO LEAVE?	119	119	F1
	0 No, or abuser refused			
	1 Yes			
	9 No information			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
LENGHTO	RELATIONSHIP LENGTH-ABUSED/CURRENT OR NOT	120	122	F3
	1 One year or less			
	2 13 months to two years			
	3 25 months to three years			
	4 37 months to five years			
	5 61 months to 15 years			
	6 181 months or longer			
LENGTHR	RECODED LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP	123	123	F1
	1 One year or less			
	2 13 to 24 months			
	3 25 to 36 months			
	4 Three years or more			
M13TALKR	TALKING, RECODED	124	126	F3
	1 Yes or sometimes			
	2 No			
	998 M Naw			
	999 M Missing			
M17CNSLR	R CONTACT AGENCY/COUNSELOR AFTER INC	127	129	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 Sometimes			
	998 M Naw			
	999 M Missing			
M21MEDR	DID R GET MEDICAL CARE BEFORE T1 VISIT?	130	133	F4
	1 Yes			
	2 No, or this is the first time			
	999 M Naw			
	9999 M No answer			
M24TELL	DID R TELL THEM WHAT HAPPENED?	134	136	F3
	1 Yes, I always told them			
	2 No, I never told them			
	3 Yes, but not always			
	4 I told them this first time			
	5 No, didn't tell this first time			
	777 M This is the first time r sought medical help			
	888 M Don't know			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
M24TELL (cont.)				
	996 M R never sought medical help			
	997 M No one ever asked			
	998 M Naw			
	999 M Missing			
M28POLR	R CONTACT POLICE AFTER INC IN PAST YR	137	139	F3
	1 Yes, r or someone else			
	2 No			
	99 M No answer			
	998 M Naw			
	999 M Missing			
HELPTYPE	COUNT OF TYPES OF HELP-SEEKING	140	142	F3
	0 None			
	1 One type			
	2 Two types			
	3 Three types			
	4 Four types			
	999 M Missing			
HELP	AT LEAST ONE TYPE OF HELP?	143	143	F1
	0 Undoc code			
	1 Yes			
HELPTYP2	HELP TYPES-COUNTING COUNSELOR ONLY ONCE	144	146	F3
	999 M Missing			
HELPPFORM	FORMAL HELP TYP-COUNTING COUNSELING ONCE	147	149	F3
	999 M Missing			
HELPR	AT LEAST ONE TYPE OF HELP?	150	152	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	999 M Missing			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
HELPPFR	AT LEAST ONE TYPE OF FORMAL HELP?	153	155	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	999 M Missing			
HELPPMP	DID SHE SEEK MEDICAL HELP OR CALL POLICE	156	158	F3
	0 Neither			
	1 Either one, not both			
	2 Sought help from both sources			
	999 Missing			
M35SAFE	SOMEPLACE R CAN GO WHERE R FEELS SAFE	159	161	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
M37COURT	R GO TO COURT IN PAST YR-RELATED MATTER	162	164	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	888 M Don't know			
	998 M Naw			
	999 M Missing			
M38ORDER	ORDER OF PROTECTION?	165	167	F3
	1 Yes, r got order of protection in past year			
	2 Court, but no order of protection			
	3 Didn't go to court			
	998 Naw			
	999 Missing			
M41ILLGL	PAST YR, PARTNER FORCE R TO DO SOMETHING	168	170	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
M42DAGR	RECODED-DID SHE THINK LIFE WAS IN DANGER	171	173	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes or maybe			
	999 M Missing			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
H25DIVRC	H25-PAST YR, PARTNER REFUSED DIVORCE	174	176	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 M Not married (n/a)			
	4 M Yes, not in past year			
	888 Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
L28KID	HAS R AND PARTNER HAD ANY CHILDREN?	177	179	F3
	1 Yes, by him			
	2 Yes, adopted or foster			
	3 No, or pregnant now			
	777 N/a			
	999 Missing			
L28BYHIM	NUMBER OF CHILDREN R HAS HAD BY PARTNER	180	182	F3
	9 M Unknown			
	666 Unreliable answer			
	999 M Missing			
D1ALONE	PEOPLE LIVING IN R'S HOUSEHOLD	183	185	F3
	1 R lives alone			
	2 More than one			
	333 M R lives in group home/institution			
	444 M R is homeless			
	555 M Refusal			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
NOHOME	R HOMELESS/LIVE IN GRP HOME/INSTITUTION	186	188	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	999 Refusal			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
RCHTOT	TOTAL R'S CHILDREN/BIRTH/ADOPTED/FOSTER	189	191	F3
	555 Refusal			
	666 Unreliable			
	777 Has kids not in household, no other info.			
	999 Missing			
RCHANY	DOES R HAVE ANY CHILDREN?	192	194	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	666 Unreliable			
	999 Missing			
RCHILD17	R'S CHILDREN TOTAL, 17 OR YOUNGER	195	198	F4
	999 Missing			
RCHILD18	R'S CHILDREN TOTAL, 18 OR OLDER	199	202	F4
	999 Missing			
D3TOT12	CHILDREN AGE 12 AND UNDER IN HOUSEHOLD	203	205	F3
	555 Refusal			
	666 Unreliable			
D3TOT17	CHILDREN AGE 13 TO 17 IN HOUSEHOLD	206	208	F3
	555 Refusal			
	666 Unreliable			
D3TOTAL	CHILDREN 17 & UNDER LIVING IN HOUSEHOLD	209	211	F3
	555 Refusal			
	777 Treatment center, shelter			
D3RCHILT	TOTAL R'S CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD, ANY AGE	212	214	F3
	555 Refusal			
	666 Unreliable			
D6KIDOUT	R HAVE ANY CHILDREN NOT LIVING IN HH?	215	217	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	9 M Unknown			
	999 Missing			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
PREGR	PREGNANT NOW OR IN LAST YEAR?	218	218	F1
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	9 M Missing or don't know			
PREGRR	PREGNANT NOW?	219	219	F1
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	9 M Unknown			
STDETAI	ANY R'S CHILDREN NOT BY [NAME] IN HH	220	222	F3
	1 Yes children, not [name]'s			
	2 No r's children in household			
	3 Yes children, some are [name]'s			
	4 Don't know where r & [name]'s children living			
	5 All r's children are [name]'s			
	6 Has children, not [name]'s, but not living in HH			
	7 Children in household, but don't know if they			
	999 Missing			
STEPCHIL	CHILDREN IN R'S HH/HER CHILD NOT [NAME]	223	225	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 M Maybe			
	999 M Missing			
E1HEALTH	R'S GEN HEALTH COMPARED W/ WOMEN HER AGE	226	228	F3
	1 Excellent			
	2 Very good			
	3 Good			
	4 Fair			
	5 Poor			
	999 M Missing			
POORHTH	POOR HEALTH	229	229	F1
	0 No			
	1 Yes			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
E2HLTHNW	R'S GEN HEALTH COMPARED TO ONE YEAR AGO	230	232	F3
	1 Much better now			
	2 Somewhat better now			
	3 About the same now			
	4 Somewhat worse now			
	5 Much worse now			
	999 M Missing			
E3VISIT	R SAW HEALTH CARE PRFSSNL FOR HEALTH	233	235	F3
	1 Never			
	2 Once			
	3 Twice			
	4 Three or four times			
	5 Five or more times			
	999 M Missing			
E4PROBLM	R LIMITED DUE TO PHYSICAL CONDITION	236	238	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	999 M Missing			
E7EMTION	R BEEN LIMITED BY EMOTIONAL CONDITION?	239	241	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 M Interviewer says r unstable			
	4 M Later int. r says there was a problem			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
E8CONDTN	EMOTIONAL CONDITION WHICH LIMITS R	242	301	A60
N7PREGNT	N7-BEATEN BY PARTNER WHILE PREGNANT	302	304	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 R says never pregnant			
	9 Naw, not asked			
	777 N/a			
	888 Don't know			
	999 Missing			



NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
E15ALCHL	HAS R EVER HAD A PROBLEM WITH ALCOHOL	305	307	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	999 M Missing			
E18DRUG	HAS R EVER HAD A PROBLEM WITH DRUGS?	308	310	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	999 M Missing			
SUBTOTAL	R'S SUBSTANCE USE, TOTAL	311	311	F1
	0 Other			
	1 Ever had alcohol or drug problem			
DEPRESS	EMOTIONAL CONDITION: DEPRESSION	312	314	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	999 M Missing			
DEPTOT	TOTAL DEPRESSED FEELINGS, COUNT	315	317	F3
	999 M Missing			
DEPTOT2	TOT DEPRESSION-COUNTING EMOT CONDITION	318	320	F3
PINCOM	PERSONAL INCOME R CONTROLS	321	323	F3
	0 None			
	1 Under \$5000			
	2 \$5000 to \$9999			
	3 \$10000 to \$19999			
	4 \$20000 to \$29999			
	5 \$30000 to 39999			
	6 \$40000 or more			
	99 Don't know			
	999 Missing			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
ANYPINC	DOES R HAVE ANY PERSONAL INCOME?	324	326	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	99 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
HINCOME	HOUSEHOLD INCOME	327	329	F3
	1 Less than \$5000			
	2 \$5000 to 9999			
	3 \$10000 to \$19999			
	4 \$20000 to \$29999			
	5 \$30000 to \$39999			
	6 More than \$40000			
	99 Missing			
	888 Don't know			
PINCOMER	RECODED PERSONAL INCOME	330	330	F1
	0 None			
	1 Under \$5,000			
	2 \$5,000 to \$9,999			
	3 \$10,000 to \$19,999			
	4 \$20,000 and up			
	9 M Unknown			
HINCOMER	RECODED HOUSEHOLD INCOME	331	333	F3
	1 Less than \$5,000			
	2 \$5,000 to \$9,999			
	3 \$10,000 to \$19,999			
	4 \$20,000 and up			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Undoc code			
GUNS	GUNS IN THE HOME AT INITIAL INTERVIEW?	334	337	F4
	0 Loaded handgun(s)			
	1 Handgun(s), not loaded			
	2 Other gun(s)			
	3 No			
	99 M No home			
	999 M Missing			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
GUNSR	IS THERE A LOADED GUN IN THE HOUSE? 0 Yes 1 No 99 M No home 999 M Missing	338	341	F4
POWER	TOTAL POWER AND CONTROL SCALE-OUT OF 5 999 Missing	342	344	F3
HARASS	HARASS SCORE:COUNT OF H6 TO H24-MAX.=19	345	346	F2
RSUICIDE	SUICIDE ATTEMPT OR THREAT, RECODED 0 No 1 Yes 999 M Missing	347	349	F3
REEXPER	REEXPERIENCING TOT, 1,2,3,4	350	350	F1
AVOIDANC	AVOIDANCE TOT, 6,7,8,9,10,11,12	351	351	F1
AROUSAL	AROUSAL TOT, 5,13,14,15,16,17	352	352	F1
PTSDDX	PTSD DIAGNOSIS 0 No 1 PTSD diagnosis 999 M Missing	353	355	F3
ACCESS	3,10,11:ACCESS TO/KNOWLEDGE OF RESOURCES 999 M Missing	356	358	F3
ACCESS2	3,10,11, COUNTING ONLY LANGUAGE 999 M Missing	359	361	F3
EMERHELP	6,8,12,13:TANGIBLE HELP IN EMERGENCIES 999 M Missing	362	364	F3
SUPPORT	1,2,4,5,7: ACCEPTANCE AND SUPPORT 999 M Missing	365	367	F3
TOTSUPRT	TOTAL SUPPORT NETWORK SCORE, OUT OF 12 999 M Missing	368	370	F3

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
TOTSUPT2	TOTAL SUPPORT, WITH F3 ONLY LANGUAGE 999 M Missing	371	373	F3
N1FRQNCY	N1-PHYSICAL VIOLENCE INCREASED 1 Yes 2 No 3 M No abuse in past year 888 M Don't know 999 M Missing	374	376	F3
N2SVRITY	N2-PHYS VIOLENCE INCREASED IN SEVERITY 1 Yes 2 No 3 M No abuse in past year 888 M Don't know 999 M Missing	377	379	F3
N4CHOKE	N4-PARTNER EVER TRIED TO CHOKE YOU? 1 Yes 2 No 3 No abuse in past year 888 M Don't know 999 M Missing	380	382	F3
CHOKED	[NAME] EVER TRIED TO CHOKE OR STRANGLE R 0 No 1 Yes	383	383	F1
N6CONTRL	N6-PARTNER CONTROL DAILY ACTIVITIES? 1 Yes 2 No 3 No abuse in past year 888 M Don't know 999 M Missing	384	386	F3

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
N8JEALUS	N8-PARTNER VIOLENTLY JEALOUS	387	389	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 No abuse in past year			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
N9KILL	N9-PARTNER THREATEN TO KILL YOU?	390	392	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 No abuse in past year			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 Missing			
N10CPBLE	N10-PARTNER CAPABLE OF KILLING YOU?	393	395	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 No abuse in past year			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 Missing			
N11DRUGS	N11-DOES PARTNER USE DRUGS?	396	398	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
N12ALCHL	N12-PARTNER HAS/HAD PROBLEMS W/ALCOHOL	399	401	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
N13SUHIM	N13-PARTNER EVER TRIED TO COMMIT SUICIDE	402	404	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
N14SUHER	N14-YOU TRIED TO COMMIT SUICIDE?	405	407	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 M R later says yes			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
N15HOME	N15-PARTNER VIOLENT OUTSIDE OF THE HOME?	408	410	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	888 M Don't know			
	999 M Missing			
SEVEREST	SEVEREST INCIDENT IN PAST YEAR	411	412	F2
	-1 Forced sex only - no injury, weapon or threat			
	0 Threat to hit with a fist or anything else that would hurt r			
	1 Slapping, pushing - no injury, no lasting pain			
	2 Punching, kicking - bruises, cuts, and/or continuing pain			
	3 Beating up, choking - severe contusions, burns, broken bones			
	4 Threat weap use, head inj, lost cons, internal or perm inj			
	5 Weapon use or wounds, attempted murder			
	9 Calendar missing			
SEVERER	RECODED SEVEREST INCIDENT IN PAST YEAR	413	413	F1
	1 Less severe			
	2 Beating up or worse			
	9 M Calendar missing			
TOTINC	TOTAL OF INCIDENTS IN PAST YEAR	414	416	F3
	999 M Calendar missing			
TOTINCR	RECODED TOTAL INCIDENTS, PAST YEAR	417	419	F3
	1 One			
	2 2 to 4			
	3 5 to 10			
	4 11 to 172			
	999 M Calendar missing			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
TOTINC11	RECODED:11 OR MORE INCIDENTS PAST YEAR	420	422	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	999 Missing calendar			
TOTINONE	ONE INCIDENT IN THE PAST YEAR?	423	423	F1
	1 Yes, one			
	2 More than one			
TOTINFIV	FIVE OR MORE INCIDENTS IN PAST YEAR?	424	424	F1
	1 1 - 4 incidents			
	2 5 or more			
RECENT	# DAYS FROM INC TO INIT INTERVIEW DATE	425	427	F3
	999 Missing			
RECENTR	DAYS BEFORE INITIAL INTERVIEW, RECODED	428	430	F3
	1 0 to 6 days			
	2 7 to 30 days			
	3 31 to 60 days			
	4 61 to 180 days			
	5 181 to 300 days			
	6 301 to 364 days			
	999 M Missing calendar			
RECENTRR	MOST RECENT INC BEFORE INITIAL INTERVIEW	431	433	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	999 M Calendar missing			
RECENT30	LAST INC W/IN 30 DAYS OF INIT INTERVIEW	434	436	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	999 M Missing			
FOLLWUP1	FIRST FOLLOWUP COMPLETED?	437	437	F1
	1 Interview completed			
	2 Not completed			
	5 No consent or no info.			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
FOLLWUP1 (cont.)				
	6 Deceased before first followup			
	7 Incarcerated			
ABUSER23	ABUSED ON FOLLOWUP?	438	440	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	997 Calendar has no incidents, but aw in section j			
	998 Calendar unreliable			
	999 M No followup			
ABUSE23	ABUSE IN FOLLOW-UP PERIOD?	441	443	F3
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
	997 No incidents in calendar, but aw in section j			
	998 Unreliable			
	999 No followup			
SEVER23R	SEVERITY ON FOLLOWUP	444	446	F3
	0 No incidents			
	1 Other incidents			
	2 Beating up or worse			
	998 Calendar unreliable			
	999 No followup			
SEVERE23	MOST SEVERE INCIDENT ON FOLLOWUP	447	449	F3
	-2 M No incident on followup			
	-1 Forced sex only - no injury, weapon or threat			
	0 Threat to hit with a fist or anything else that would hurt r			
	1 Slapping, pushing - no injury, no lasting pain			
	2 Punching, kicking - bruises, cuts, and/or continuing pain			
	3 Beating up, choking - severe contusions, burns, broken bones			
	4 Threat weap use, head inj, lost cons, internal or perm inj			
	5 Weapon use, wounds; attempted murder			
	998 Unreliable			
	999 No followup			
TOT23	TOTAL FOLLOWUP INCIDENTS	450	452	F3
	998 Followups unreliable			
	999 No followup			



NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
TIMEDAYS	DAYS FREE FROM VIOLENCE	453	456	F4
	995 M Initial calendar missing, abused on followup			
	996 M Initial calendar missing, no followup			
	997 M Initial calendar missing, no followup incident			
	998 M Unreliable followup			
TIMEFREE	RECODED DAYS FREE FROM VIOLENCE	457	460	F4
	0 Incident same day as interview, no followup			
	1 1 to 7 days after last incident			
	2 8 to 14 days later			
	3 14 to 21 days later			
	4 22 to 30 days later			
	5 31 to 60 days later			
	6 61 to 90 days later			
	7 91 to 120 days later			
	8 121 to 150 days later			
	9 151 to 180 days later			
	10 181 to 365 days later			
	11 366 to 730 days later			
	12 731 to 917 days later			
	995 M Initial calendar missing, abused on followup			
	996 M Initial calendar missing, no followup			
	997 M Initial calendar missing, no incident in followup			
	998 M Unreliable followup			
DAYSTOT	DYS FROM INIT INTERVIEW-1ST FOLLOWUP INC	461	464	F4
	998 Unreliable			
	999 Calendar missing			
	9999 M Unknown			
FOLLDAYS	DYS FROM INIT INTRVIEW TO FINAL FOLLOWUP	465	467	F3
	0 No followup			
T2STATUS	ABUSE STATUS OF [NAME1] AT FOLLOW-UP	468	470	F3
	1 Aw [name1] only			
	2 Aw [name1] & [name2]			
	3 Aw [name2] only			
	4 Aw [name3] only			
	8 M Not abused at follow-up			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
T2STATUS (cont.)				
	9 No follow-up			
	555 M Person other than [name1] followed-up on			
	999 Unreliable or missing			
BCPCTAID	% OF BEAT HOUSEHOLDS ON PUBLIC AID	471	476	F6.3
BCPCTVAC	% OF BEAT HOUSING UNITS VACANT	477	482	F6.3
BCVACPAR	% OF BEAT LAND PARCELS VACANT	483	488	F6.3
BCPCTOWN	% OF BEAT HOUSING UNITS OWNED	489	494	F6.3
BFEMPOVE	FEMININE POVERTY IN BEAT	495	500	F6.3
BASSA95	ASSAULTS 1995, BEAT	501	504	F4
BASSA96	ASSAULTS 1996, BEAT	505	508	F4
BASSAULT	ASSAULT RATE PER 10,000, 1995/96	509	514	F6.1
BDRUG95	DRUG CRIMES 1995, BEAT	515	518	F4
BDRUG96	DRUG CRIMES 1996, BEAT	519	522	F4
BDRUG	DRUG OFFENSES PER 10,000, 1995-96	523	528	F6.1
ESTPOP98	ESTIMATED BEAT POPULATION, 1998	529	533	F5
CHAN9098	BEAT POPULATION CHANGE, 1990-1998	534	538	F5.2
BEATTEST	BEATS 511 OR 1231?	539	542	F4
F14LIVE	LIVING IN SAME PLACE AS LAST INTERVIEW	543	545	F3
	1 Yes			
	2 No			
	3 M Yes, gave her initial address only during foll			
	4 M Says no, but gives same address			
	999 M Missing			