

ICPSR 3735

Urban Morality Issues Incidents in Ten Cities, 1990-2000: [United States]

Elaine B. Sharp
University of Kansas

First ICPSR Version
May 2004

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

Terms of Use

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:

Sharp, Elaine B. URBAN MORALITY ISSUES INCIDENTS IN TEN CITIES, 1990-2000: [UNITED STATES] [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Lawrence, KS: Elaine B. Sharp, University of Kansas [producer], 2002. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.

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. Visit the ICPSR Web site for more information on submitting citations.

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.

Responsible Use Statement: In preparing data for public release, ICPSR performs a number of procedures to ensure that the identity of research subjects cannot be disclosed. Any intentional identification or disclosure of a person or establishment violates the assurances of confidentiality given to the providers of the information. Therefore, users of data obtained from the ICPSR archive and/or any of its special topic archives agree:

- To use these datasets solely for statistical analysis and reporting of aggregated information, and not for investigation of specific individuals or organizations, except when identification is authorized in writing by ICPSR
- To make no use of the identity of any person or establishment discovered inadvertently, and to advise ICPSR of any such discovery
- To produce no links among ICPSR datasets or among ICPSR data and other datasets that could identify individuals or organizations

Redistribution: ICPSR data may not be redistributed or sold to other individuals, institutions, or organizations without the written agreement of ICPSR.

Data Collection Description

Principal Investigator(s): Elaine B. Sharp

Title: Urban Morality Issues Incidents in Ten Cities, 1990-2000:
[United States]

ICPSR Study Number: 3735

Funding Agency: National Science Foundation

Grant Number: 9904482

Summary: This collection consists of data that tracked how ten city governments in the United States responded to morality issues in the last decade of the 20th century. The ten cities varied in their geographic properties and were characterized by their locations, e.g., South City, Metro City, and Coast City. Morality issues were defined as issues concerning actions or behaviors that were regulated by a deeply held belief and/or a religious value. The issues falling within this categorization were gay rights, abortion rights, abortion clinic protests, needle exchange programs for drug users, hate speech, hate groups, gambling policies and regulations, animal rights, and regulations pertaining to the sex industry, which included pornography, prostitution, and adult entertainment. Incidents or events in the ten cities related to these moral issues were identified. The data were generated by scanning local newspapers to isolate and gather relevant information about the selected cities, interviewing political elites (e.g., mayor, city manager, and council person), and reviewing public government records for the selected cities. Part 1, Ten City Data, contains data on 451 incidents related to morality issues in the ten cities. Part 2, Subset of Ten City Data With City-Specific Variables, is a subset of the cases included in Part 1 and also includes a broader array of city-specific contextual variables. The variables shared by Part 1 and Part 2 are whether a city had a mayor or a city manager, whether city council elections were at-large or by district, the percentage or share of the city council elected by a particular district, the strength and prevalence of the city's homosexual community, the percentage of residents in the county who attended religious services, the percentage of residents in the county who identified themselves as Catholic or as religious fundamentalists, and whether activists involved with this issue were more likely to be from the left or right, politically. Additional shared variables are city population in 1990 and 1998 (in thousands), the percentage of population change between 1980-1990 and 1990-1998, the metro area population in 1990 (in thousands), the percentage of population change in the metro area from 1980-1990 and from 1990-1996, the percentage of female, Asian, White, Black, and Hispanic residents, the median household income, the percentage of married residents, the percentage of female-headed households, the 1997 unemployment rate, the percentage of same gender partnerships, the total number of churches, the number of churches per capita, the percentage of households with children under the age of 19, the percentage of the

population aged 18-34, the percentage of residents that were college educated, income per capita, the percentage of foreign-born residents, the percentage of residents living in poverty, and the acceptability and prevalence of the city's "unconventional" or "counter" culture. The variables contained only in Part 2, Subset of Ten City Data With City-Specific Variables, are the type of community education present, the type of social culture in the community, the percentage of the work force employed in education or technology related jobs, the percentage of women in the work force, and the total number of churches in the county.

Universe: Cities within the United States with populations of at least 300,000 people. At the time of the study, there were 52 cities with populations of 300,000 or greater.

Sample: Ten of the 52 cities with populations greater or equal to 300,000 were selected. The ten cities were selected based on the following criteria: (a) each city had to be +/- 0.75 standard deviation from the mean percentage of population in non-family households, (b) each city had to be +/- 0.75 standard deviation from the mean percentage of population change, and (c) within the group, a city contributed to maximizing the variation between governmental structures.

Date of Collection: June 1999-June 2001

Data Collection Notes: (1) Those who make use of these data should acknowledge the support of the National Science Foundation (9904482). Copies of all papers written on the basis of these data should be sent to Elaine B. Sharp. (2) The codebook is provided by ICPSR as a 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.

Data Source: newspaper files, personal interviews, and documentary evidence

Restrictions: This data collection may not be used for any purpose other than statistical reporting and analysis. Use of these data to learn the identity of an person or establishment is prohibited.

Extent of Collection: 2 data files + machine-readable documentation (PDF) + SAS data definition statements + SPSS data definition statements

Extent of Processing: CONCHK.PR/ DDEF.ICPSR/ SCAN/ REFORM.DOC

Data Format: Logical Record Length with SAS and SPSS data definition statements and SPSS portable files

File Specifications

<i>Part No.</i>	<i>Part Name</i>	<i>File Structure</i>	<i>Case Count</i>	<i>Variable Count</i>	<i>LRECL</i>	<i>Records Per Case</i>
1	Ten City Data	rectangular	451	98	286	1
2	Subset of Ten City Data With City-Specific Variables	rectangular	351	120	706	1

Related Publications

Sharp, Elaine B. "Culture, Institutions, and Urban Officials' Responses to Morality Issues." POLITICAL RESEARCH QUARTERLY 55,4 (December 2002), 861-883.

Processing Note

The data set encompasses a universe rather than a sample of the relevant issue incidents in each study city for the period 1994-2000. The data for the core variables in the data set were obtained by systematic searches of local newspaper files from the study cities to isolate and gather factual detail on the history of the relevant morality issue topic in the city. Then, in-depth personal interviews were conducted with relevant political elites (i.e. mayors, city managers, council members, city attorneys) and community leaders or activists (e.g., leaders of gay rights organizations or needle exchange programs) about governmental action on those issues. This, combined with the inspection of documentary sources such as city ordinances yielded information on the incidents. Various city characteristics from Census data were added as contextual variables.

Data were collected for each of the 52 cities in the United States with a population of at least 300,000. With respect to the city's economic health, population change (1980-1990) served as a rough indicator of where the city falls on the continuum from declining local economies to coming ones. With respect to the socio-cultural character of the community, the percentage of the population in non-family households served as a rough indicator of where the community falls on Rosdil's (1998) conventional-unconventional socio-cultural dimension.

The 52 cities were winnowed down to those that are both (a) ± 0.75 standard deviation from the mean on percentage of the population in non-family households and (b) ± 0.75 standard deviation from the mean on population change, yielding a set of 14 cities, which also presents information on each city's government institutions. Selection of study cities from each cell maximizes the variance of the values of the two key explanatory variables and minimizes the problem of co linearity between those two explanatory variables. To accomplish the same goals with respect to institutional arrangements, study cities were selected within each cell with an eye toward maximizing variation in both aspects of governmental structure. This resulted in the final sample consisting of ten cities in the United States.

LIST OF VARIABLES FOR 3735 PART 2 - SUBSET OF TEN CITY DATA WITH CITY-SPECIFIC VARIABLES

Name		Position
INCIDENT	INCIDENT NUMBER (CITY CODE; NUMBER)	1
CITYID	CITY ID	2
	Value Label	
	1.0000 Metro City	
	2.0000 Hill City	
	3.0000 Border City	
	4.0000 Western City	
	5.0000 Lake City	
	6.0000 South City	
	7.0000 River City	
	8.0000 Port City	
	9.0000 Valley City	
	10.0000 Coastal City	
INCIDTYP	INCIDENT TYPE	3
	Value Label	
	1.0000 ABORTION	
	2.0000 HATE CRIME/GROUPS	
	3.0000 PORNOGRAPHY, PROSTITUTION, SEX, OBSCENIT	
	4.0000 RELIGIOUS/PUBLIC ART DISPLAY	
	5.0000 GAY RELATED	
	6.0000 NEEDLE EXCHANGE	
	7.0000 GAMBLING	
	8.0000 ANIMAL RIGHTS	
	9.0000 MEDICAL MARIJUANA	
	10.0000 OTHER	
MONSTART	MONTH INCIDENT STARTED	4
YRSTART	YEAR INCIDENT STARTED	5
	Missing Values: 9999	
	Value Label	
	9999 M Year Not Known	
MONEND	MONTH INCIDENT ENDED	6
	Missing Values: .0000	
	Value Label	
	.0000 M Unknown	
YREND	YEAR INCIDENT ENDED	7
	Missing Values: 9999	

	Value	Label	
	9999 M	Year Not Known	
MAYORDIR	MAYOR DIRECTED		8
	Value	Label	
	.0000	NO MAYOR	
	1.0000	QUASI-MAYOR	
	2.0000	STRONG MAYOR	
COUNCWDR	COUNCIL BY WARD		9
COUNCLRG	COUNCIL-AT-LARGE		10
CITYMNGR	CITY MANAGER		11
	Value	Label	
	.0000	NO CITY MANAGER	
	1.0000	CITY MANAGER	
ROLE1	ROLE 1 (PRIMARY ROLE)		12
	Value	Label	
	1.0000	ENTREPRENEURIAL INSTIGATION	
	2.0000	HYPERACTIVE RESPONSIVENESS	
	3.0000	RESPONSIVENESS	
	4.0000	EVASION	
	5.0000	NON-RESPONSIVENESS	
	6.0000	REPRESSION	
ROLE2	ROLE 2 (SECONDARY ROLE)		13
	Value	Label	
	1.0000	ENTREPRENEURIAL INSTIGATION	
	2.0000	HYPERACTIVE REESPONSIVENESS	
	3.0000	RESPONSIVENESS	
	4.0000	EVASION	
	5.0000	NON-RESPONSIVENESS	
	6.0000	REPRESSION	
ROLE3	ROLE 3		14
	Value	Label	
	1.0000	ENTREPRENEURIAL INSTIGATION	
	2.0000	HYPERACTIVE RESPONSIVENESS	
	3.0000	RESPONSIVENESS	
	4.0000	EVASION	
	5.0000	NON-RESPONSIVENESS	
	6.0000	REPRESSION	

ROLE4		15
ROLE5		16
ROLE6		17
ROLE7		18
ROLE8		19
ROLE9		20
ROLE10		21
ROLE11		22
ROLE12		23
ROLE13		24
ROLE14		25
ACTOR1	ACTOR 1 (PRIMARY ACTOR)	26

Value	Label
1.0000	CITY COUNCIL
2.0000	CITY MANAGER
3.0000	MAYOR
4.0000	POLICE
5.0000	HUMAN RELATIONS/RIGHTS COMMISSION
6.0000	OTHER BUREACRATIC ORGANIZATION
7.0000	DISTRICT ATTORNEY (OR EQUIVALENT)
8.0000	COUNTY COMMISSION
9.0000	COUNTY CEO
10.0000	SHERIFF
11.0000	FBI
12.0000	OTHER COUNTY
13.0000	FIRE
14.0000	STATE ATTORNEY
15.0000	STATE LEGISLATURE
16.0000	SUPERIOR COURT
17.0000	MUNICIPAL COURT
18.0000	OTHER
19.0000	CITY ATTORNEY/SOLICITOR

ACTOR2	ACTOR 2 (SECONDARY ACTOR)	27
	Value	Label
	1.0000	CITY COUNCIL
	2.0000	CITY MANAGER
	3.0000	MAYOR
	4.0000	POLICE
	5.0000	HUMAN RELATIONS/RIGHTS COMMISSION
	6.0000	OTHER BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION
	7.0000	DISTRICT ATTORNEY (OR EQUIVALENT)

8.0000	COUNTY COMMISSION
9.0000	COUNTY CEO
10.0000	SHERIFF
11.0000	FBI
12.0000	OTHER COUNTY
13.0000	FIRE
14.0000	STATE ATTORNRY
15.0000	STATE LEGISLATURE
16.0000	SUPERIOR COURT
17.0000	MUNCIPAL COURT
18.0000	OTHER
19.0000	CITY ATTORNEY/SOLICITOR

ACTOR3 ACTOR 3

28

Value	Label
1.0000	CITY COUNCIL
2.0000	CITY MANAGER
3.0000	MAYOR
4.0000	POLICE
5.0000	HUMAN RELATIONS/RIGHTS COMMISSION
6.0000	OTHER BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION
7.0000	DISTRICT ATTORNEY (OR EQUIVALENT)
8.0000	COUNTY COMMISSION
9.0000	COUNTY CEO
10.0000	SHERIFF
11.0000	FBI
12.0000	OTHER COUNTY
13.0000	FIRE
14.0000	STATE ATTORNEY
15.0000	STATE LEGISLATURE
16.0000	SUPERIOR COURT
17.0000	MUNICIPAL COURT
18.0000	OTHER
19.0000	CITY ATTORNEY/SOLICITOR

ACTOR4 ACTOR 4

29

Value	Label
1.0000	CITY COUNCIL
2.0000	CITY MANAGER
3.0000	MAYOR
4.0000	POLICE
5.0000	HUMAN RELATIONS/RIGHTS COMMISSION
6.0000	OTHER BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION
7.0000	DISTRICT ATTORNEY (OR EQUIVALENT)
8.0000	COUNTY COMMISSION
9.0000	COUNTY CEO
10.0000	SHERIFF
11.0000	FBI
12.0000	OTHER COUNTY
13.0000	FIRE
15.0000	STATE LEGISLATURE
16.0000	SUPERIOR COURT
17.0000	MUNICIPAL COURT

18.0000 OTHER
19.0000 CITY ATTORNEY/SOLICITOR

ACTOR5 ACTOR 5 30

Value	Label
1.0000	CITY COUNCIL
2.0000	CITY MANAGER
3.0000	MAYOR
4.0000	POLICE
5.0000	HUMAN RELATIONS/RIGHTS COMMISSION
6.0000	OTHER BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION
7.0000	DISTRICT ATTORNEY (OR EQUIVALENT)
8.0000	COUNTY COMMISSION
9.0000	COUNTY CEO
10.0000	SHERIFF
11.0000	FBI
12.0000	OTHER COUNTY
13.0000	FIRE
14.0000	STATE ATTORNEY
15.0000	STATE LEGISLATURE
16.0000	SUPERIOR COURT
17.0000	MUNICIPAL COURT
18.0000	OTHER
19.0000	CITY ATTORNEY/SOLICITOR

ACTOR6 ACTOR 6 31

Value	Label
1.0000	CITY COUNCIL
2.0000	CITY MANAGER
3.0000	MAYOR
4.0000	POLICE
5.0000	HUMAN RELATIONS/RIGHTS COMMISSION
6.0000	OTHER BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION
7.0000	DISTRICT ATTORNEY (OR EQUIVALENT)
8.0000	COUNTY COMMISSION/BOARD
9.0000	COUNTY CEO
10.0000	SHERIFF
11.0000	FBI
12.0000	OTHER COUNTY
13.0000	FIRE
14.0000	STATE ATTORNEY
15.0000	STATE LEGISLATURE
16.0000	SUPERIOR COURT
17.0000	MUNICIPAL COURT
18.0000	OTHER
19.0000	CITY ATTORNEY/SOLICITOR

ACTOR7 ACTOR 7 32

Value	Label
1.0000	CITY COUNCIL
2.0000	CITY MANAGER

3.0000	MAYOR
4.0000	POLICE
5.0000	HUMAN RELATIONS/RIGHTS COMMISSION
6.0000	OTHER BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION
7.0000	DISTRICT ATTORNEY (OR EQUIVALENT)
8.0000	COUNTY COMMISSION/BOARD
9.0000	COUNTY CEO
10.0000	SHERIFF
11.0000	FBI
12.0000	OTHER COUNTY
13.0000	FIRE
14.0000	STATE ATTORNEY
15.0000	STATE LEGISLATURE
16.0000	SUPERIOR COURT
17.0000	MUNICIPAL COURT; COURTS
18.0000	OTHER
19.0000	CITY ATTORNEY/SOLICITOR

ACTOR8 ACTOR 8

33

Value	Label
1.0000	CITY COUNCIL
2.0000	CITY MANAGER
3.0000	MAYOR
4.0000	POLICE
5.0000	HUMAN RELATIONS/RIGHTS COMMISSION
6.0000	OTHER BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION
7.0000	DISTRICT ATTORNEY (OR EQUIVALENT)
8.0000	COUNTY COMMISSION/BOARD
9.0000	COUNTY CEO
10.0000	SHERIFF
11.0000	FBI
12.0000	OTHER COUNTY
13.0000	FIRE
14.0000	STATE ATTORNEY
15.0000	STATE LEGISLATURE
16.0000	SUPERIOR COURT
17.0000	MUNICIPAL COURT; COURTS
18.0000	OTHER

ACTOR9 ACTOR 9

34

Value	Label
1.0000	CITY COUNCIL
2.0000	CITY MANAGER
3.0000	MAYOR
4.0000	POLICE
5.0000	HUMAN RELATIONS/RIGHTS COMMISSION
6.0000	OTHER BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION
7.0000	DISTRICT ATTORNEY (OR EQUIVALENT)
8.0000	COUNTY COMMISSION/BOARD
9.0000	COUNTY CEO
10.0000	SHERIFF
11.0000	FBI
12.0000	OTHER COUNTY

	13.0000	FIRE	
	14.0000	STATE ATTORNEY	
	15.0000	STATE LEGISLATURE	
	16.0000	SUPERIOR COURT	
	17.0000	MUNICIPAL COURT; COURTS	
	18.0000	OTHER	
ACTOR10			35
ACTOR11			36
ACTOR12			37
ACTOR13			38
ACTOR14			39
AGE	%	18-34 YEARS	40
RELIGION	%	FUNDAMENTALIST	41
BLACK	%	BLACK	42
HISPANIC	%	HISPANIC	43
ASIAN	%	ASIAN	44
SSPH	#	SAME SEX PARTNER HOUSEHOLDS	45
NFH		NON-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	46
EDUC	%	COLLEGE EDUCATED	47
INCOME		PER CAPITA INCOME	48
POPCHNG		POPULATION CHANGE 1990-96	49
FOREIGN	%	FOREIGN	50
FEMALE	%	FEMALE	51
FHH	%	FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS	52
POVERTY	%	IN POVERTY	53
UNEMPLOY		1997 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE	54
BSPLUS1	%	OF PERSONS (IN CENTRAL CITY) 25 YRS + WITH BACHELOR'S DEGREE OR MORE	55
BSPLUS2	%	OF PERSONS (OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY) 25 YRS + WITH BACHELORS' DEGREE OR MORE	56
HOUSINC1		MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME FOR CENTRAL CITY	57
HOUSINC2		MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME, NOT IN CENTRAL CITY	58

SSHOU51	NUMBER OF SAME GENDER UNMARRIED PARTNER HOUSEHOLDS IN CENTRAL CITY	59
SSHOU52	NUMBER OF SAME SEX UNMARRIED PARTNER HOUSEHOLDS, NOT IN CENTRAL CITY	60
TOTHOUS1	TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS IN CENTRAL CITY	61
TOTHOUS2	TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS, NOT IN CENTRAL CITY	62
MARRKID	INDIVIDUALS IN MARRIED-COUPLE-WITH-KIDS-UNDER-19 FAMILIES, AS PERCENT OF ALL PERSONS	63
CCWHITE	% WHITE IN CENTRAL CITY	64
CCBLACK	% BLACK IN CENTRAL CITY	65
CCHISP	% HISPANIC IN CENTRAL CITY	66
METWHITE	% WHITE NOT IN CENTRAL CITY	67
METBLACK	% BLACK NOT IN CENTRAL CITY	68
METHISP	% HISPANIC NOT IN CENTRAL CITY	69
CITPOP90	CITY'S POPULATION IN 1990, IN 000'S	70
CPOPCH90	% CHANGE IN CITY'S POPULATION 1980-90	71
CITPOP98	CITY'S 1998 POPULATION IN 000'S	72
CPOPCH98	% CHANGE IN CITY'S POPULATION 1990-98	73
METPOP90	METRO AREA POPULATION 1990 IN 000'S	74
MPOPCH90	% CHANGE IN METRO POPULATION 1980-90	75
MPOPCH96	% CHANGE IN METRO POPULATION 1990-96	76
GAY1	SAME SEX PARTNER HOUSEHOLDS PER 100,000 HOUSEHOLDS, CENTRAL CITY	77
CHURCHES	TOTAL NUMBER OF CHURCHES IN CORE COUNTY	78
CRCHPCAP	CHURCHES PER CAPITA	79
ROLENEW1	UNITARY CROSS-ACTOR ROLE AND CONFLICTS DESIGNATED	80

Value	Label
1.0000	ENTREPRENEURIAL INSTIGATION
2.0000	HYPERACTIVE RESPONSIVENESS
3.0000	RESPONSIVENESS
4.0000	EVASION
5.0000	NON-RESPONSIVENESS
6.0000	REPRESSION
9.0000	CONFLICTING ROLES

WARD	SHARE OF COUNCIL MEMBERS ELECTED BY DISTRICT	81
COUNCIL	IS CITY COUNCIL AN ACTOR	82
	Value Label	
	.0000 NO	
	1.0000 YES	
INCTYPE2	RECODED SO REL ART DISPLAY AND AIMAL RTS IN OTHER	83
	Value Label	
	1.0000 ABORTION	
	2.0000 HATE	
	3.0000 DECENCY	
	5.0000 GAY-RELATED	
	6.0000 NEEDLE EXCHANGE	
	7.0000 GAMBLING	
	9.0000 MED MARIJUANA	
	10.0000 OTHER	
WARD2	RECODED SO ALL MIXED SYSTEMS ARE .5	84
	Value Label	
	.0000 MIXED	
CITYOFF	DOES ANY CITY OFFICIAL PLAY A ROLE	85
NUMACTOR	NUMBER OF DIFFERENT ACTORS INVOLVED	86
EXECUTIV	CHIEF EXECUTIVE ARRANGEMENT	87
	Value Label	
	1.0000 STR MAYR NO CM	
	2.0000 STR MAYR + CM	
	3.0000 QUASI MAYR + CM	
	4.0000 CM NO MAYOR	
EXEC2	EXECUTIV RECODED	88
	Value Label	
	.0000 MIXED (ANY)	
	1.0000 STRONG MAYOR NO CM	
WARD3	WARD RECODED SO ALL MIXED SYSTEMS ARE .5	89
	Value Label	
	.0000 .54-.85 ELECTED BY WARD	
	1.0000 ALL ELECTED BY WARD	

EDTYPE	COMMUNITY ED TYPE		90
	Value	Label	
	.0000	DECLINING	
	1.0000	GROWING	
CULTURE	COMMUNITY'S SOCIAL CULTURE TYPE		91
	Value	Label	
	.0000	CONVENTIONAL	
	1.0000	UNCONVEN	
ROLENEW2	ROLENEW1 RECODED SO HYPER INTO RESPONSIVENESS		92
	Value	Label	
	1.0000	ENTREPRENEURIAL INSTIGATION	
	2.0000	RESPONSIVENESS, INC. HYPER	
	3.0000	EVASION	
	4.0000	NON-RESPONSIVENESS	
	5.0000	REPRESSION	
	6.0000	CONFLICTING ROLES	
CHRCHGO	% OF TOTAL POPULATION (COUNTY) ADHERING TO A CHURCH		93
CATHOLIC	% OF TOTAL POPULATION (COUNTY) CATHOLIC		94
EXECFIN	RECONSIDERED EXECUTIVE CLASSIFICATION		95
	Value	Label	
	.0000	MAYOR, INC. SOUTH CITY	
	1.0000	CM, INC COASTAL, VALLEY, BORDER, HILL	
WARDFIN	RECONSIDERED COUNCIL ELECTION TYPE		96
	Value	Label	
	.0000	DISTRICT, ALL OR PREDOM, INC. South City	
	1.0000	AT-LARGE	
SUBINDX2	ZGAY+ZBA<+Z%PROFSCIED		97
SUBINDX1	ZFEWORK PLUS ZNON-CHRCH MEMBER		98
CRCHMEM	PCT OF COUNTY POP. ADHERING TO A CHURCH		99
TECHED	% OF WORKFORCE IN TECHNICAL OR EDUCATIONAL CATEGORIES		100
FEWORK	% OF WOMEN IN WORKFORCE		101
EXECFINX	REVERSE CODED EXECFIN		102

	Value	Label	
	.0000	CITY MANAGER	
	1.0000	MAYOR	
WARDFINX	REVERSE CODED	WARDFIN	103
	Value	Label	
	.0000	AT LARGE	
	1.0000	WARD	
INCTYP3	INCIDENT TYPE, LEFT TO FAR RIGHT		104
	Value	Label	
	1.0000	LEFT ACTIVISTS	
	2.0000	RIGHT ACTIVISTS	
	3.0000	FAR RIGHT HATE CRIME	
FINLCULT	6-ITEM UNCONVENTIONAL CULTURE INDEX A LA BOOK CH 2		105
FINLED	3 VARIABLE ECON DEV INDEX A LA CH 2		106
HATE	HATE INCIDENT DUMMY		107
	Value	Label	
	.0000	not a hate incident	
	1.0000	hate incident	
INCTYP4			108
	Value	Label	
	1.0000	GAY, MJ, ANIMAL RTS	
	2.0000	GAMBLING AND DECENCY	
	3.0000	ABORTION	
	4.0000	HATE	
RFINCULT	RECODED FINLCULT		109
	Value	Label	
	1.0000	-.68 THRU -.9	
	2.0000	-.46 AND -.32	
	3.0000	.07	
	4.0000	.25-.29	
	5.0000	1.18	
INCTYP5	RECODED INCTYP4		110
	Value	Label	
	-2.0000	LEFT INCIDENTS	
	1.0000	TAME RIGHT	
	2.0000	ABORTION	

	3.0000	HATE	
DECENCY	DECENCY INCIDENT DUMMY		111
	Value	Label	
	.0000	not a decency incident	
	1.0000	decency incident	
CHrchDEC	DECENCY INCIDENT DUMMY X % ADHERING TO CHURCH		112
GAYINTER	GAY DUMMY X SUBINDEX2		113
ABRTDUM	ABORTION INCIDENT DUMMY VARIABLE		114
	Value	Label	
	.0000	not an abortion incident	
	1.0000	abortion incident	
FCTHABRT	ABORTION INCIDENT DUMMY X % CATHOLIC OR FUNDAMENTALIST (RELIGION)		115
INCTYPNU	Incident Type a la PRQ		116
	Value	Label	
	-2.0000	HATE	
	-1.0000	CONT RIGHT (ABORT)(
	.0000	CONS RIGHT ()GAMB, DEC)	
	1.0000	LEFT (GAY, MJ, ANIMAL)	
INTEROSD	INCTYPNU X RFINLCULT		117
ROLEFIXD	ROLENEW2 WITH DECENCY CASE CORRECTIONS FOR SEVERAL CITIES		118
	Value	Label	
	1.0000	ent instigation	
	2.0000	responsive inc. hyper	
	3.0000	evasion	
	4.0000	non-responsive	
	5.0000	repression	
GAYDUM	GAY INCIDENT DUMMY VARIABLE		119
	Value	Label	
	.0000	not a gay incident	
	1.0000	gay incident	
GAYINT2	GAY INCIDENT DUMMY X SSPH PER 100,00 HOUSEHOLDS		120