

116598

CRIMINAL EVENTS AMONG SERIOUSLY CRIMINAL DRUG ABUSERS

FINAL REPORT

Bruce D. Johnson and Eric D. Wish

**Interdisciplinary Research Center
for the Study of the Relations of
Drugs and Alcohol to Crime**

of

Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

and

Bureau of Research and Evaluation
New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services
55 West 125th Street
New York, N.Y. 10027

April 14, 1987

NCJRS

APR 17 1989

Julio Martinez, President
Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc. **ACQUISITIONS**

This report was supported in part by a research agreement program (80-IJ-CX-0049 S1) to Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc. by the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1969, as amended. Additional support was also provided by the New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services and Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the U.S. Government, New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services, or Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

CRIMINAL EVENTS AMONG SERIOUSLY CRIMINAL DRUG ABUSERS

Bruce D. Johnson and Eric D. Wish

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is one of three primary research monographs derived from the work of the Interdisciplinary Research Center (IRC) for the Study of the Relations of Drugs and Alcohol to Crime, a unit of Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc. The IRC's major objective was to increase understanding of the role of drugs and alcohol in criminality, especially among those who are routinely involved in all three behaviors.

After a review of the literature and discussions with IRC advisory board members, a serious research gap was identified: a better understanding of criminal events, particularly the role of drugs and alcohol in such events, was needed. In this research, the analytic focus is primarily upon serious crimes (robbery, burglary, and larceny) which were successful (from offenders' viewpoint) and upon whether various drugs and/or alcohol were used before, during, and shortly after such crimes. The analyses were designed to show whether and how specific substances influenced specific types of crime events.

Methods

In order to study serious crime events, research staff recruited 105 male drug abusers who were very active criminals from the streets of East Harlem in New York City. The recruiter was directed to locate persons who had committed a major nondrug crime (robbery, burglary, theft, or others) in the past 24 hours. These subjects were primarily black and Puerto Rican males who had grown up mainly in the low income neighborhoods from which they were recruited. A majority reported extensive deviance and arrests as juveniles. Although most were ages 25-40, very few had legal employment and only a third received public support. They claimed that illegal activities provided much of their income. While half reported 6 or more arrests as adults, only a sixth admitted currently being on parole, probation, or in some pretrial status. Over half were daily users of cocaine or heroin or both in the month prior to interview. Their self-reports were generally corroborated by urinalysis, internal consistency checks, and reports by other subjects. In short, the average subject was living in poverty and was a very serious abuser of cocaine or heroin and other substances.

The interview schedule obtained extensive data about the subjects' backgrounds, criminality and drug use patterns in their lifetime, past 12 months, past month, and past 24 hours. Subjects described all nondrug crimes committed in the past 24 hours. The one most serious event, the focal crime, was selected for intensive questioning. Details were obtained about circumstances before, during, and after this crime, and especially the perpetrator's drug and alcohol involvements.

FINDINGS

Violent Predators and a New Distinction

We replicated the "criminal variety" classification developed among prison and jail inmates in California, Michigan, and Texas by Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a,b). They labeled persons who committed robbery, assault, and drug sales in the past year as violent predators. This subgroup constituted 15 percent of that sample and was the most serious group of offenders among prison and jail inmates.

Using similar classification procedures, half of the 105 subjects in the current study were violent predators. The higher proportion of violent predators was probably due to the recruitment criteria (subject was to have committed a serious nondrug crime in the past 24 hours). Subjects in all other criminal varieties were labeled as "moderate robbers" (almost all reported one or more robberies in their lifetime).

Violent predators were as or more likely than moderate robbers to be active (commit one or more crimes) and be high rate offenders (over 10 crimes) in 14 different offense classes. Even among offenders active in a particular offense class (e.g., burglary) violent predators were more likely to be high rate offenders than moderate robbers.

One subgroup of violent predators was even more severely criminal. Over half of our violent predators were high rate offenders in six or more offense classes; they were labeled as

"marauders." When compared with the remaining "nonmarauder" violent predators and moderate robbers, much larger proportions of marauders committed over 10 crimes annually in 9 of 14 different offense classes. The two subgroups of violent predators were very similar in their demographic and antecedent characteristics, prior criminal justice contacts, and consumption of most drugs. But marauders were more involved in the daily abuse of multiple drugs.

The fact that the number of prior arrests and incarcerations were similar in both groups suggests that the criminal justice system is not more likely to apprehend and incapacitate the marauder. These findings do suggest that a possible means for identifying serious violent predators may lie in identifying offenders who abuse several different hard drugs. Nevertheless, violent predators, and particularly marauders, could be the highest priority targets for intensive programs of policing and career criminal prosecution in the future.

Characteristics of the Focal Crime Events

What are the characteristics of serious crime events? And what types of offenders commit them? The one most serious crime committed by each subject was selected for intensive analysis. These 105 focal crimes were classified into robberies (n=46), burglaries (n=18), and thefts (n=41).

Robberies, when compared with the other crimes, were associated with cash returns rather than property, and with weapon possession and use during the crime. About half of the focal robberies had victims who were "deviant" (drug users/sellers,

drunk, prostitutes, Johns). Focal robberies, burglaries, and thefts had similar numbers of victims or perpetrators, were seldom followed by arrests or police contacts, and were committed mainly in the neighborhood.

Almost 90 percent of persons who committed focal robberies and focal burglaries committed other nondrug crimes or drug distribution crimes in addition to their focal crime. In short, these subjects were very active offenders; almost all committed two or more crimes (including the focal crime) during the past 24 hours.

The type of focal crime was not associated with demographic characteristics. The type of focal crime, however, does provide clues about the offender's life-style. Specifically focal robberies were associated with being an offender in the past year in virtually every offense class and indicated that the offender was usually among the most serious subgroups of offenders in this sample--violent predators or marauders. Since focal thefts, by definition, were the least serious crimes, persons committing focal thefts were less serious offenders among these subjects (although they were very active in crime by any definition). Focal burglaries were committed by offenders who were intermediate between robberies and theft.

Crime Events and Drugs-alcohol Use

Are the types of crime events associated with prior and subsequent use of drugs or alcohol, and if so, how? While the existing literature documents the salience of complex life-styles

involving drug use and crime among the most serious offenders, almost no research examines the role of drugs or alcohol near (before or after) the time of specific crimes. Subjects were asked many questions about drug and alcohol involvements in the six hours before and after the focal crimes. Vignettes describing focal robberies and burglaries offer examples of typical events and the thinking of offenders who commit them.

Almost all (89 percent or more) robberies and burglaries were preceded by alcohol or drug use, as were most (71 percent) of the thefts. Two-thirds of the offenders drank alcohol prior to the crime. Three-fifths used some illicit drug prior to the crime. Robberies were associated with prior cocaine use. However, no statistical association was evident between the types of focal crimes and use of heroin, illicit methadone, marijuana, alcohol or pills in the prior six hours.

Almost all subjects listed several goals and many expressed a drug-related criminal intent. Robberies, for example, were positively associated with the goal of obtaining cocaine and heroin, but not marijuana or pills. Compared with burglaries/thefts, robberies were negatively associated with plans to obtain alcohol, illicit methadone, and goals such as food and money.

While over half reported feelings of depression, no association between depression and the type of focal crime was evident. Robberies were associated with needing or craving both cocaine and heroin, but not other drugs or alcohol.

Physical symptoms of opiate withdrawal (runny nose, chills, goose bumps, muscle twitch, stomach cramps, and diarrhea) were more common prior to robberies/burglaries than to thefts.

The type of focal crime was not associated with being under the influence of drugs--with one exception: offenders reported being under the influence of cocaine about twice as often for robberies as for burglaries/thefts. Reports of being "more violent" were about five times more prevalent for robberies than for burglaries/thefts.

Offenders rejected items implying that their drugs-alcohol use may make them lose control of their actions (excepting the association of robberies with being more violent). The majority endorse items stating that their drugs-alcohol use may assist in committing the crime. Thus, these offenders do not endorse disinhibition explanations which blame substances (and loss of control) for the crime; rather, they view substances as helping them prepare for and to commit the crime.

Almost all of the 105 focal crimes were successful from the offenders' perspective. Over three-quarters had used drugs-alcohol in the six hours after the crime. When compared with thefts, robberies were significantly associated with postcrime cocaine and heroin use. Offenders obtained some form of criminal returns in the six hours after the focal crime: mainly cash or property/goods. The monetary returns (after sale of stolen goods) from robberies and burglaries were similar (\$79 versus \$93), while thefts generated about half as much money (\$46).

Thus, drug use, alcohol use, and criminality appear to be chronic near-daily behaviors in the life-styles of virtually all these subjects. With the exception of the consistently strong robbery-cocaine and some robbery-heroin associations, other specific substances used before, during, or afterwards were generally not associated (or only weakly so) with the three types of focal crimes.

Criminal Income and Expenditures for Drugs-alcohol

How much money did these offenders gain from their focal crimes? How do they spend their criminal income? How much is spent for specific drugs and alcohol? Respondents provided details about their criminal returns, including cash, specific goods stolen, and drugs-alcohol gained. Only the stolen goods which had been resold ("fenced") for cash were included in analyses of criminal income.

The average robbery gained \$79; burglary gained \$112, and theft \$51 for an overall average of \$74 per crime per person. Criminal returns were higher for robberies and burglaries, mainly because half or more of these crimes gained the offender over \$100 compared with 10 percent of the thefts.

Criminal income was expended primarily upon illicit drugs. Robberies were associated with higher expenditures (\$48) of criminal income for both cocaine and heroin compared with thefts (\$21). Expenditures for other substances (alcohol, illicit methadone, marijuana, pills) and nonsubstance purposes (adding to \$25) were not associated with the type of focal crime.

Focal robberies and burglaries were associated with higher criminal incomes than focal thefts. Therefore, offenders can spend more upon expensive drugs (cocaine and heroin) after robberies than after thefts.

Robbers or Robberies And Cocaine-heroin Purchases

Throughout these analyses, focal robberies were consistently associated with measures of cocaine use and purchases and with several measures of heroin involvement. The analyses in Chapter 3 also show that most high rate robbers are violent predators or marauders. Such persons exhibit very complex life-styles of crime and drug use; they have very frequent involvements, typically daily or multiple times a day, in various forms of criminality as well as cocaine-heroin use. Clearly, robbery events are confounded with the type of robber the offender may be. This analysis disaggregates whether crime income and expenditures for cocaine or heroin is influenced more by the types of persons (e.g., robber subgroups--"high" (10 or more) versus "low" (1-10) rate robbers in past year) or the types of crime events actually committed (e.g., robberies versus property crimes--burglaries and thefts).

The analyses were systematically biased (by selection of subjects and the most serious events, and by use of hierarchical analysis of variance) towards support for 'type-of-crime' explanations. Where significant associations were evident, however, the robber type (high versus low robbers) was the primary

factor influencing higher criminal income and expenditures for cocaine-heroin (but not other illicit drugs). The focal crime type had no statistically significant impact upon criminal income nor upon expenditures for cocaine-heroin or other drugs when the robber type was controlled.

Conclusions

The associations between robberies and cocaine and/or heroin which emerged at several points in this report appeared to be primarily due to the very complex behaviors of high rate robbers. Their life-styles involved the most extreme levels of involvement in many different behaviors. They were most likely to commit more than 10 crimes a year in many different offense classes, both nondrug and drug sales (and to be marauders--Chapter 3). They are also more likely to be daily and multi-daily users of cocaine-heroin and other drugs than low rate robbers.

Surprisingly, the greater life-style complexity of high robbers was also associated with greater cash returns from both their robberies and burglaries-thefts. After successful robberies, high robbers tended to choose cocaine and expend large amounts upon it. But after successful property crimes, high robbers were less likely to choose and spend criminal income on cocaine, although heroin purchases were common.

The extensive data in this report also show that very large proportions of these 105 subjects used specific substances before, during, and after the focal crimes, but with few or no significant associations. In short, while the specific substances of alcohol, marijuana, illicit methadone, and pills were frequently used near the time of the focal crime, such involvements were not linked to the specific crime type (robberies, burglaries, thefts) actually committed. Hence, these substances had no clear role in the focal crime.

Future research with larger samples and a broader array of different offenses across time are needed to further replicate and validate the findings reported here. Moreover, if some subgroups of robbers are more successful in committing large numbers of different crimes at high rates and gaining larger criminal incomes, future research based upon criminal justice samples may also help develop techniques for targeting high rate robbers among the large number of persons arrested for robbery for future policies designed to help focus police work, prosecution, sentencing, and community supervision practices.

Concrete recommendations for shifting criminal justice policies towards more careful supervision of drug-abusing offenders are being advanced in parallel products authored by staff affiliated with the Interdisciplinary Research Center (Johnson, Lipton, and Wish 1986; Chaiken and Johnson 1987; Lipton and Wexler 1987; Wexler, Johnson, and Lipton 1987).

CRIMINAL EVENTS AMONG SERIOUSLY CRIMINAL DRUG ABUSERS

Chapter		Page
	Executive Summary	i
	Table of Contents	xii
	List of Vignettes	xiii
	Acknowledgements	xiv
1	Introduction	1
2	Methodology and Subjects	14
3	Violent Predators among Unapprehended Criminals and a New Distinction	38
4	Focal Crime Events and Characteristics of Persons Committing Them	60
5	How Are Serious Crime Events Associated with Prior or Subsequent Drugs-Alcohol Use?	77
6	Income from Crime Events and Expenditures For Drugs-Alcohol	94
7	The Hard Drug-Robbery Connection: Do Robbers or Robberies Influence Cocaine-Heroin Use?	103
	References	120

CRIMINAL EVENTS AMONG SERIOUSLY CRIMINAL DRUG ABUSERS

List of Vignettes

Vignette	Contents	Page
A	A Small Time Hustler	29
B	The Business-Like Approach to Crime	30
C	A Depressed and Violent Offender	31
D	A Marauder at Work	50
E	A Focal Burglary	64
F	A Focal Robbery	64-5

*The vignettes were compiled from earlier papers written by Kevin Anderson.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Interdisciplinary Research Center is one of several grants administered by Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc., a private, not-for-profit research organization affiliated with the New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services.

Many persons have contributed to the research and analyses presented in this report. Julio Martinez, President of Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc. has been continuously supportive of our studies on drugs and crime. Norwig Debye-Saxinger, David Diamond, Dennis Whalen, Doris Brown, Robert Bosman, Hugh Schrader, and many others at Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc. and Division of Substance Abuse Services in Albany have assisted this research in numerous ways.

The National Institute of Justice, James Stewart, Director, provided funding and encouragement to complete this research; Bernard Gropper and Richard Linster were particularly supportive. Ann Brunswick, Patrick O'Malley, and Robin Room served on the IRC Advisory Board.

Several staff members of the Interdisciplinary Research Center contributed substantially to this report. Kevin Anderson and Tom Miller conducted the interviews. Kevin Anderson coded most of the interviews and also wrote papers from which the vignettes have been extracted. Alton Sears coded and provided computer programming, Godwin Bernard and James Schmeidler assisted with statistical approaches. Jackie Coward, Nancy Meggett, Marva Bernard, Ana Santana, and Bernice Richardson performed many essential functions to complete the manuscript. Douglas S. Lipton provided a critical review of the manuscript, as did Ansley Hamid and Ernest Quimby.

We owe a special debt of gratitude to all of the subjects who participated in our research; they willingly told us about their criminal activity and drug use with an eagerness which is still surprising. It is our sincere wish that the findings from this research will help develop new policies enabling them to reduce their drug abuse and criminality so they can make positive contributions to American society in the future.

CRIME EVENTS AMONG SERIOUSLY CRIMINAL DRUG ABUSERS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This report is one of three primary research monographs derived from the work of the Interdisciplinary Research Center (IRC) for the Study of the Relations of Drugs and Alcohol to Crime, a unit of Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc. The IRC's major objective was to increase understanding of the role of drugs and alcohol in criminality, especially among those who are routinely involved in all three behaviors. This monograph presents the results from studies of serious crime events committed by cocaine-heroin abusers in low-income communities of New York City.

BACKGROUND

After a review of the state of knowledge of drug use and crime, and discussions with IRC advisory board members, staff concluded that a serious research gap existed. A better understanding of criminal events, particularly the role of drugs and alcohol in such events, is of central importance to criminal justice policy.

American jurisprudence and criminology, moreover, place very different emphases upon crime events. Criminal justice processing specifies that the alleged crime event is the primary factor in determining punishment; an offender's characteristics are clearly secondary. Legal statutes carefully define a particular behavior

(e.g., entry of any structure with the intent to take money or goods) as a criminal event (i.e., burglary) and specify a range of punishments (e.g., imprisonment for 1-5 years) for a person convicted of that crime.

The entry phase into the criminal justice system is primarily organized by the importance of the criminal event. That is, police can only make an arrest when a specific crime has occurred and the suspected offender is apprehended. Prosecutors initiate and continue criminal case processing only if the evidence is legally adequate and the offender is apt to be found guilty. Careful procedural protections have been instituted to insure that only the facts about the crime, and not the offender's characteristics, are considered by the jury in determining guilt or innocence for the specific offenses charged. Only after conviction for a specific crime event are the personal attributes of the offender legally considered in the judge's determination of a sentence.

Despite primacy in jurisprudence and criminal justice practice, however, criminal events are virtually ignored by academic criminology. Virtually all major theories and studies of criminality focus almost exclusively upon offenders. Criminal events are treated as transient and relatively unimportant behaviors in a longer criminal career spanning several years. With a few exceptions, most studies of delinquents and criminals do not obtain data about nor analyze specific crime events. For example, studies of and theories about why robberies occur and how much money is earned and expended for various purposes are virtually nonexistent, even among studies of robbers (or other criminal subgroups such as burglars or thieves).

Both criminologists and criminal justice practitioners generally ignore the offender's use and abuse of drugs and alcohol. Judicial consideration of substance use by the offender generally occurs at the sentencing phase as an aggravating or mitigating circumstance. Many excellent criminological studies fail to include the offender's drugs and alcohol use as important variables in the study.

Despite the relative neglect of drugs-alcohol use in both jurisprudence and criminology, a growing literature in the 1970s and 1980s documents the importance of drug abuse to high rate criminality, and draws attention to the large proportion of cocaine-heroin abusers and other drug and alcohol users entering the criminal justice system (see Anglin 1985; BJS 1983a, b; Johnson, Lipton, Wish 1986; Nurco et al. 1985; Gropper 1985; Wish, Brady, Cuadrado 1984, 1986; Wish, Cuadrado, Mortorana 1986; Chaiken and Johnson 1987; Lipton and Wexler 1987; Wexler, Johnson, and Lipton 1987).

But even among regular cocaine-heroin abusers who routinely commit a variety of crimes, this literature does not clearly document the role of specific substances used before, during, or after specific types of crimes.

The following sections review several of the questions and the limited literature which led to the study and analyses presented in the subsequent chapters.

What Are the Characteristics of "Successful" Crime Events?

Our review of the quantitative research literature located virtually no information which analyzes "successful" crime events from the perspective of the offender--those crimes in which the perpetrator obtains money or merchandise and is not arrested. It should be noted that this focus upon "successful" crimes does not, of course, suggest implicit approval of these crimes, nor of offenders committing them.

Rather, the major reason for analyzing such successful crimes is that they constitute the vast majority of all crimes in American society. Optimistic estimates suggest that for every 10 crimes committed about one arrest occurs. Recent research, however, finds that more than 100 crimes occur for every arrest (Inciardi 1979, 1984, 1986; Ball 1986; Johnson, Lipton, Wish 1986). Thus, analytic attention is directed away from offenders (as in almost all prior criminological research) and refocused on a few of the criminal events which they commit.

In short, this analysis explores perpetration, especially the commission of serious, but common, street crimes (primarily robberies, burglaries, and grand larcenies). Regardless of the offender's characteristics, this research has been designed to describe the following key characteristics of successful (from the offender's point-of-view) but serious criminal events: Are crimes committed alone or with others? Who are the victims of various types of crimes and how are they selected? Were weapons used? Did

injury occur? Where do crimes occur geographically? Which substances were used before, during, and after the crimes? How much money (the "take" or "returns") is gained from these crimes? How much criminal income is expended for different specific drugs? For purposes other than substances? Are crime events influenced by the personal characteristics of the offender such as demographics, age of onset to crime, drug use, or prior treatment and punishment?

To questions such as these, few answers exist and almost no quantitative data have been based upon self-reports by offenders. Some averages are available from federal victimization surveys (reports about criminal events made by the victims) and from studies of arrestees or crimes in which arrests occurred (reports by police of crimes which were "unsuccessful" from the offender's perspective).

The National Crime Survey (NCS) is an ongoing longitudinal survey conducted by the Bureau of Census of about 60,000 households in the U.S.A. Numerous reports have emerged, primarily presenting rates of victimization in the population and subpopulations. Subjects who report criminal victimization are asked many questions about specific attributes of that event. Relatively few published reports, however, present information about the characteristics of these crimes. Some descriptive data provide parameters about robberies, burglaries, and thefts (i.e. the common street crimes committed by the subjects reported below).

As reported by NCS robbery victims, three-fifths of the robberies took place during the nighttime (6PM to 8AM) and two-thirds occurred in public places. Almost half of the robberies were committed by multiple offenders and four-fifths were committed by strangers. Half of all robberies were committed by armed offenders; 40 percent were armed with firearms and 37 percent with knives (BJS 1986). The victim was injured in about 14 percent of the robberies and hospitalized about half as often (BJS 1981, 1985a,b, 1986).

About a third of household burglaries happened at nighttime. In about a tenth of burglaries, the characteristics of the offender was known; among these, over half were committed by strangers (BJS 1985a). No data were available about weapons possession by burglars.

Despite being the most common crime reported in the NCS, no special reports on characteristics of larcenies have been generated to date. A third of personal larcenies occurred at nighttime and almost half were committed in public places (BJS 1981, 1985b). The NCS also does not obtain data about a very common larceny--shoplifting from stores.

A major feature of successful crime events is the perpetrator's dollar returns and expenditures of criminal income. The NCS provides some data on economic losses (BJS 1984). In 1981, the median theft (property or money) loss to victims of robbery was \$75, to victims of burglary-\$200, and to larceny victims-\$40. The upper quartile of losses was \$250 for robbery, \$800 for burglary, and \$100 for larceny. While these losses to victims may appear modest, the offender's dollar returns are likely to be substantially less,

especially for burglary and theft, since the offender must typically sell ("fence") stolen goods for considerably less than their economic value to the victim (Johnson et al. 1985)

What is the Role of Drugs and Alcohol in Crime Events?

The central purpose guiding this research, however, is to document more clearly the role of specific substances with specific crime events. This relationship is apt to be clearest among offenders who are the most regular drug users and offenders. Thus, persons not involved in all three behaviors are excluded from analysis.

Indeed, most theories and models of drug-crime linkages (see Lettieri, Sayers, and Pearson 1980) generally assume very high frequencies of drug involvement. Hence, an association with serious crimes is hypothesized primarily for daily/near daily users of cocaine, heroin, and alcohol. That is, persons who are physically or psychologically dependent upon these substances may commit crimes to raise funds with which to purchase drugs.

Theoretically based paradigms which link specific crimes to specific drugs are not well developed in the literature. While complex theories of drug abuse are available (Lettieri 1980), the linkages are frequently ambiguous about the types of crimes likely to be committed. Both cocaine and heroin are expensive drugs so users may need to commit crimes which maximize criminal income. Since heroin produces symptoms of physical dependence, heroin abusers should commit property crimes (primarily burglary and theft)

to avoid withdrawal symptoms (Lindesmith 1965, 1980; McAuliffe and Gordon 1974, 1975, 1980). Cocaine produces strong psychological dependence (craving or need) and a very rapid urge for more. Therefore, cocaine users may also commit property crimes, but also be more willing to use violence and subsequently engage in robbery than if other drugs had been used. Due to its legality and low cost, alcohol is widely believed to be associated with aggressive or violent crimes (e.g. assault) without property crimes (Room and Collins 1983), although some very low income persons may commit property crimes to buy alcohol (Strug et al 1984). Marijuana has not been pharmacologically linked to crime, except that criminally active persons may use it.

Likewise, research linking specific offenses to specific drugs is not well documented, even among addict populations. Lindesmith (1965) argues that the primary factor motivating addict crime is avoidance of withdrawal symptoms, but he does not specify the types of property crimes likely to be committed. McAuliffe and Gordon (1974, 1980) argue that the desire to get high (euphoria or psychological dependence) is as important as withdrawal in property crime, but do not specify the likely crime types.

Among New York heroin abusers who commit burglary, the annualized burglary rate and burglary income is significantly higher among daily than irregular (0-2 days/week) heroin abusers. Similar findings emerge for nonshoplifting larcenies (Johnson et al. 1985:236). Cocaine use is also associated with higher crime rates and criminal incomes (Collins, Hubbard, Rachal 1985).

The key focus of this research, however, is upon specific criminal events--particularly robberies, burglaries, and thefts--and the role of specific drugs used before, during, and after these crimes. In these analyses, a given drug may (statistically) have a role in a given crime type if it meets two criteria: propinquity and significant difference.

Propinquity involves a given substance being used near the time of the crime for a substantial proportion of crime events. That is, a given measure of substance involvement is close enough in time to the crime event so that plausible interpretations may include the pharmacological effect of the substance or craving which may bring about a need for money and the crime. [If an offender uses a substance on Monday but commits a robbery on Thursday, it would be implausible to argue that the pharmacological effects had some direct effect upon the subsequent crime.]

Since many serious offenders may be continuously using some substances (such as alcohol), mere propinquity between use and the crime event does not mean the substance had an effect upon the crime. Rather, across several offenders and crime events, measures of substance involvement also need to be associated in a statistically significant manner with one or more offense class(es) to ensure that substance involvement and criminal events are not simply randomly occurring events which are likely to occur at about the same time in the lives of very regular drug-abusing offenders.

For example, if cocaine is used before (propinquity) half of the robberies and before a fifth of the thefts, and this difference is significantly different, cocaine use may be said to have a "role" in robberies (by these criteria). On the other hand, if alcohol use (high propinquity in time) occurs before 75 percent of robberies and 65 percent of the thefts, but this is not a significant difference, alcohol use may be said not to have a role in robbery--even though alcohol is present among the vast majority of offenders before all crime classes.

Persons or Crimes: Which is Most Critical in Successful Crimes?

Drug-abusing offenders judge crime events as "successful" (see above) primarily by two criteria: the dollar returns and amounts expended for chosen drugs. Three general paradigms are sometimes invoked to account for successful crimes. The "type-of-persons" paradigm asserts the primacy of the personal attributes of the offender. The "type-of-crimes" paradigm asserts that certain crimes are more risky and lucrative than other crimes. The "additive" paradigm asserts that both the type of offender and type of crime may increase the criminal returns and expenditures. The null hypothesis suggests that criminal income and expenditures are not affected by either types of persons or types of crimes.

In an empirical analysis of burglary incidents and burglar types in California, Pope (1975, 1977a,b,c) found that an offender's previous criminal history was the major factor in determining the victim's financial loss during burglaries. Overall,

the null hypothesis was supported; certain kinds of burglars do not commit certain kinds of burglaries (Pope 1977c:41). That is, the more serious burglars (those with prior criminal and burglary records and having crime partners) when compared with less serious burglars (low prior record and doing burglary alone) committed burglaries with similar offense characteristics (type of goods taken, methods employed, financial loss, distance from residence, time of day). Offender demographics (sex, ethnicity, age) also made little difference in burglary incidents. Similar analyses have yet to be located for robbers and robbery events and for thieves and thefts.

If analytical focus is shifted to a limited subgroup of criminals such as "robbers" (as in Chapter 7 below), "the type-of-persons" paradigm suggests that robbers are not homogeneous; "high" rate robbers may be hypothesized to gain larger cash income per average robbery or expend more money on specific substances than "low" rate robbers.

A central finding from recent research, however, is that the most serious criminals commit many crimes in several different offense classes. "Robbers" are likely to also commit other crimes at high rates; robbery may be among the least frequently committed crimes among many "robbers" (Chaiken and Chaiken 1982a; Johnson et al. 1985). Thus, the "type-of-crime" paradigm suggests that even among "robbers," the commission of robberies as compared with thefts (for example) should result in higher cash income and more expenditures for expensive drugs.

Of course, a strong association (due to mutual colinearity) is likely between types of robbers and the types of crimes committed (e.g., high rate robbers are more likely to commit robberies than low rate robbers), but when such colinearity is controlled, the central question remains: Does the type of robber (high versus low rate) or type of crime (robberies versus thefts) account for higher criminal incomes or expenditures for drugs received by active robbers?

Organization of This Report

This report provides analyses of crime events designed to address the questions raised above. Chapter 2 describes the research methods used to gain detailed self-reports about very recent serious criminal events and describes the offenders who participated in the study. Chapter 3 presents a new distinction about the criminal life-styles of offenders, especially those labeled as "violent predators" by Chaiken and Chaiken 1982a,b).

Chapter 4 delineates the characteristics of the one most serious crime (the focal crime) committed by the offender in the past 24 hours and the characteristics of persons doing these crimes. Chapter 5 examines various roles which specific substances may have for the focal crimes of robbery, burglary, and theft. This chapter shows whether various measures of implicit theories of dependence, disinhibition, and economic compulsion are associated with the type of focal crime committed.

Chapter 6 presents the dollar returns from the focal crimes and documents the expenditures of criminal income upon specific substances and food/other goods. Chapter 7 examines an important emergent finding: that robberies are associated with use and expenditures for cocaine (and sometimes heroin). This chapter assesses whether the association of robbery with high criminal income and expenditures for cocaine-heroin are due primarily to the type of robber or the type of crime committed.

Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY AND SUBJECTS

This study is among the first to focus upon criminal events shortly after their commission by serious offenders at liberty on the streets. These self-reported crime events were "successful" from offenders' points-of-view; they had committed the crime, generally evaded detection by anyone, were not contacted by the police; typically they had obtained money, property, or drugs. These crime events and their characteristics are described in Chapter 4. In this chapter, the research methods employed to study these crime events and characteristics of subjects are presented.

Recruitment

During the past eight years, staff members at Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc. (NDRI) have developed methods for recruiting serious drug-abusing criminals as participants in their research and getting them to talk about the details of their crimes and drug use (Strug, et al. 1984; Johnson et al. 1985). As part of this effort, staff maintained a research storefront in a high-crime, high-addiction neighborhood in Harlem.

For this study, a black male, age 50, who had sold heroin and cocaine for many years before serving time in prison was hired to recruit potential research subjects. He had maintained a wide range of contacts with street hustlers over the years and had served as a recruiter on the previous NDRI project (Johnson et al. 1985). Because he was known on the streets as our recruiter, prior subjects could vouch for him and the confidentiality of the research.

In the first half of 1983, our recruiter went into the community with instructions to bring back to the storefront hard-drug abusers who, in the past twenty-four hours, had committed one or more relatively serious nondrug crimes (such as a robbery, burglary, grand larceny, or assault). Although subjects were paid \$10 per hour of interview time, not all persons approached agreed to participate in the research.

At the storefront, the recruiter introduced the potential respondent to an interviewer, who administered the informed consent procedure. This procedure included assurances that all information would be kept strictly confidential and was protected by a federal certificate of confidentiality. Persons were advised not to give their names, and were assigned code names instead.

Interview Schedule

Scheduled interviews took one and a half to two hours to complete. The initial part of the interview obtained demographic characteristics of subjects and gathered information on their involvement with various drugs and crimes: from onset, during the past twelve months, and in the past thirty days.

The main focus, however, was to elicit information about drug-crime behaviors during the past twenty-four hours. Subjects were asked to report all the nondrug crimes committed during this period. The most serious crime was selected for intensive questioning; below, this crime will be referred to as the focal crime. Subjects were asked many questions about circumstances before and after this focal crime. Were they using drugs or alcohol

before the crime? What were the reasons for the crime? Who were they with? In what area of the city did it occur? How much cash was gained? For how much was stolen property sold? Which substances did they purchase and use with their criminal income? Did they purchase goods other than drugs? For these and a variety of other questions, subjects responded to both precoded and open-ended questions which form the basis of this report.

At the end of the interview each person was asked to provide a urine specimen for analysis for recent use of drugs. Almost everyone did so and was paid an additional \$3.

Limitations

A random sample of "successful crimes" or of unapprehended drug-abusing criminals was impossible to define and locate. But our methods appeared to be a reasonable strategy for locating a sample of crime events and serious offenders in their "natural" settings (see Chapter 3). Our selection procedures clearly influenced the types of offenders recruited. Since our recruiter mainly located subjects at local drug copping communities, all subjects reported using cocaine or heroin in the past month, and the average subject was a daily user of either or both substances (see below).

In addition, our reliance upon one older recruiter with extensive prior heroin abuse may have led us to underselect young (under 25) street hustlers with no or little heroin use. In comparison with recent NDRI studies of 6,000 male arrestees interviewed at the Manhattan Central Booking Facility (Wish, Brady,

and Cuadrado 1984) and of street heroin abusers (Johnson et al. 1985:21), higher percentages of our subjects were older and more poorly educated; and they were more likely to be unemployed.

Our analyses rely entirely upon offenders' self-reports of criminality in the past year and at the time of the interview. Since we did not obtain the subjects' names or other identifiers, we could not verify their records of arrests and incarcerations. In a pilot study using similar persons as subjects, however, we compared self-reports of recent drug use with the results of a urinalysis conducted at the end of the interview and found generally high agreement between the two (Wish et al. 1983).

SUBJECTS

Demographic Characteristics

A total of 107 persons completed this interview. All interviews were carefully read, coded and checked for internal consistency. These checks disqualified the answers of two subjects (see below). Thus, 105 subjects provide the data employed in these analyses.

Table 2-1 presents the demographic characteristics of the 105 male subjects in this study. They were relatively old: only 11 percent were under age 26, the modal group was ages 31-35, and a fifth were over age 40.

Three-fifths were blacks, and most of the remainder were Puerto Rican. Only two percent were whites. Nearly two-thirds had spent their teenage years in the East Harlem and Central Harlem communities from which they were recruited. Almost all were native New Yorkers.

Only four percent reported their current marital status as married. A third said that they had never married. However, subjects frequently lived with other persons. Usually, these were girl friends; but parents, siblings, other relatives or friends were also common. Only eighteen percent reported living alone. Because others provided them with a place to sleep (see Johnson et al. 1985), they typically resided in an apartment or house. A substantial minority (14 percent) lived in abandoned buildings. Almost a quarter lived in a public shelter or other temporary location [see Vignette A].

Although virtually all these men were in the age range when most men, even in low income communities, have some form of work, eighty-two percent had no legal employment (Table 2-2). Only fifteen percent were fortunate enough to claim a parttime job that was "off the books." Four percent had jobs that appeared to be legitimate but low-paying. Over all, the criminality and life-styles of these men exhibited considerable heterogeneity (see Vignettes A, B, and C).

Subjects did not fare much better as recipients of public transfer payments. Fully sixty percent received no public transfer payments at all. The remainder most commonly received welfare and food stamps, and a few received other forms of support (SSI, handouts from families etc.). When asked about their money income in a typical week, thirteen percent mentioned employment income, thirty-six percent reported welfare/food stamps, and forty percent said that they were receiving money from their families. Virtually all subjects, however, affirmed that illegal activities provided them with money income.

The overall picture for these 105 subjects is one of extremely high unemployment, avoidance of or failure to obtain public assistance, dependence upon others (mainly girlfriends) for shelter and some money. Although they appear relatively old, a comparison of these subjects (Johnson et al. 1985:21) shows that they have similar age and ethnic distributions to subjects in other studies of heroin abusers in New York City.

In terms of their demographic characteristics, they appear to be reasonably similar to currently active male heroin abusers and methadone clients from the minority communities of New York City in age, education, and unemployability, although no claims of statistical representativeness are made.

Table 2-1
Demographic Characteristics of 105 Subjects

Characteristic	Percent
Age	
Under 26	11
26-30	23
31-35	28
35-40	18
41 and Older	20
Ethnicity	
Black	59
Puerto Rican	39
White	2
Education	
9 or less	26
10-11 grades	41
12 grade	25
13 or more	9
Place of Residence in Teenage Years	
East Harlem	49
Central Harlem	14
Other Manhattan/Bronx	17
Elsewhere	19
Marital Status	
Never Married/Single	32
Married	4
Common Law	24
Separated	28
Widowed/Divorced	12
Currently Resides with: a	
Wife	8
Girl Friend	33
Children	18
Parents/Siblings	14
Other Friends	14
Alone	18
Other/No Permanent Residence	16
Type of Housing Now:	
Apartment/House	63
Abandoned Building	14
Shelter/Other	23
Religious Preference	
Protestant	38
Catholic	37
Muslim/Other	11
None	13

a. Multiple responses possible; percentages add to much over 100%. Due to rounding, some percentages may be slightly different than 100%.

Table 2-2
Current Sources of Legal Income for 105 Subjects

Characteristic	Percent
Current Employment	
None	82
Full or Parttime "on the books"	4
Parttime "off the books"	15
Current Public Support: a	
None	60
Welfare	30
Food Stamps	27
Social Security	5
Disability/Unemployment/Other	10
In a typical week, those with money income from: a	
Legal Work "On the Books"	2
Legal Work "Off the books"	11
Welfare/Food Stamps	34
Family Support	38
Illegal Activities	97

a. Multiple responses possible; percentages add to much over 100%.

Table 2-3
Self-Reported Measures of Criminal Justice Contacts and Youthful
Deviance

Deviance Measures	Percent
Criminal Justice Contacts	
Arrests Prior to Age 16	
None	49
1-2	31
3-5	13
6 or more	7
Nontraffic Arrests Age 16 & Older	
None	2
1-2	13
3-5	28
6-10	19
11-20	14
Over 20	15
Current Legal Status	
None	86
Parole	5
Probation	6
Pretrial Status	3
Drug or Alcohol Treatment	
None Ever	22
Previously, Not Now	63
Currently Enrolled	15
Methadone Treatment	12
Outpatient/Alcohol	3
Childhood Deviance Items ^a	
Played Hooky 5 Days or More for Two Years	92
Ever Repeat Grade	49
Frequent Trouble in School	46
Expelled or Suspended	49
Trouble in School for Fighting	54
Trouble in Neighborhood for Fighting	55
Run Away from Home	45
Got Drunk before Age 15	57
Arrested before Age 16	51
Childhood Deviance Scale (Sum of Above Items)	
1-2 Items	23
3-4 Items	19
5 Items	15
6 Items	19
7-9 Items	24

a Multiple responses possible; percentages add to much over 100%.
Due to rounding, other percentages may be slightly different
than 100%.

Criminal Justice Contacts and Early Deviance

Subjects manifested extensive deviance in childhood and had had multiple criminal justice contacts as adults (Table 2-3). Half had been arrested as juveniles, and twenty percent self-reported three or more such juvenile arrests. As adults, they have had extensive arrest histories. Only two subjects claimed no arrests as an adult. Almost thirty percent claimed over 10 arrests as adults.

Despite a large number of arrests, eighty-six percent claimed no current criminal justice contact at the time of the interview. Only small proportions reported being currently on parole (five percent), probation (six percent); only three percent reported being in some preadjudication status (out on bail, released on own recognizance, etc.).

Only two subjects reported arrests (but were quickly released) for the crimes they committed on the day they were recruited. Similarly, only fifteen percent admitted to being currently in some form of drug treatment, although about sixty-three percent said that they had been in treatment previously. Only about a fifth claimed never to have been in drug or alcohol treatment.

Subjects were asked ten items designed to measure early deviance in childhood. On virtually every item almost half or more of these subjects were positive, regardless of whether the item measured problems at school, home, neighborhood, or with drugs or police. In fact, over half were positive on five or more of these early childhood items. The implication is, therefore, that our subjects have long histories of deviant behavior which began in childhood and persisted in adulthood.

Drug Use and Abuse Patterns

Our subjects were drug abusers. Virtually all (over ninety-eight percent) report lifetime use of each substance: heroin, cocaine, marijuana, and alcohol. Eight-five percent report use of pills, mainly downers and uppers.

Table 2-4 presents the number of days in the past month that they reported the use of several drugs. Over eighty percent were current users of cocaine, heroin, alcohol, illicit methadone, and marijuana. Over a quarter reported using cocaine, heroin, and marijuana on a daily basis (28 or more days), and almost two-thirds report daily alcohol use. The use of downers and uppers was less apt to occur in the past month and daily use of them was relatively less frequent compared to the other drugs.

The extensive nature of subjects' drug abuse can be seen in Table 2-5. Only 14 percent were not daily users of some substance. Fully a quarter were daily users of three or more of the seven substances (heroin, cocaine, alcohol, marijuana, illicit methadone, downers, and uppers).

Subjects were also classified into a hierarchy of combinations of substances used. The Heavy Drug User Hierarchy classified subjects according to the combinations of drugs they used on 28 of the past 30 days. Two-fifths were not heavy users or limited their

heavy consumption to alcohol/marijuana. All other subjects were heavy users of heroin, cocaine, or both. Virtually all persons classified as heavy users of illicit methadone and downers are also heavy users of heroin or cocaine. Over half of all subjects, therefore, are daily polydrug users of heroin and/or cocaine, plus other substances.

When the criteria are shifted to use for 15 days out of the past 30 days, a Moderate Drug User Hierarchy is formed. Only a few subjects (five percent) limit their moderate use to alcohol, marijuana, or no substances. Almost half are moderate users of heroin, cocaine, illicit methadone, and downers (as well as marijuana and alcohol).

By comparison with other samples of substance abusers, the patterns of drug use and abuse of serious drugs by these subjects are extreme. They report using several drugs each day, or every other day during the past 30 days. This pattern of intensive, multiple substance use will be further documented as the linkages between drug use and their criminality are examined.

Table 2-4
Use of Specific Drugs in the Past 30 Days

Drug Use Measures	Percent
Number of Days Used Drugs in the Past 30 Days	
Cocaine	
Zero	5
1-14 Days	32
15-27 Days	34
28-30 Days	29
Heroin	
Zero	7
1-14 Days	40
15-27 Days	22
28-30 Days	31
Illicit Methadone	
Zero	17
1-14 Days	46
15-27 Days	21
28-30 Days	16
Marijuana/Hashish	
Zero	12
1-14 Days	31
15-27 Days	28
28-30 Days	28
Alcohol	
Zero	3
1-14 Days	19
15-27 Days	16
28-30 Days	62
Downers	
Zero	40
1-14 Days	40
15-27 Days	10
28-30 Days	10
Uppers	
Zero	88
1-14 Days	11
15-27 Days	0
28-30 Days	1

Due to rounding, some percentages may be slightly different than 100%.

Table 2-5
Hierarchical Measures of Drug Abuse in the Past 30 Days

Hierarchical Drug Use Measures	Percent[a]
Number of Substances Used Heavily (28 or More Days in Last 30 Days)	
None	14
One	33
Two	29
Three	14
Four or More	11
Heavy Drug User Hierarchy (Used Following Substances 28 Days or More in Past 30 Days)	
No Heavy Use	14
Alcohol/Marijuana	28
Heroin	18
Cocaine	10
Heroin and Cocaine	10
Illicit Methadone	11
Downers	11
Moderate Drug User Hierarchy (Used Following Substances 15 Days or More in Past 30 Days)	
None	0
Alcohol/Marijuana	5
Heroin	15
Cocaine	12
Heroin and Cocaine	23
Illicit Methadone	25
Downers	20

Percentages may add to slightly more than 100 due to rounding.

Table 2-6
Comparison of Urinalysis Results and Self-Reports of Recent Drug Use

Specific Substances	Percent of Respondent's Drug Positive Via: Urinalysis	Self-Reports
Cocaine	44	65
Alcohol	57	85
Methadone	75	73
Heroin (Morphine)	26	46
Quinine a	30	b
Opiates a	49	b
Darvon	10	11

a. Quinine is frequently an adulterant with heroin.
Opiates include heroin, morphine, and all other opiates except methadone.

b. Subjects were not asked about these classes of drugs, but urinalysis tests can detect them.

Vignette A
A Small Time Hustler

"I commit crimes for cocaine."

Poet B. was a 44 year-old black man who had published and done poetry readings in schools under his real name. In prison, he had read Shakespeare, Poe, Marx, and Fanon among other writers. "I went to school more in city jail than formal schooling." Poet B. was a heavy user of cocaine and alcohol, but no longer of heroin. Although a welfare recipient, he committed crimes, mainly "popping shorts" (stealing contents and tires from cars) solely to obtain cocaine. He drank frequently but confessed to a psychological dependency on cocaine only. When asked if he would still commit crimes if off drugs, he commented: "If I took coke out of my life, I don't think so". He gave the following reasons for his cocaine use:

I feel more secure, uplifting, with it. Doesn't make me feel inadequate. I feel I can talk to people better, have a sense of belonging and also dig the high. I really like the feeling. Also [I] like people I'm around. I also like the people who indulge in drugs, specifically cocaine. We seem to think on the same level. Another reason is financial. If I had a great deal of money, I'd resort to something else -- go to college, etc. With a little bit of money, it (cocaine) gets me away from this reality.

Poet B. used cocaine and alcohol as pain-killers to ease the sense of being walled into the ghetto and its poverty. His lifelong heavy consumption of these substances may have resulted in the ulcer which killed him in late 1983.

Vignette B
The Business-Like Approach to Crime

"I've been doing burglaries now for almost nine years."

Ray W., 24 years old, has been living with his girlfriend for six years. They have four children. A high school graduate who was currently unemployed, Ray did not receive public assistance. The longest job he has ever held was for six months as a messenger at \$80 per week. He supported himself through committing crimes. Ray was an extremely heavy drug user, and reported being dependent on heroin, cocaine, and downers.

Ray first used heroin at age 15 and has used it daily since age 17. He reported using cocaine on 20 out of the 30 days prior to interview. He usually combined cocaine with his heroin into a "speedball." He reported frequent use of downers as well as uppers and mentioned the names of no less than 12 different pills he has used in the last year. He did not use much alcohol, but took illegal methadone occasionally: "when I can't get H, I'll take meth."

His main crime specialty was burglary, which he reported doing several times per week, as well as shoplifting and low level drug distribution crimes. He has committed just over ten robberies in the last year. But burglary remained his specialty. "It's a easy crime. I get away with it." As to his general motivations and outlook, Ray W. stated:

I do the crimes to get the drugs. If I didn't do the crimes I'd have a hard time to get the drugs. I'm not on welfare or anything. I've been doing burglaries now for almost nine years. That's what I like to do. That's what I'm good at. (I do crimes) to get drugs and money to eat. That's all. My girl also uses drugs. I have to take care of her. (If I didn't do drugs) I won't have no reason to (do crimes). If I had a job and my girl was off them also. I like them (drugs). I have a habit. I'm very depressed. Depressed because there is no work. I'm not on welfare or anything. They tell me at the (methadone) program that I have to be on a waiting list. And I have to buy drugs--and it's a heavy load to carry."

Thus, Ray represented the "business-like" approach to crime; he committed crimes mainly to feed his heroin habit, and did so in a business like, low risk manner. He exhibited little of the reckless and violent behavior seen in other subjects. [Also see vignette E.]

Vignette C
A Depressed and Violent Offender

Cat Eye, 25 years old, lived with his mother. He had completed only eight years of schooling. Cat Eye claimed three juvenile and one adult arrest for "mostly bullshit things," (i.e. minor charges.) He has served little time in jail.

Cat Eye's main drugs were heroin, illicit methadone, and pills. He used downers daily and also took Elavil, an antidepressant. He used large amounts (100 mgs.) of illicit methadone almost daily, and used heroin about every two days. He no longer smoked marijuana. He drank alcohol daily, ten hours per day, and considered himself dependent on alcohol and on downers. He avoided cocaine: "It's too expensive."

Cat Eye claimed to have been severely depressed for the last ten years. He reported the following symptoms of depression: feeling that he was losing his mind, crying spells, loss of appetite, thoughts of suicide, and seeking medical help for depression. Describing the cause of his depression, Cat Eye said:

I have family problems. At age 15 I went to Puerto Rico to see my real father. He's a drug dealer in Puerto Rico. Ever since I was depressed.

His motivations for the focal crime included, but were not limited to, drugs:

I needed money. I wanted money for my pockets. I'm getting a hard time from my stepfather. My stepfather, he looks at me as if I'm not his son. I got family problems. The drugs take away my depression. But it's right back the next day.

Money - I need the money to buy my medication. Cigarette money. Pocket money. Clothes money. Just money. It makes you feel good to have money. For my habit. I don't have a job. I'm out of work. Problems with the family.

Cat Eye was on methadone maintenance for two years, but left:

The only thing bothers me is my habit. It's gonna be hard to kick this meth habit. I want to get into a program now. I hope I do. My welfare case was shut down. It was a private program. I need Medicaid to get on one. I'm planning to apply for Medicaid now. I getting tired of this. I want to stop. I want to go into a T.C. program, get straightened out, get a job. Maybe go back to Puerto Rico.

Cat Eye exhibited violent, desperate, and reckless behavior. On the other hand, he was one of the few who mentioned a desire to enroll in a treatment program. [Also see Cat Eye in vignette D.]

How do you know they were telling the truth?

Staff were concerned about the veracity of subjects' self-reports about their drug use and crime. Unlike most previous work in which subjects were asked to report about drug use or crime over an extended period, this research focused upon their activities in the past 24 hours. The brief interval since the crime and drug use afforded staff ways of ascertaining that self-reports were reasonably truthful. Four major types of information were employed to assess the veracity of each respondent's self-report: 1) Interviewer probes and ratings. 2) Internal consistency checks. 3) Requests for evidence of the crime (goods, cash, etc.). 4) Urinalysis results versus self-reported drug use.

1. Interviewer probes and ratings. Our interviewers were highly trained and experienced in interviewing substance-abusing criminals. The senior interviewer had worked on similar projects for the preceding seven years, and had conducted over 2,000 interviews with persons similar to these subjects. He was very skillful at obtaining answers and in using probing questions with street addicts, even those who were suffering from withdrawal or who were heavily intoxicated from alcohol. The other interviewer was a Ph. D. with extensive training in qualitative methods. Both interviewers asked the precoded questions and used intensive probing and recorded written comments to reduce the vagueness of answers or to clarify apparent inconsistencies in responses. Such clarifications were written in the margins or in the space for open ended questions.

In addition, at the end of the schedule, the interviewers checked several items that reflected their impressions of the subject:

Honesty of answers: 81% high, 14% medium, and 5% low.

Understanding of answers: 65% high, 33% medium, 2% low.

Cooperativeness: 83% cooperative, 17% suspicious/uncommunicative.

2. Internal Consistency Checks. The interview schedule was designed with a large number of internal consistency checks. Interviewers were trained to clear up inconsistencies as they progressed through the schedule, and then to review the whole instrument before terminating the interview. The respondent had to provide very detailed information about his activities in the six hours prior to and after the focal crime, as well as to account for every article taken and the dollars obtained and spent. The presence of partners, victims, and their relationship to the subject were ascertained at various points in the interview.

If the subjects reported committing some type of crime which they had denied at an earlier time, the interviewer clarified such discrepancies. A careful check of the interview ratings and the internal consistency checks of each interview led us to remove two completed schedules from the analysis. One subject claimed four robberies in the past 24 hours, but remembered little about the victims in a subway robbery. The interviewer rated him as "low honesty". He claimed heroin, cocaine, and alcohol but urinalysis results were negative. He made contradictory statements on

treatment. Another subject was rated "low honesty" by the interviewer. He reported few lifetime crimes despite 40 years of heroin use. He rushed through the interview saying no to many questions. Accounts of the focal crime were conflicting, and there were discrepancies regarding his age and year of birth.

Most of the other subjects provided information that was relatively consistent. Many data cleaning problems were handled by carefully crosstabulating possible inconsistent answers and resolving discrepancies against the original interview forms and written comments.

3. Evidence of the crime and drug use. During the interview, subjects occasionally showed items from the crime, such as stolen goods, cash, a knife or gun, drugs purchased, or other tangible evidence. Usually, of course, such goods would have been sold and drugs purchased and used prior to recruitment and interview. In some cases, the field worker's log established that he had observed tangible evidence in the street before the subject had disposed of it. Subjects were also asked to show evidence of drug use such as injection marks ("tracks"), treatment identification card, methadone bottle, or drug-related paraphernalia. Other subjects and people on the street were sometimes able to corroborate subjects' accounts.

4. Urinalysis results and recent self-reported drug use. It was easier to ascertain the veracity of self-reported drug use. The subjects were asked about their use of specific substances in the past 24 hours during ten or more separate sets of questions; so there were many internal consistency checks about drug and alcohol use in different parts of the interview. In addition, at the end of

the formal interview, and after obtaining the subject's urine specimen, the subject was asked to report which drugs he had used in the previous 24 hours--this was recorded on the urine consent form and was also placed on the slip which was sent to the urinalysis laboratory.

Table 2-6 presents a drug-by-drug comparison of the percent of subjects who tested positive. Persons were considered "positive" by urinalysis if they were definitely positive or had a "trace" of the substance. They were considered "positive" by self-report if three sources were affirmative: the lab slip filled out by the interviewer and accompanying urine bottle; the urine consent form on drugs reported used in the last 48 hours; and self-report within the last 24 hours somewhere within the interview itself.

These data generally show that self-report leads to higher levels of drug use than can be detected by even sensitive urinalysis testing (EMIT). About 20 percent more subjects reported cocaine, alcohol, and heroin than were detected by urinalyses. This suggests that they may be exaggerating or that they are not really consuming what they believe they were purchasing and using (i.e. they really received bad products containing little or no drugs). Alcohol especially may be rapidly metabolized, so that when persons had used it more than 10 hours before the urine specimen was obtained, it may not have been detected. These data clearly suggest, however, that our subjects are not seriously underreporting their drug consumption; if they err, it is towards over reporting.

These data do not establish the degree of concordance between each individual's self-reports of a given substance and his urinalysis results (such as in Wish et al. 1984). The discrepancies generally suggest that subjects may not be purchasing the drugs they think (and report) they are using, or that the urinalysis results underdetect alcohol and cocaine use.

Summary

In this study, a reliable methodology for recruiting drug abusers who had recently committed a serious nondrug crime was developed. A knowledgeable exaddict, exfelon could be trained to follow research procedures and persuade street offenders who recently committed serious crimes to come for an interview.

While their demographic characteristics appear similar to offenders in other samples, the analyses which follow suggest that these 105 subjects are equally or more seriously criminal and more intensive heroin and cocaine abusers (as well as users of other substances) than those previously studied, even when compared with prison based samples (BJS, 1983a,b), jail and prison inmates (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982a,b; Chaiken 1986), street heroin abusers (Johnson et al. 1985; Ball, et al. 1981, 1983), and samples of drug treatment programs (Sells, et al. 1976, 1981; DeLeon, 1984; DesJarlais, et al. 1983).

Most of our subjects exhibit life long impoverishment, inability and/or unwillingness to obtain legal employment, avoidance of public assistance, and a continuing reliance upon criminal activity to generate money for the drugs which are their "daily bread."

The criminal patterns of these offenders are described in more detail in the next chapter, and their focal crimes in Chapter 4.

Chapter 3

VIOLENT PREDATORS AMONG UNAPPREHENDED CRIMINALS
AND A NEW DISTINCTION

Eric Wish, Bruce D. Johnson, and Alton Sears

A new typology for classifying offenders, called criminal varieties, was developed by Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a,b) among prison and jail inmates in three states. Ten varieties of offenders were defined according to the combinations of crimes which they reported or denied committing in the past year. The most seriously criminal variety was labeled "violent predators" and consisted of persons who reported committing at least one robbery, assault, and drug sale in the year prior to their incarceration. The violent predators committed these three definitional crimes at the highest rates as well as committed other (nondefinitional) crimes at rates that equaled or surpassed those at which other varieties of offenders committed such crimes.

The violent predator classification has special practical significance for the criminal justice system because it opened up the possibility of reducing a community's level of crime if the system could identify and selectively incapacitate violent predators (Greenwood with Abrahamse, 1982). Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a,b) examined whether violent predators had any distinctive personal characteristics that could be used to identify them. Those analyses indicated a higher prevalence of juvenile drug use and/or an adult,

high-cost heroin habit among violent predators than among other offenders. Demographic characteristics and the number of prior contacts with the criminal justice system did not appear to be useful indicators of violent predators (Chaiken and Chaiken 1982a; Chaiken 1986). Similar results were replicated among heroin abusers at liberty on the streets of New York (Johnson et al. 1985:Ch 14).

This chapter reproduces the Chaiken's criminal varieties as closely as possible, but among unapprehended serious drug abusing offenders who had successfully committed a serious nondrug crime in the previous 24 hours. In addition, our analyses differentiate subgroups within the violent predator group to increase the utility of this offender classificatory device. Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a) used self-administered questionnaires to obtain information about the inmates' background and drug abuse history. This study used in-person interviews that focused intensively on each person's life history and patterns of criminality and drug abuse. This chapter provides new information about the personal attributes of violent predators and their criminality which emerged serendipitously during our analyses of crime events.

The remainder of this chapter has four parts. First, we reproduce the Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a) criminal varieties and present comparative distributions for three samples of offenders. Second, we determine whether the violent predator classification identifies the most criminally active offenders among a sample of unapprehended drug-abusing offenders in Harlem. Third, we examine whether some subgroups of violent predators have higher levels of

criminal activity than other subgroups. Fourth, we determine whether drug abuse and other personal history information can discriminate among subgroups of violent predators and other offenders.

Can the Criminal Varieties be Reproduced?

To get an idea of how seriously criminal the 105 street offenders in this sample were, we compared them with offenders in prison and jail inmates and a very similar street sample. Using parallel item wording, little difficulty was encountered in replicating the Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a) criminal varieties (Table 3-1). Comparative distributions are provided for three samples. Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a) interviewed 2,090 male prison and jail inmates in California, Texas, and Michigan. The 201 New York heroin abusers from the prior study (Johnson et al. 1985) came from the same neighborhoods and were selected by the same recruiter (plus others), interviewed mainly by the same interviewer at the same storefront as in the current study. The major difference was that the 201 heroin abusers were selected to represent a wide variety of heroin-abusing life-styles while the current sample (N=105) was selected only because they had committed serious nondrug crimes in the past 24 hours.

In both comparison studies (prison/jail inmates and the 201 street heroin abusers), less than 15 percent were violent predators compared with half of the 105 subjects in this study. Thus, the current sample contains a much higher proportion of violent predators than the others, probably because our selection effectively recruited persons who had two of the three criteria (robbery and drug sales) which defined violent predators.

Table 3-1
Distribution Across Criminal Varieties for Three Samples

Variety of Criminal Behavior	Jail/Prison Inmates in 3 States a	Heroin Abusers in New York	This Study
Violent Predators (robber-assaulter-dealers)	15	c	49
Robber-Dealers	9	11 c	15
Low-Level Robbers	20 d	13	20 d
Burglar-Dealers	10	8	2
Low-Level Burglars	8	12	1
Thief-Dealers	6	18	2
Low-Level Thieves	8	20	3
Drug-Dealers	6	6	4
Low level distributors	e	8	0
None of Above	--	4	0
Other varieties	18 f	0	4 f
Total	100	100	100
(N--Sample Size)	(2,090)	(201)	(105)

a -- Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a:26).

b -- Johnson et al. (1985:143).

c -- No assault distinction was made; violent predators included among robber-dealers.

d -- Includes robber-assaulters and low-level robbers.

e -- Data not obtained about nonsellers but active distributors.

f -- Includes "mere assaulters" variety plus others who could not be classified above.

Table 3-2

Violent Predators Are The Most Criminally Active (in the Past Year)

	Moderate Robbers (53)	Violent Predators (52)	p of Chi Square
DEFINITIONAL CRIMES			
1. Robbery			
% Committed At Least Once	70%	100%	sd
% Did More Than 10 Times	27	65	sd
2. Assault			
% Committed At Least Once	38	100%	sd
% Did More Than 10 Times	9	48	sd
3. Heroin Sales			
% Committed At Least Once	15	54	sd
% Did More Than 10 Times	9	35	sd
4. Cocaine Sales			
% Committed At Least Once	11	56	sd
% Did More Than 10 Times	6	46	sd
5. Illicit Methadone Sales			
% Committed At Least Once	11	56	sd
% Did More Than 10 Times	6	46	sd
6. Marijuana Sales			
% Committed At Least Once	34	65	sd
% Did More Than 10 Times	17	52	sd
NONDEFINITIONAL CRIMES			
7. Burglary			
% Committed At Least Once	68	79	ns
% Did More Than 10 Times	23	48	.05
8. Auto Theft			
% Committed At Least Once	77	88	ns
% Did More Than 10 Times	2	8	ns
9. Theft			
% Committed At Least Once	94	96	ns
% Did More Than 10 Times	83	71	ns
10. Forgery			
% Committed At Least Once	24	40	ns
% Did More Than 10 Times	4	23	.05
11. Fraud			
% Committed At Least Once	30	69	.01
% Did More Than 10 Times	9	29	.10
12. Vandalism			
% Committed At Least Once	15	29	ns
% Did More Than 10 Times	4	14	ns
13. Pimping			
% Committed At Least Once	8	19	ns
% Did More Than 10 Times	8	17	ns
14. Steer, Tout, Cop			
% Committed At Least Once	85	94	ns
% Did More Than 10 Times	68	81	ns

sd - Significantly different due in part to definition of violent predators and moderate robbers .

ns - Not significantly different at p <.10 level.

a - All violent predators commit robbery, assault, and drug sales by definition. Instead of asking about drug sales as a group, we asked about sales of specific drugs.

Table 3-3

Violent Predators Are More Likely to Commit Given Crimes At High Rates
(Compares Only Persons Who Committed That Offense at Least Once
in Prior Year)

Offense Class	Moderate Offenders	Violent Predators	p by Chi Square
Percent Committing Offense at Least 11 + Times			
DEFINITIONAL CRIMES			
Robberies	39 (37)	65 (52) a	.001
Assaults	24 (20)	48 (52) a	ns
(N Who Sold Any Drug Below)	(24)	(52) a	
Heroin Sales	21	35	ns
Cocaine Sales	13	31	.05
Illicit Methadone Sales	13	46	.05
Marijuana Sales	36	52	.10
NONDEFINITIONAL CRIMES			
Burglaries	33 (36)	61 (41) b	.05
Auto Thefts	10 (10)	30 (13)	ns
Thefts	88 (49)	74 (51)	ns
Forgeries	15 (13)	57 (21)	.05
Fraud and Cons	31 (16)	42 (36)	ns
Vandalisms	25 (8)	47 (15)	ns
Pimping	90 (4)	100 (10)	ns
Steer, Tout, Cop (N Who Sold Drugs)	75 (24)	81 (52)	ns

a -- All violent predators commit assaults, robberies, and drug sales in the prior year, by definition.

b -- Base Ns--only persons active in the given crime, e.g., 36 moderate robbers and 41 violent predator committed one or more burglaries.

Were Violent Predators More Criminally Active Than Other Offenders?

Most of the questions asked about criminal behavior were structured to be similar to those asked by Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a). We obtained self-reports of involvement in 14 offense classes (robbery, assault, burglary, auto theft, thefts, forgery, fraud, vandalism, pimping, and five drug distribution offenses). Instead of asking about sales of all drugs as a group, we asked separate questions about the sale of heroin, cocaine, marijuana, and illicit methadone in the past year and about steering, touting, and copping (STC).[1]

Each person was asked how often he had committed each of the 14 crimes in the previous 12 months. Subjects were classified as "active" if they reported committing one or more crimes in each offense class in the past year, and as "high rate" offenders if they reported committing each offense more than 10 times in the past year. Of our 105 subjects, all except three reported some lifetime experience in robbery, and all but 16 had robbed in the past year.

The remainder of this chapter is designed to make improved distinctions among robber subgroups by also taking into account the other crimes such robbers also commit. Half of the persons in our sample (52 out of 105) were violent predators, i.e., they committed at least one robbery, assault, and drug sale in the previous 12 months compared to 15 percent of the prison and jail inmates in the Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a) survey. In subsequent analyses, those in all

other criminal varieties (from robber-dealers to drug dealers and others), who were not violent predators, are labeled as "moderate robbers," since almost all (50 out of 53) had committed robbery in their lifetimes; moreover, 49 out of 53 reported committing one or two of the three crimes that define violent predators.

The violent predators, by definition, were more likely to have committed robbery, assault, and drug dealing at least once in the past year (Table 3-2) and were also about as likely as moderate robbers to have committed each of the nondefinitional offenses (e.g. burglary, theft, forgery, vandalism) at least once in the past year. The violent predators were significantly more likely than moderate robbers to have committed burglary and forgery at high rates in the past year.

Even after limiting the comparisons to violent predators and moderate robbers who had committed at least one offense of a given type in the past year (Table 3-3), the violent predators were significantly more likely than moderate robbers to be high-rate offenders for 6 of the 14 offenses: robbery, burglary, forgery, cocaine sales, illicit methadone sales, and marijuana sales. Although larger proportions of violent predators were the highest rate offenders for most other offenses (except theft), such differences did not reach statistical significance.[2]

The diversity of offending at high-rates among violent predators and moderate robbers is shown in Table 3-4. The violent predators committed an average of 5.7 offense classes at high rates, compared with 2.7 for moderate offenders. Six percent of moderate robbers and 55 percent of violent predators committed six or more offense classes at high rates ($p < .0001$). Thus, the violent predator classification

appears to indicate a propensity for committing many crimes annually as well as much diversity across offense classes, even though these persons are defined solely by their participation in just three crime types. The next section examines whether violent predators are a homogeneous group.

Are There Differences Among Violent Predators

In this section, the violent predator group is differentiated into two subgroups of active offenders. Two groups of violent predators were formed according to the number of offenses they committed at high rates (11 or more times) in the prior year.[3] As noted above, over half of the violent predators (55 percent or 28 subjects) were high-rate offenders in six or more offense classes. Careful consideration of terminology led to the choice of marauders [4] to describe violent predators who were high rate offenders in several offense classes.

Violent predators who were high-rate offenders in fewer than six offense classes were labeled as "nonmarauders" (N = 24)--although they were only somewhat less active in the variety of offense types. A person could have been classified as a marauder if he committed six or more of the relatively less serious nondefinitional crimes at high rates (such as theft, forgery, auto theft, burglary, fraud, vandalism, or pimping). [See vignette D for a focal burglary by a marauder.]

Marauders (Table 3-5), however, tended to commit both definitional and nondefinitional crimes at high rates. Half or more of the marauders committed the following crimes at high rates: robberies, assaults, burglary, thefts, cocaine sales, marijuana sales, illicit methadone sales, and STC. By contrast, half of the nonmarauders were high-rate offenders only for theft and STC.

Even though all violent predators committed assault and robbery at least once, by definition, 75 percent of the marauders were high-rate assaulters compared with 13 percent of the nonmarauders ($p < .001$); marauders were also more likely to be high-rate robbers (79 versus 31 percent-- $p < .005$). Even though drug selling is a definitional crime, marauders were significantly more likely to be high rate sellers of cocaine, heroin, and marijuana and to engage in STC than nonmarauders.

Marauders were also more likely than nonmarauders to commit burglary, fraud, vandalism, and steer-tout-cop drugs at high-rates. For the remaining offense classes (auto theft, theft, forgery, pimping, and illicit methadone sales), the two groups were not significantly different, although the proportion of high-rate offenders was usually higher among the marauders.

We have also included information about moderate robbers in Table 3-5. A comparison of moderate robbers and the nonmarauders shows both have relatively equal proportions who committed each offense at a high rate. Thus, in our sample, the simple definition of violent predators encompasses a large proportion of persons whose crime rates are similar to those of the moderate robbers. A better empirical cutting point for distinguishing the most serious offenders appears to be between marauding and nonmarauding violent predators, rather than between nonmarauders (or violent predators) and moderate robbers.

Table 3-4
Diversity of Offending Among High-rate Violent Predators
and Moderate Robbers

	Moderate Robbers (53)	Violent Predators (52)	p of Chi Square
Number of Offense Classes (of 14)			
Committed 11 or More Times			
0 - 1	25%	4%	
2 - 3	47	17	
4 - 5	23	25	.0001
6 - 7	4	33	
8 - 9	2	12	55%
Over 9	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	
	100	100	
Mean Number of Offenses			
Committed 11 or More Times	2.7	5.7	.0001

Table 3-5
Which Crimes Were Marauders More Likely to Commit at High Rates
(11 or More Times) in Prior Year

Offense Class	Moderate Robbers (53) (a)	Violent Predators		p of Chi Square (b vs. c)
		Nonmarauders (16) (b)	Marauders (28) (c)	
DEFINITIONAL CRIMES				
Robberies	19% ^e	31%	79%	.005
Assaults	15 ^e	13	75	.001
Heroin Sales	16 ^f	13	46	.05
Cocaine Sales	8 ^f	6	50	.01
Illicit Methadone Sales	13 ^f	25	54	ns
Marijuana Sales	33 ^f	25	64	.03

NONDEFINITIONAL CRIMES				
Burglaries	18	25	67	.02
Auto Thefts	2	0	14	ns
Thefts	82	56	79	ns
Forgeries	4	12	36	ns
Fraud and Cons	10	6	46	.02
Vandalism	4	0	26	.07
Pimping	6	6	25	ns
Steer, Tout, Cop	65	63	93	.03

d -- For each specific offense, this analysis subtracts from the column (independent) variable the contribution due to that offense. Subjects who committed exactly five crimes (N = 8) were excluded so that an individual's classification as a marauder or nonmarauder violent predator did not change. For example, if a person was a high-rate (11 or more) robber, his score on the diversity index was reduced by one. Thus, marauders (high rate on five or more crimes other than robbery) were more likely than the nonmarauders (high rate on four or fewer crimes other than robbery) to commit robberies at high rates.

e -- Based on moderate robbers committing this crime in past year: robbery (N = 37), assault (N = 20).

f -- Based on moderate robbers selling some drug in past year (N = 24).

Vignette D
A Marauder at Work

"He would of shot me, but I would of got a piece of him."

Cat Eye (also see vignette C) reported committing a wide variety of crimes regularly: burglaries, muggings, assault, STC, shoplifting, stripping and stealing cars, and arson. Arson was related to stripping and stealing cars: "After I'm through with the stolen cars, I would set them on fire."

He broke into a car and took clothes and a camera for which he received \$65 in the afternoon before the interview. But his focal crime was more serious and dangerous: burglarizing a drug dealer's apartment the night before the interview. When asked the main reason for this crime, he stated:

It was told to me the guy keeps money in there. He's a dope dealer. I wanted to get his gun and jewelry.

Cat Eye reported taking a knife with him and drinking alcohol very heavily just before this crime: six pints of Night Train (wine) and five quarts of beer. This consumption occurred on the street with six others, one of whom later was a lookout for the crime. He also took eight Valiums by himself during this period. He was not experiencing withdrawal just before the crime. He claimed that his alcohol and drug use helped prepare him for his risky crime:

There's got to be some drugs in me to do a crime. The wine gave me more courage. I prepared myself with the valium and alcohol to make me do the crime. I would have done it anyway but the drugs helped. I got me high where I said, 'Hell, I'm gonna do it tonight.' I walked in like it was my house. They could of been sleeping but I didn't give a fuck.

My timing was off. It was about 11:45 p.m. We went to the house. My friend stayed downstairs to be the lookout. I went up the fire escape from the roof. I opened the window. He had a alarm but it didn't go off. As I was in the apartment, he was coming back upstairs to the apartment. I knew he had a gun on him 'cause I couldn't find it in the house. I couldn't find any dope either. I had the stereo all wrapped up to take but I had to get out. When I first went in there was \$56 and a ring on the dresser. I put them in my pocket right away, then went looking around for the drugs. He had a dog, a pincher, but he didn't do anything. I also had a small T.V. ready to go but I had to leave in a hurry. I found bullets in the drawer but no gun. He must of been carrying it on him. When I heard him and couldn't find the gun I knew I better get out fast. I went back on the roof and went down the stairs in a hurry. I heard before

I did the crime that he killed 2 or 3 other people that was looking to take him off. He's a big dealer. If I had time to look I would have found the drugs, he must of had them hidden real good. If I was caught in there, he could of shot me or thrown me off the roof - probably both. A gun against a knife. He would of shot me, but I would of got a piece of him. I would of tried to talk my way out of it. But I don't think it would do any good.

This burglary netted Cat Eye a total of \$68; he gave \$12 to his lookout. He used \$56 for methadone and \$2 for alcohol, but not until more than eight hours after the crime.

At the end, the interviewer asked Cat Eye more about his peers:

Q: How many young guys do you know your age or under that are into drugs and crime?

A: A lot. I know a lot, they're into violent crimes, stick-ups, muggings, robberies, just beating people up to get their money.

Q: How many do you hang out with or know real good that are like that?

A: Three or four guys I hang out with my age or younger are into everything. One guy is into meth. He is a burglar like me. One is into coke. He's mean. He just shot a coke dealer ten days ago, nearly killed him, wanted to kill him but didn't hit him right. He figures, 'if he lives he gonna come back and get me.' But there's alot of young guys out there doing all kinds of shit.

Table 3-6
Do the Three Offender Groups Have Differing Characteristics?

Variable	Moderate	Violent Predators		Signi- ficance
	Robbers (53)	Nonmarauders (24)	Marauders (28)	
JUVENILE BEHAVIOR				
Early Onset of:				
Marijuana	38%	67%	75%	a,c
Heroin	17	42	43	a,c
Cocaine	23	58	57	a,c
Illicit Methadone	47	38	43	
Alcohol	40	38	46	
First Drunk	32	38	46	
High on Early Deviance Index	55	54	68	
As Teenager, Lived in East Harlem	45	54	53	
DEMOGRAPHICS				
Age: 29 and Under	34	38	18	
Education: 10th or less	42	54	57	
Ethnicity: Black	49	75	64	
Resides: Alone/Shelter/ Abandoned Bldg	38	33	39	
Marital Status: Never Married Nor Common Law	32	29	35	
CRIMINAL JUSTICE CONTACTS				
Early Onset for First Juvenile Arrest	26	17	25	
Adult Arrests: 7 or More	42	50	61	
Incarcerations: At or Above Median as Adult	31	38	42	

NOTES: The p of Chi Square is significant at the .10 level for the association between this variable and:

a- all three groups.

b- marauders versus nonmarauders (excludes moderate robbers).

c- moderate robbers versus nonmarauders (excludes marauders).

Early onset refers to persons who reported initial involvement at or below the median age of onset for that activity among persons who reported involvement in that activity during their juvenile years.

Table 3-7
Does Violent Predator Status Influence Current Heavy Drug Use?

Variable	Moderate Robbers (53)	Violent Predators Not Marauders (24)	Marauders (28)	p of Chi Square
Percent with Heavy (28+ Days in Past 30 Days) Use of				
Alcohol	62%	46%	75%	a,b
Marijuana	13	38	46	a,c
Heroin	19	29	57	a,b
Cocaine	17	25	54	a,b
Illicit Methadone	20	4	19	
Number of Substances Used Heavily (28+ Days in Past 30)				
None	17	25	0	
1-2	72	58	47	a,b
3 or More	11	16	54	

Urinalysis, Positive for				
Alcohol	59	54	57	
Heroin	26	25	29	
Cocaine	32	50	50	
Methadone	74	75	68	
Urinalysis Positive for Three or More Above Drugs				
	19	25	29	

Lifetime Drug Treatment				
Never	25	25	4	
Drug Treatment Only	47	46	64	
Alcohol and Drug Treatment	<u>28</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>32</u>	
	100	100	100	
Currently In Methadone Program				
	6	25	14	a,c

In 24 Hours Prior to Interview				
Any Drug Sales	9	50	46	a,c
Any Steer, Tout, Cop	55	64	65	
Other Drug Crime d	6	13	40	a,b

NOTES: The p of Chi Square is significant at the .10 level for the association between this variable and:

- a - all three above groups.
- b - marauders versus nonmarauders (excludes moderate robbers).
- c - moderate robbers versus nonmarauders (excludes marauders).
- d - Other drug crimes includes such activities as lending works, running a shooting gallery, and serving as watchman or guard.

Can Personal Characteristics Differentiate Marauders From Nonmarauding Violent Predators?

Having found that marauders were the most criminally active persons in our sample, we looked for any antecedent factors, other than self-reports of crime, that were characteristic of marauders. Our interviews elicited information about juvenile behavior, demographics, current living circumstances, and prior criminal justice contacts.

Background Characteristics

The background characteristics of moderate robbers, nonmarauders, and marauders are compared in Table 3-6. Almost none of the background variables was strongly associated with the offender groups. Marauders and nonmarauders were virtually identical on all juvenile behavior and demographic variables. Moderate offenders, however, were least likely to initiate use of marijuana, heroin, or cocaine at an early age. The moderate robbers were similar to the two groups of violent predators on other background characteristics.

All three groups of offenders had a similar likelihood of early juvenile arrests, adult arrests, and being incarcerated. Criminal justice contacts do not appear to differentiate among the three groups of offenders. Thus identifying the violent predators through information about demographic and other background characteristics and prior criminal justice contacts was not possible, as was the case among prison/jail inmates (Chaiken and Chaiken 1982a,b) and the earlier study of heroin abusers (Johnson et al. 1985).

Concurrent Behaviors

While the three offender groups did not have different background characteristics, their recent behaviors were different (Table 3-6). Marauders were significantly more likely than the other offenders to be heavy users of alcohol, heroin, and cocaine in the past 30 days. Over half (54 percent) of the marauders used three or more substances heavily (28 out of 30 days) compared with 16 the percent of nonmarauders and 11 percent of the moderate robbers. Although 96 percent of the marauders reported previous drug and/or alcohol treatment, they were not more likely to be currently enrolled in methadone treatment at the time of interview. That is, most marauders were treatment drop outs who resumed or never stopped abusing heroin and cocaine.

Urine test results for the specimen obtained at the end of the interview show that regardless of offender group, the likelihood of a drug-positive urine was high. Methadone was the drug most likely to be found in the urine specimens, probably because our recruiter was familiar with persons who bought from methadone clients in the neighborhood. Alcohol and cocaine were the next most frequently detected drugs, followed by heroin. The fact that all three groups of offenders were detected by test to have used a drug in the past 24 to 48 hours is probably the result of our recruiting persons known to be currently abusing drugs. Thus while the degree of self-reported drug use in the past month was related to offender group, use in the past 24 to 48 hours day (defined by the urine test) was not.

Drug sales and STC crimes committed in the past 24 hours also did not differ greatly among the nonmarauders and marauders. But the marauders were significantly more involved than nonmarauders in other drug crimes, such as running a shooting gallery and acting as "runner" or "watchman" (see Johnson et al. 1985 for a description of these activities).

Discussion

This chapter shows that the violent predator classification developed by Chaiken and Chaiken (1982a,b) has validity when applied to heroin- and cocaine-abusing offenders recruited from the streets of Harlem. The discriminative power of the violent predator classification was replicated in our sample. Unlike the Chaikens' subjects, who were incarcerated in jails and prisons, our respondents had recently committed a crime and were at liberty on the streets. Violent predators were much more prevalent (50 percent versus 15 percent) among our subjects, however, than in the Chaikens' study and in a very similar prior study of heroin abusers (Johnson et al. 1985). The higher proportion of violent predators is partially accounted for by our recruitment practices, which almost guaranteed that subjects would be drug abusers who had committed a serious nondrug crime. Violent predators had committed 5.7 different types of offenses at high rates in the past year, compared with 2.7 offense types by moderate robbers.

Although violent predators did commit crimes at higher rates than other offenders, the violent predator group was quite heterogeneous. A subgroup of violent predators, whom we labeled "marauders," was much more criminally active than the nonmarauding violent predators.

Our ability to differentiate this group was helped by selection procedures which were effective at recruiting intensively active street criminals, a sufficient number of whom were violent predators to permit making subtle distinctions.

The two subgroups of violent predators in our sample were very similar in their patterns of crime commission, antecedent characteristics, and current patterns of drug use. But some characteristics differentiated marauders from the nonmarauders. The marauders were clearly more involved in the daily abuse of multiple illicit drugs. On the other hand, age of onset of drug use was not different in the two groups.

The fact that the number of prior arrests and incarcerations was similar in both groups suggests that the criminal justice system is not more likely to apprehend and incapacitate the marauder. This is understandable, given the difficulty the Chaikens encountered in developing their criminal varieties and our efforts to distinguish among subgroups of violent predators--even where subjects provided self-reports about their criminality without fear of arrest. However, our findings do suggest that a possible means for identifying serious violent predators may lie in identifying offenders who abuse several different hard drugs.

We conclude that the simple definition of violent predators based upon self-reports of prior criminal behavior provides a method for targeting the most criminally active offenders even within a group of generally active unapprehended street criminals. To the extent that additional information about high-rate criminality across many offense

classes can be obtained in future research, so that persons can be defined as marauders, criminal justice personnel may be further able to refine their ability to target the most serious offenders. Unfortunately, violent predators could not be identified by their early deviant behaviors or by their number of contacts with the criminal justice system.

A means of identifying the violent predator without relying upon voluntary self-reports of crimes committed may be possible, however. Since the most criminally active violent predators in our sample were daily abusers of multiple hard drugs, it may be possible to identify many of violent predators and marauders by focusing on offenders with serious multiple drug habits. Ways by which such persons may be identified by the criminal justice system are being developed (see Wish and Johnson 1986; Chaiken and Johnson 1987; Lipton and Wexler 1987; Wexler, Johnson, and Lipton 1987).

NOTES

1. Subjects were asked about certain distribution roles which they do not define as "dealing:" steering (referring customers to buyers), touting (finding customers for dealers), and copping (acting as intermediary between buyers and sellers who never meet) (Johnson et al. 1985). These acts are defined as sales by police and courts, however, and are included here as a related form of drug sale. Persons who only steer, tout, or cop drugs, but do not sell drugs, are excluded as "sellers" in this chapter.

2. We mention some results that may not reach statistical significance ($p < .10$ level) due to the small numbers of cases, yet the association appears relatively strong (e.g. in Table 3-3, half of the violent predators versus a quarter of the moderate robbers were high-rate assaulters). The .10 level of significance is employed to reduce the possibility of a type II error; with small samples such as this, analysts may fail to reject the null hypothesis, when a real difference exists.

3. Additional analyses (not presented) found that subgroups of violent predators who were high-rate offenders for both assault and robbery did not differ significantly from the remaining violent predators in the proportion who were high-rate offenders for other offense classes.

4. The Dictionary (1966) defines a marauder as one who "roams about...in search of plunder" which is "taking something by force, theft, or fraud." To this definition, selling of various substances could be added in the mid-1980s.

CHAPTER 4

FOCAL CRIME EVENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSONS COMMITTING THEM.

This chapter* describes the focal crime (defined shortly), and other crimes committed by the offender within the same 24 hour period. The final section describes the criminal patterns, drug use, and demographic characteristics of the persons committing the focal crimes.

Focal Crimes

After obtaining self-reports about criminal behavior in the past year and drug use in the past month, subjects were asked to list all nondrug crime events committed in the 24 hours prior to being interviewed. Three was the maximum reported. The interviewer selected the one most serious crime event--the focal crime--and asked many detailed questions about that crime. Analyses in subsequent chapters will focus upon only upon these focal crimes, or the one most serious nondrug crime committed in the past 24 hours.

The ordering criteria for selecting focal crimes were: robberies, burglaries, grand larcenies, and other property crimes. Thus, an offender who reported a burglary, shoplifting, and sale of stolen goods in the past 24 hours was questioned about his burglary. When a subject reported multiple robberies, the presence of assault or the dollar returns were used to select the focal robbery. These "focal crime" events were classified as robberies (N=46), burglaries (N=18), and larcenies/other crimes (N=41).

*With the assistance of Alton Sears.

Robberies include three events in which assault also occurred (no assaults without robberies were reported in the past 24 hours). Larcenies and other crimes are called "thefts" throughout this report; they include a variety of property crimes such as shoplifting, thefts from vehicles, one vehicle theft, pocket picking, pimping, fraud, forgery, cons, and selling stolen goods.

Because the number of questions asked about the focal crime were so extensive, no efforts were made to obtain such detailed data about the subjects' other crimes. Thus, each subject had only one focal crime. In subsequent analyses, it is essential to keep clear the distinction between crime events and persons. The reader should not equate the characteristics of focal crimes with the characteristics of persons committing them or vice versa. For example, the fact that a person committed a focal burglary does not mean the person is only a burglar, because he may also commit robbery and thefts, but at other times. Likewise persons who are frequent robbers (on other days) may have committed a theft (focal theft) on the day of our interview. The remainder of this chapter will document that the focal crime is but one of several crimes committed by these subjects in a 24 hour period as well as describe the characteristics of offenders doing these focal crimes.

Characteristics of Focal Crime Events

Detailed data about the characteristics of the three classes of focal crimes are presented in Table 4-1. Over half of all focal robberies were committed against deviant persons (drug users, dealers, drunks, prostitutes, Johns, criminals--see vignette D, Chapter 3).

Table 4-1
 Characteristics of the Focal Crimes by
 Type of Focal Crime.

Characteristics of Events Base N (Crimes)	Types of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
	%	%	%	%
Type of victim d				
Deviant persons e	54	0	2	25
Other persons/places	37	100	51	53
Stores/businesses	9	0	46	22
Totals	100	100	100	100
More than one victim	2	5	0	2
Two or more perpetrators	39	50	27	36
Perpetrator had weapon	87 a	56	46 c	56 d
Weapon used in crime	67 a	0	0 c	30 d
Weapon hurt someone	7	0	0	3
Arrest occurred	0	6	2	2
Type of criminal return				
Any cash	98 a	28	22 c	56 d
Any property/goods	35 a	94	81 c	63 d
Any drugs-alcohol	4	6	0	3
Location of crime d				
Lower East Harlem	18	33	31	25
Upper East Harlem	30	33	15	25
North Manhattan/Bronx	39	22	21	29
Elsewhere	13	11	33	20
Totals	100	100	100	100

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:

- a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
- b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
- c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
- d for three offense types (e.g. 3 X 3 chi square is significant).
- e deviant persons include drug user, dealer, prostitute, alcoholic, criminals, and so on.

Burglaries were mainly directed against households rather than businesses (see vignette E). About half the thefts were against stores and business, the remainder directed against persons, but generally not against deviants .

Robberies almost always (98 percent) resulted in cash income; some property or goods were also taken in about a third of the robberies (see vignette F). Burglaries and thefts usually resulted in goods or property; cash was taken in about a quarter of these crimes.

The offender carried weapons in most (86 percent) of the robberies and during about half of the burglaries and thefts. In two-thirds of the robberies, weapons were used, but assaults on the victim were reported by the offender in only seven percent of the robberies (a somewhat lower percentage than 14 percent of robbery victims who report injury in the National Crime Surveys (BJS 1986). Thus, while weapons were carried by most offenders, they were shown only in robberies and infrequently used on the victim.

Most of the subjects were recruited from the streets of East Harlem and a majority lived in this community. Burglaries were somewhat more likely to be committed in this community, while thefts were slightly more likely to be done in other areas of New York City.

Crimes against multiple victims were rare for all three crimes classes. Approximately a third of the crimes involved two or more perpetrators, but no association by type of focal crime was evident. Only two subjects were arrested (and quickly released) for a theft and a burglary, but no arrests occurred for any robberies. (Of course, if an arrest had occurred and the offender was detained, he would not have been eligible for being recruited for this study).

Vignette E
A Focal Burglary

"I did it just for the drugs. I thought about getting busted too."

Ray W. (also see Vignette B) is an experienced burglar who reports never having been arrested for this crime. He reported committing both shoplifting and a burglary, plus low level distribution of cocaine in the 24 hours preceding the interview. From the shoplifting and the distribution, he received \$40 cash and two \$8 bags of coke. Before the focal burglary, he reported taking \$10 worth of heroin and \$4 worth of Placidyls (a sleeping pill): "It gives me more courage to do the crime. If I didn't take them I wouldn't do the crime."

He indicated having severe withdrawal symptoms before doing the burglary and said that just before the crime he felt like he was losing his mind and had crying spells. He reported this burglary:

I did it just for the drugs. To get H and coke. And something to eat.

I got my tools ready. I sat down and thought about it. I thought about getting busted too. I knew the people were going to work. I checked it out for a good 5 days before I did it. They left at 8:15 and I went in at 8:30. I used my screwdriver on the front door. I took a stereo set, two watches, and a camera. I was inside for about 20 minutes. I left the same way I went in. Nobody seen me going in or out.

Within an hour of the burglary, Ray W. had received \$100 for some of these goods. He immediately bought \$40 in heroin and \$30 in cocaine, which he consumed as a speedball. He also spent \$30 for a "walking suit" (matching street clothes) and \$1 for food. He took the drugs a little over an hour after the crime. He expects to get another \$50 from two watches he showed the interviewer.

Vignette F
A Focal Robbery

"I felt a little crazy."

Survivor is a 23-year-old who lived with his parents and had finished ten years of school. He was involved with PCP, both as a user and a dealer and reports recently using marijuana, PCP, and cocaine heavily. He used methadone only occasionally now, heroin not at all, and alcohol ten days a month. He claimed not to be dependent on any of these.

He says his family has forcefully opposed his drug use: "My father beat the shit out of me a few times for the use of drugs."

Vignette F (continued)

Besides selling PCP and marijuana, Survivor's main crime specialties are robbery and shoplifting. Before his focal crime, he drank three cans of Budweiser with two others, but reported that this had no impact on the crime. The three of them also smoked PCP, which had a strong effect on him; he claims that PCP actually helped make him do the crime. The major crime about which he was interviewed occurred at 3 p.m.:

I was walking over to my aunt's house on the East Side. I was trying to come off the dust (PCP), 'cause my aunt will tell my father. I was high. I thought the walk would do me some good. This fourteen year old Puerto Rican kid bent to tie his lace. I grabbed for the radio. He got up just as I had it and grabbed my arm. I punched him in the side of the face and kicked him in his balls and just ran. I ran and jumped on the crosstown bus. Went to Broadway and met a friend. We went to sell the radio. I gave him \$7.

I felt a little crazy, you know what I mean. I didn't give a shit. I just seen the radio and I wanted it. I wanted the radio. It was nice. I wanted it for the beach this summer.

I wanted the radio for myself. Even though I sold it. At that time I wanted it for myself. He (the victim) was a little punky kid. No more than 14 years old. The radio was bigger than him. I forgot I had the knife. If I remembered it I might of stabbed him instead of hitting him.

When asked if the PCP made him forget the risks involved, Survivor answered: "Yeah, that shit makes you do crazy shit." Not only that. He reports that the PCP made him literally unaware of what he was doing. After the crime:

I ran like shit. I don't think anybody would of caught me. But after I was running I said to myself: What am I running for? Then I seen the radio in my hand and remembered."

Despite his initial desire to use the radio for himself, Survivor soon sold it to a friend for \$40 and bought \$30 worth of cocaine. He took the cocaine along with some beer. Survivor's account of his general motivations paralleled this event:

That dust makes me do shit I probably wouldn't do if I was high on other shit. It seems like I only do a crime when I'm high. When I'm high my mind's a blank, I don't think. I do (crimes) because I enjoy the excitement. If I wouldn't get high I probably wouldn't do them. Everybody does them. The people I hang with all use dust and coke. They can get the dust easy, but the coke you have to have money in your pocket.

During the interview Survivor seemed to be the opposite of the personality he described during the crime. The interviewer wrote in his final comments: "Nice easy going kid. Very likeable."

Total Crimes In Past 24 Hours

These subjects did not limit themselves to their focal crimes. Indeed, these 105 subjects committed a total of 52 robberies, 22 burglaries, and 79 thefts--for a total of 153 nondrug crime events or an average of 1.46 nondrug crimes--within the 24 hours prior to interview (Table 4-2). This average is somewhat lower than the 1.89 nondrug crimes per day with some nondrug criminal activity reported among 201 Harlem heroin abusers (Johnson et al. 1985:230).

Slightly over half (N=26) of all robberies were committed against persons whom the offenders reported to be drug users/sellers, drunks, prostitutes, Johns, or other criminals ("deviants"). Four business robberies and 22 robberies of lay citizenry (persons not labeled by the offender as deviant) also occurred. Shoplifting accounted for over half (N=38) of all thefts, with thefts from vehicles being the next most popular (N=17). Burglaries were less common than shoplifting and robberies. This distribution of total events, however, may be a function of our selection process (both of subjects and events).

As well as their focal crimes, persons committing focal robberies also committed an additional 6 robberies, 4 burglaries, and 18 thefts (Table 4-3). Persons reporting focal burglaries and focal thefts also committed 20 additional thefts. Hence, focal robberies were associated with a wider diversity of offense classes than burglaries-thefts.

Table 4-2
 Total Number of Nondrug Crimes in Past 24 Hours

Specific Crimes	Number of Nondrug Crimes
Robberies	52
of Deviants a	26
of Other Individuals	22
of Stores/Businesses	4
Burglaries	22
Thefts	79
From stores (shoplifting)	38
From vehicles	17
Pickpocket/purse snatch	8
From persons	7
Forge/fraud/cons	9
Total Nondrug crimes in 24 hours by 105 subjects	153
Average number of nondrug crimes per subject in past 24 hours.	1.46

a - Victims described by subjects as drug users, dealers, drunks, prostitutes, Johns, and criminals.

Table 4-3
Other Crimes, Excluding Focal Crimes, Committed in Past 24 Hours
by Type of Focal Crime.

Characteristics of Events Base N (Crimes)	Types of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
During past 24 hours				
Among persons with focal crime above;				
number of other:	Number of Crimes			
Robberies	6	0	0	6
Burglaries	4	0	0	4
Thefts	18	5	15	38
Total other crimes	28	5	15	48
Among offenders whose focal crime is above:				
Any drug sales	44 a	17	17 c	29 d
Any steer, tout, cop	57	61	54	56
Any other drug crimes	22	17	7	15
Among subjects whose focal crime is above,				
percent with additional drug or nondrug crime (i.e. did focal crime plus some other crime in past 24 hours)	87	89	71 c	81

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:

- a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
- b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
- c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
- d for three offense types (e.g., 3 X 2 chi square is significant).

In addition to their nondrug crimes in the past 24 hours, many subjects also reported drug distribution offenses. Those committing focal robberies were more likely than persons committing focal burglaries/thefts to engage in drug sales in the past 24 hours (Table 4-3). But they were no more likely to steer (customers to dealers), tout (locate customers for dealers), or cop (transport money and drugs between buyers and sellers) or other drug-related crimes (lend or rent works, hold drug, and so on--see Johnson et al. 1985). The vast majority of subjects, however, engaged in some form of drug crime during the same 24 hour period regardless of the type of focal crime committed.

Overall, almost 90 percent of persons who committed focal robberies and focal burglaries committed some other nondrug crime or drug crime in addition to their focal crime. Persons who committed focal thefts were somewhat less apt to commit other crimes, but even so, 70 percent committed additional crimes. In short, these subjects were very active offenders; almost all committed two or more crimes (including the focal crime) during the past 24 hours.

Characteristics of Persons Committing Focal Crimes

What are the criminal and drug using patterns of offenders committing these focal crimes over a longer period of time (over a year or month)? Focal robberies, burglaries, and thefts were committed by persons who exhibited considerable diversity in the other types of crime they were likely to commit in the past year, a finding parallel to that documented elsewhere (Chaiken and Chaiken 1982; Johnson et al. 1985).

All of the robberies, 94 percent of the focal burglaries, and 63 percent of the focal thefts were committed by persons who also committed one or more robberies in the past year (Table 4-4). In fact, focal robberies were as likely as focal burglaries (but focal thefts were less likely) to be committed by persons who also committed burglary at other times during the year. All three types of crimes were equally likely to be committed by persons who committed thefts at other times.

Focal robberies were committed by persons, four-fifths or more of whom were also assaulters, burglars, thieves, drug dealers, and cocaine-heroin sellers during the prior year. Focal burglaries were committed by very similar types of persons; over 70 percent were also robbers, assaulters, thieves, and drug dealers. When compared with robberies and burglaries, focal thefts were considerably less likely (about half) to be committed by persons who were robbers, assaulters, burglars, and cocaine/heroin dealers. Equal proportions of focal robberies, burglaries, and thefts were committed by persons who also were thieves, forgers, marijuana dealers, and sellers of any drug.

The criminal varieties developed by Chaiken and Chaiken (1982) were reproduced in Chapter 3; these varieties classify offenders according to the combinations of crimes which they commit. Violent predators were the most serious offenders who self-report robbery, assault, and drug sales in the past year (Chaiken and Chaiken 1982; Chaiken 1986; Johnson et al. 1985). Among the 105 subjects here, half were violent predators by these definitions, and half of these committed 10 or more crimes annually in 6 or more offense classes and were classified as "marauder" violent predators.

Over two-thirds of the focal robberies were committed by violent predators compared with half of the focal burglaries and a quarter of the focal thefts. Over a third of the focal robberies were committed by marauders. Focal thefts were unlikely to be committed by serious subgroups of offenders mainly due to selection of the most serious crimes for study (e.g., persons who committed focal robberies were equally likely to commit thefts--Table 4-3).

Is the specific focal crime associated with the offender's current pattern of drugs-alcohol use? Subjects were asked how many days in the past 30 days they had used various substances (Table 4-4). Very substantial proportions reported heavy use (most reported use on 30 out of 30 days) of various substances. Focal robberies (41 percent) were more likely to be committed by persons who were daily cocaine abusers than burglaries and thefts (about 20 percent). Types of focal crimes, however, were not associated with other measures of drug use nor with previous or current drug treatment.

Background Characteristics of Persons Committing Focal Crimes

All demographic factors (age, ethnicity, marital status, living situation, and housing) were not associated with the types of focal crimes (Table 4-5). Likewise, the types of focal crimes did not differ according to the early childhood deviance of the offenders or precocity at first juvenile arrest. Offenders doing focal robberies and focal burglaries reported an average of 15 prior arrests; those committing focal thefts had fewer (9) prior arrests. Clearly, these offenders have been seen frequently by the criminal justice system, but their personal characteristics were not associated with the focal crimes, a finding documented elsewhere (Blumstein et al. 1986).

Table 4-4
Recent Criminality and Drug Use Among Subjects by
Type of Focal Crime.

Characteristics of Persons Base N (Crimes)	Types of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
Focal crime committed by Persons active in past year as:	%	%	%	%
Robber	100 a	94	63 c	85 d
Assaulter	83 a	72	51 c	67 d
Burglar	80	94	56 c	73
Thief	91	100	97	95
Forger	37	33	27	32
Any drug seller	80	72	63	72
Cocaine-heroin seller	63 a	44	20 c	43 d
Marijuana seller	52	50	46	50
Offender typology				
Violent predators				
Marauders	37 a	28	15	27
Nonmarauders	33	22	12	23 d
Moderate robbers	30	50	73 c	51
Total	100	100	100	100
Heavy User (28-30 Days in Past 30 Days) of:				
Cocaine	41 a	17	20	29
Heroin	35	39	24	31
Illicit methadone	13	11	20	15
Marijuana	30	22	27	28
Alcohol	57	72	63	62
Urinalysis positive for:				
Cocaine	45	28	42	41
Heroin	35	16	22	26
Illicit methadone	74	75	68	72
Alcohol	59	67	51	57
Three or more of above substances	28	16	19	23
Ever in treatment	85	67	83	81
Currently in treatment				
Methadone	15	11	10	12
Other	12	0	5	3

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs for:

a robberies versus burglaries/thefts.

b burglaries versus robberies/thefts.

c thefts versus robberies/burglaries.

d three offense types (e.g., 3 X 2-3 chi square is significant).

"Recent" involvement may include the past 24 hours.

Table 4-5
Demographic and Other Characteristics of Persons by
Type of Focal Crime.

Characteristics of Persons Base N (Crimes)	Types of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
	%	%	%	%
Age				
29 and younger	26	39	32	31
30 - 39	48	33	51	47
40 and older	26	28	17	23
Ethnicity				
Black	67	50	54	59
Hispanic\white	33	50	46	41
Marital Status				
Never married	37	33	27	32
Married/common law	28	22	29	28
Other status	35	44	44	40
Resides with:				
Woman/children	41	33	39	39
Relatives/friends	29	17	39	30
Alone/no address	30	50	22	31
Type of Housing				
Apartment/house	61	56	68	63
None/shelter	39	44	32	37
At/below median age of first juvenile arrest	41	33	34	37
Early deviance scale				
Mean # positive (8 items)	4	4	4	5
Mean # adult arrests	15	15	9 c	13

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs for:
a robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
b burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
d three offense types (e.g., 3 X 2-3 chi square is significant).

Discussion

This chapter has described the most serious crime committed in the 24 hours prior to interview. These focal crimes were classified into robberies, burglaries, and thefts. Robberies, when compared with the other crimes, were associated with cash returns rather than property, and with weapon possession and use during the crime. About half of the focal robberies had victims who were "deviant" (drug users/sellers, drunk, prostitutes, Johns). The characteristics of focal robberies, burglaries, thefts were similar for the number of victims or perpetrators, arrests, or locale of the crime.

The type of focal crime, however, does provide clues about the seriousness of the offender's life-style. Specifically focal robberies were associated with being an offender in the past year in virtually every offense class and indicates that the offender is usually among the most serious subgroups of offenders in this sample--violent predators or marauder violent predators. Since focal thefts, by definition, were limited to the least serious crime committed in the past 24 hours, persons committing focal thefts were the least seriously criminal among these subjects (although very active in crime by any definition). Focal burglaries were committed by offenders who were intermediate between robberies and theft.

While most subjects were daily users of some substances, focal robberies were associated only with daily cocaine use.

Otherwise, the type of focal crimes exhibited no association with other substances used in the past 30 days. Demographic characteristics and early childhood deviance measures were not associated with the type of focal crimes.

This information suggests that offenders with the most serious characteristics (heavy cocaine-heroin users and violent predators) were disproportionately more likely to commit the more serious focal crimes (robberies) and to commit a wider range of offenses during the 24 hour period. While temporal propinquity (see chapter 1) was shown between focal crimes and measures of drug involvement and characteristics of crime events, statistical associations were much rarer. For the most part, demographic characteristics and current patterns of drug use (excepting cocaine) did not appear to have a "role" in the focal crime events because these measures were not statistically associated with these crimes.

In the following chapter, we examine the specific role of drugs-alcohol in the commission of specific crimes.

NOTE

1. Note on Significance Levels -- The information on significance levels are provided as a guide to ascertain which differences are relatively most important, compared with those that are less important. Since these subjects were not sampled with a known probability, most assumptions underlying significance tests are not met. For example, statistical tests assume normal distributions. But all studies document that criminality is highly skewed; this is particularly true for these subjects.

Significance tests based upon small sample sizes have many limitations, especially when the expected number in any cell is five or less. Because only 18 of the focal crimes were burglaries, when crosstabulating these three crimes against various characteristics of events, expected cell sizes of five or less were common for burglars. Thus, we present the data for all three focal crimes, but have collapsed burglaries with robberies or thefts for purposes of reporting significance levels.

The .10 significance level was chosen for two reasons. With small samples such as this, the probability of a Type II error is great: i.e. failing to reject the null hypothesis, when there is actually a real difference. Also, no theory indicates that these types of crime events should always be high or low on specific dependent variables. Thus, two-tailed rather than one-tailed tests were used.

Chapter 5

HOW ARE SERIOUS CRIME EVENTS ASSOCIATED WITH
PRIOR OR SUBSEQUENT DRUGS-ALCOHOL USE?*

Virtually all analytic attention in criminology has been directed towards understanding offenders and their life-styles. Relatively little attention has been devoted to describing self-reported criminal events and whether and how these are influenced by drugs and/or alcohol use. In this chapter, we present findings from a sample of drug-abusing offenders who provided detailed descriptions of their thinking and drugs-alcohol use prior to and after the single most serious crime committed in the prior 24 hours. The analytic focus is upon whether the type of crime committed is associated with prior and subsequent (post-crime) drugs-alcohol use and with implicit theories (see below) about why drugs-alcohol may influence the crime.

Background

Available studies of crime events have relied upon two major sources: official police and court records or victimization surveys. The rare studies which obtain information about crime events and use of drugs-alcohol come from samples of incarcerated persons (BJS 1983a,b,d; 1985).

*With the assistance of Alton Sears. The term "drugs-alcohol" refers to alcohol and/or several illegal drugs (as specified below).

Absent from the criminological literature is information about serious crime events as reported by perpetrators who committed "successful" crimes (from the perspective of the offender) in which they obtained money and/or goods, and are not apprehended. Such successful crimes outnumber by 99 (or more) to 1 the few crimes in which an arrest or other police contact occurs (Huizinga and Dunford 1985; Chaiken and Chaiken 1982a; Inciardi 1979, 1986; Ball, 1986; Johnson et al. 1985; Johnson, Lipton, and Wish 1986).

A growing literature (summarized in Johnson and Wish 1986a,b; Johnson, Lipton, Wish 1986) now documents the importance of complex life-styles and patterning of drug use and crime. The most serious street offenders appear to be those exhibiting a complex life-style which combines: routine crime commission in several offense classes--burglary, robbery, theft, stolen goods, etc.; polydrug abuse (weekly to multi-daily use of cocaine, heroin, marijuana, and pills); drug sales (weekly or more frequent sales and distribution of illicit substances, primarily cocaine, heroin, and marijuana); and alcohol abuse (Johnson and Wish, 1986a,b). During a typical day, such serious street offenders will commit one or more nondrug crimes, use cocaine and/or heroin and/or marijuana several times, possibly engage in several drug sales, and drink alcohol several times or continuously.

An emerging literature (Hunt, Lipton, Spunt 1984; Ball, Shaffer, Nurco 1983; Nurco et al. 1985; Speckart and Anglin 1986a,b) shows that during periods of daily cocaine or heroin use, robbery rates are much higher than when the same persons are using cocaine-heroin on a weekly or less than weekly basis. That is, something about very regular cocaine-heroin use is associated with high robbery rates.

Explanations for the association between such high levels of use and criminality generally involve several implicit theories or folkways (described shortly) in which the unit of analysis is unwittingly shifted from persons to events. In this research, we employ criminal events as the unit of analysis and examine the associations with reported drugs-alcohol use episodes before and after such crimes.

Implicit Theories and Verbal Articulations

This paper will not directly address particular scientific theories of drugs-alcohol use (such as those in Lettieri et al. 1980), but rather will address several "implicit theories" (frequently derived from scientific theories) and show whether these are associated with specific types of crime events. Implicit theories are understood to be common sense beliefs or folkways which participants may invoke to explain behaviors. Such implicit theories are vague, have unspecific referents, and are what "everyone knows" (unlike scientific theories which demand precision of definition and measurement). Thus, according to various implicit theories, criminal events may be associated with drugs-alcohol use due to mental illness, poverty, withdrawal, disinhibition, desire for euphoria, need for money, and so on.

Verbal articulations are the statements which persons make when referring to some implicit theory; such statements may be open ended comments or endorsement of items asked by an interviewer. Verbal articulations may reflect more deeply felt beliefs, attitudes, motivations, intentions, rationalizations, and subconscious feelings, but express them imperfectly. (See all vignettes.)

Implicit theories and verbal articulations about drugs and crime are usually post hoc; they are typically invoked after a criminal event and are implied to be relevant only for that event. Such implicit theories ignore comparisons that are central to scientific research, i.e. drugs-alcohol use but no crimes and crimes without substance use. Thus, criminal events are the appropriate independent variables; the role of drugs-alcohol prior and subsequent to such events function as the dependent variables (although this violates normal scientific criteria which attempt to order factors chronologically).

Implicit theories linking drugs-alcohol to crime are also vague about the specific types of crimes likely to be committed. Implicit theories of disinhibition suggest that alcohol use is apt to be associated with aggressive crimes, but not with property crimes. Implicit theories of addiction link heroin with commission of property crimes to obtain money, but not with assaultive crimes.

The three major offense classes analyzed below (robbery, burglary and theft) may be linked in differing ways to drugs-alcohol use. Robbery involves personal confrontation with the victim and the threat or actual use of force as well as taking money or property. Thus, robberies may be associated with prior alcohol use if alcohol lowers normal inhibitions against violence. Likewise, robberies may be associated with severity of withdrawal symptoms from opiates or intense cravings for cocaine and the immediate need to obtain money to purchase such substances.

Burglaries generally involve planning and timing. Thus, implicit theories of disinhibition would suggest that burglaries should be negatively associated with alcohol use because intoxication would reduce ability to plan and to calculate timing carefully. On the other hand, burglaries should be positively associated with severity of withdrawal symptoms and need for expensive drugs (cocaine-heroin) because they provide access to cash or property which can be sold for substantial sums.

Thefts (including auto theft, shoplifting, and general larcenies) would be associated with presence of withdrawal symptoms and need for cocaine-heroin. Unless the offender is impoverished, thefts would not generally be associated with alcohol.

Since implicit theories are vague and unspecific, however, many other associations (both positive and negative) between robberies-burglaries-thefts and drugs-alcohol use could be postulated.

Since the average subject here was involved in some form of nondrug crime and used cocaine-heroin and other substances on a daily basis, the null hypothesis for events provides an important contrast to these implicit theories. The null hypothesis holds that among such persons who routinely engage in all behaviors (i.e., drugs, alcohol, crimes), specific crime events would not be statistically associated with specific occasions of drugs-alcohol use (either prior or subsequent), although much drugs-alcohol use may actually have occurred prior to or after specific crime episodes.

The null hypothesis suggests that drug use, alcohol use, and criminal activity are independent, but often concurrent, behaviors among serious drug abusing offenders. The probability is high that they will randomly occur simultaneously or at about the same time. Offenders (or observers) may easily attribute associations or perceive causal linkages where none exist at a statistically significant level. For example, a person who routinely uses alcohol may commit a crime which may be attributed to alcohol disinhibition. The fact that most occasions of alcohol use are not followed by crimes is overlooked --the co-occurrence of alcohol and crime is a function of independent rates of alcohol use and criminality.

In the following tables, chi square was employed to test for significant associations. Due to the small sample size, the probability of a Type II error is high, so significance level of .10 (two-tailed) is utilized. Chi square tests were performed for each offense type against the others: a) robberies-not robberies (burglary and thefts combined), b) burglaries-not burglaries (robberies and thefts), c) thefts-not thefts (robberies and burglaries), and d) for all three offenses.[1]

FINDINGS

Subjects were asked many questions about their drug and alcohol use and feeling states in the six hours immediately prior to the crime. Additional detailed questions were asked about drugs-alcohol use after the focal crime. These questions have been organized so as to examine the association between various implicit theories linking criminal events to drugs-alcohol use.

Implicit Theories of Offender Activity Prior to Focal Crimes

Data in Tables 5-1 to 5-4 permit examination of the association between robberies, burglaries, thefts and various items measuring implicit theories which link substance use to crime. A fundamental element of most implicit theories is that drug and alcohol are either consumed before, or are an objective of, or are needed (an rough approximation of psychological dependency) prior to committing crime.

Prior Substance Use

Almost all (89 percent or more) robberies and burglaries were preceded by alcohol or drug use (Table 5-1). Significantly more (29 percent) thefts had no prior substance use. Two-thirds of the offenders drank alcohol prior to the crime, but with no important variation according to the type of crime subsequently committed. Likewise three-fifths use some illicit drug prior to the crime; thefts were associated with a lower probability of prior illicit drug use.

Robberies were strongly associated with prior cocaine use. Almost half of the robberies were committed by persons who had used cocaine prior to the focal crime compared with less than a sixth of the burglaries and thefts. No statistical association was evident between the types of focal crimes and use of heroin, illicit methadone, marijuana or pills in the prior six hours.

Drug-Related Criminal Intent

Subjects were asked: "Just before the crime, did you have a clear idea of what you wanted to get?" While this item is not a true measure of prior criminal intent (the question was asked after the crime), it solicited implicit theories of criminal intent for drugs-alcohol. Almost all subjects listed several goals (Table 5-1).

Robberies were positively associated with the goal of obtaining cocaine and heroin, but not with marijuana or pills. Compared with burglaries/thefts, robberies were negatively associated with plans to obtain alcohol, illicit methadone, and goals such as food and money. Burglaries were positively associated with plans to obtain illicit methadone when compared to the other crimes. In other words, comparing the offender's postcrime statements about his criminal intent, robberies had the goal to gain cocaine and heroin, but not alcohol, illicit methadone, food and money for nondrug purposes. Compared with the other focal crimes, burglaries were associated only with illicit methadone, and thefts only with the goal of obtaining alcohol.

Depression and Dependency

An implicit theory suggests that depression (feeling sad or low) links drugs and crime. While over half reported feelings of depression, no association with the type of focal crime was evident.

Subjects were questioned about a measure of psychological craving or dependency: "Just before this crime, were there any illegal drugs or alcohol that you felt you needed to have?" Robberies were associated with needing both cocaine and heroin when compared with thefts/burglaries (Table 5-2). No associations were evident between the types of focal crimes and reported craving for alcohol, marijuana, illicit methadone, and pills.

Physical symptoms of drugs-alcohol dependency (i.e. withdrawal) are widely believed to be associated with crimes, especially serious crimes such as robbery. Robins (1973, 1974) found that the greater the number of physical dependency symptoms among Vietnam veterans, the greater the likelihood of high scores on several deviance items.

Subjects were asked about physical symptoms of opiate and alcohol dependence. Certain items (runny nose, chills, goose bumps, muscle twitch, stomach cramps, and diarrhea) were more likely prior to robberies/burglaries than thefts. But those reporting four or more physical symptoms exhibited no association with type of focal crime. The item measuring alcohol dependency (DT's, shakes) was the least commonly cited and not associated with the type of crime.

Disinhibition

Particularly in the alcohol literature (see especially Room and Collins 1983; Collins 1982; 1986), and to a lesser extent in the drug abuse literature (Lettieri 1980), the implicit theory of disinhibition is very widely believed. Scientific efforts (Room and Collins 1983) to define, operationalize, and test this implicit theory have met with little success. Yet disinhibition remains a popular explanation of how heavy alcohol use brings about aggressive behaviors (assaults, fights, sexual deviance). Disinhibition shifts responsibility from the offender to the substance; the offender is believed to lose control over his mental state and/or physical behavior and to commit offenses he would not do otherwise.

A closely related implicit theory is frequently advanced by alcoholic and heavy drinking offenders who deny such "loss of control" over their behavior. Rather, they claim to drink (or use other drugs) to gain courage to do a crime, to take greater risks, and to reduce fear of apprehension. Offenders frequently report that they have "control" of their behavior, and intentionally use drugs-alcohol as part of the preparation for committing a crime. (see all vignettes in Chapters 2-4 for different articulations of these beliefs).

In order to measure diverse disinhibition articulations, subjects were asked whether they were "under the influence" of drugs-alcohol and to assess their effect on the crime (Table 5-3). Three quarters reported being under the influence of drugs-alcohol at the time of the crime; about two-thirds reported being under the influence of alcohol, and 10-25 percent reported being under the influence of various drugs. The type of focal crime was not associated with being under the influence of drugs-- with one exception: offenders reported being under the influence of cocaine about twice as often for robberies as for burglaries/thefts.

Likewise, while respondents reported several ways that drugs-alcohol use may have influenced their crime, the answers were not significantly associated with the types of focal crimes. There was one exception: reports of being "more violent" were about five times more likely for robberies (48 percent) than burglaries/thefts (about 10 percent) [But then, burglaries and thefts do not involve confrontation, by definition.]

These offenders clearly rejected items (the first 4) which imply that their drugs-alcohol use may make them lose control of their actions (excepting the association of robberies with being more violent). Sizable majorities endorse items (last 8 rows of Table 5-4) which suggest that their drugs-alcohol use may assist in committing the crime.

Although most outside observers might believe that the above data suggest that persons committing robberies exhibited more loss of control than those doing burglaries/thefts, offenders report otherwise. Those committing robberies were most likely to report

Table 5-1
Offender Activity in Six Hours Prior to Focal Crime by
Type of Focal Crime.

Characteristics of Events Base N (Crimes)	Types of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
Six Hours Before Crime	%	%	%	%
Actual drugs-alcohol use				
No drugs-alcohol	11	6	29 c	17
Drank alcohol	76	68	61	69
Used drugs	67	78	49 c	62 d
Cocaine	44 a	11	15	27 d
Heroin	30	22	15	23
Street methadone	15	11	10	12
Marijuana	24	39	29	29
Pills	26	22	12	20
Goal of crime; wanted:				
Alcohol	24 a	44	54 c	39 d
Drugs	83 a	100	93	90 d
Cocaine	61 a	56	39 c	51
Heroin	61 a	56	37 c	51
Street methadone	13 a	50 b	39	30 d
Marijuana	17	11	22	18
Pills	4	6	12	8
Nonsubstance goal	41 a	67	58	52 d
Food/Clothes	30 a	56	51	43 d
\$ for loans/family	4 a	28	17	13 d

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:

- a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
- b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
- c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
- d for three offense types (e.g., 3 X 2 chi square is significant).

Table 5-2
 Measures of Psychological and Physical Dependency Prior
 to Crime, by Type of Focal Crime.

Characteristics of Events Base N (Crimes)	Types of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
Six Hours Before Crime	%	%	%	%
Felt depressed, low	56	67	48	55
Substances Needed:				
Alcohol	19	33	29	26
Drugs	74	72	73	73
Cocaine	48 a	28	20 c	33 d
Heroin	54 a	33	32 c	42 d
Street methadone	17	39	29	26
Marijuana	11	6	12	11
Pills	2	11	10	7
Symptoms of dependency				
Runny nose, eyes	22	34	12 c	21
Flushed, sweat	24	28	14	21
Chill	20	39	7 c	18
Goose bumps	24	33	12 c	21
Muscle twitch	15	39	5 c	15
Stomach cramp	28	50	10 c	25
Trouble sleeping	15	28	17	18
Diarrhea	22	50	17 c	25
Muscle pain	11	39	10	15
DTs, shakes	7	11	5	6
4 or more of above symptoms	28	44	15	26

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:
 a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
 b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
 c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
 d for three offense types (e.g. 3 X 2 chi square is significant).

Table 5-3
Being Under the Influence of Drugs-alcohol by
Type of Focal Crime.

Characteristics of Events Base N (Crimes)	Types of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
At time of focal crime:	%	%	%	%
Under the influence of:				
Any drugs-alcohol	76	94	68	76
Alcohol	67	67	56	63
Cocaine	26 a	11	10	17
Heroin	26	22	15	21
Street methadone	13	22	10	14
Marijuana	13	33	25	21
Pills	15	22	15	16
Did influence of drugs-alcohol make:				
Crime harder to do	0	6	7	6
Crime take longer	0	6	5	3
You less skilled	12	0	8	8
You more violent	48 a	11	8 c	26
You more courageous*	61	83	55	62
You less nervous*	67	83	54	65
You take greater risks*	65	83	57	65
You more skilled*	42	82	46	50
Crime take less time*	53	71	58	58
Four & more of items marked (*) above	28	56	34	35
My crimes are linked to drugs-alcohol use I control amounts used before doing crimes.	98 85 a	100 78	93 63 c	96 75

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:

- a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
- b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
- c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
- d for three offense types (e.g., 3 X 2 chi square is significant).

controlling the amounts used (last row). Thus, these offenders do not endorse disinhibition explanations which blame substances (and loss of control) for the crime; rather, they view substances as helping them prepare for and to commit the crime.

Drugs-alcohol Use and Criminal Returns After the Crime

Almost all of the 105 focal crimes were successful from the offender's perspective (Table 5-4). Over three-quarters had used drugs-alcohol in the six hours after the crime. When compared with thefts, robberies were significantly associated with cocaine and heroin use during the post-crime period, and burglaries were intermediate. Although alcohol, marijuana, illicit methadone and pills were used by sizable percentages, these substances were not associated with the type of focal crime.

Offenders obtained some form of criminal returns in the six hours after the focal crime: mainly cash or property/goods (Table 5-5). Virtually all robberies resulted in cash income, while cash was stolen in about a quarter of the burglaries and thefts. The vast majority of burglaries and thefts yielded property or goods, while about a third of the robberies also gained goods. Overall, the monetary returns (after sale of stolen goods) from robberies and burglaries were similar (\$79 versus \$93), while thefts generated about half as much money (\$46). These returns are very similar to those reported elsewhere (Collins, Hubbard, Rachal 1985; Johnson et al. 1985:232; Anglin and Speckart, 1986a,b). (More detailed analyses of criminal income and expenditures for drugs-alcohol are reported in the next chapter).

Table 5-4
 Drugs-alcohol Use and Offender Returns in Six Hours
 After the Crime by Type of Focal Crime.

Characteristics of Events	Types of Focal Crime			All Crimes
	Base N (Crimes)	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	
<hr/>				
Six Hours After Crime:	%	%	%	%
Drugs-alcohol use				
Used alcohol	72	67	78	73
Used an illicit drug	89	72	73	80
Cocaine	69 a	50	34 c	51
Heroin	59 a	44	34 c	47
Street methadone	15	22	15	16
Marijuana	24	11	27	23
Pills	7	6	10	8
Criminal Returns				
Obtained cash	98	28	22	56
Gained property/goods	35	94	81	63
Mean \$ income from focal crime	\$79	\$93	\$46 c	\$68

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:
 a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
 b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
 c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
 d for three offense types (e.g. 3 X 2 chi square is significant).

DISCUSSION

This paper has presented some of the first information available about whether three types of criminal events (robberies, burglaries, and thefts) are associated with drugs-alcohol use and whether implicit theories of drug-crime linkages are supported.

Among a sample of very serious offenders and drug abusers recruited from the streets of Harlem, drugs and alcohol were used by almost all offenders in the six hours before and after the crime. Most offenders were under the influence of some substance, mainly alcohol, at the time of the crime and most articulated agreement with several implicit theories which link drugs-alcohol to crimes.

A major central finding emerged: with two exceptions, the specific substances used before or after the crime, as well as drug-related reasons or goals given for the crime, were usually not statistically associated with the type of focal crime committed. While alcohol, illicit methadone, marijuana, and pills (tranquilizers, sedatives, etc.) were used by many subjects before, during, and after the crime, these substances were not significantly associated with specific types of focal crimes committed.

Robberies, however, were consistently and significantly linked with all measures of cocaine use and several measures of heroin use. The robbery-cocaine association was evident before, during (under the influence), and after the crime. The robbery-heroin association was evident as a stated intent to obtain funds to purchase heroin, as a substance needed prior to the crime, and in actual use after the crime. No robbery-heroin association, however, was evident for actual

use before and during the crime. Robberies were negatively associated with needing alcohol and illicit methadone.

These subjects stated their beliefs that many of the major implicit theories about the drug-crime linkages could explain their behavior in these focal crimes, but with some important emphases. They reported both depression and physiological symptoms of opiate addiction, as well as a psychological need or craving for substances. They stated that obtaining specific drugs (especially cocaine and heroin) were major goals for doing the crime.

Yet most subjects deny loss of control (i.e., that drugs-alcohol use disinhibited them and brought about a crime they would not have done otherwise). Rather, these offenders articulate beliefs that they control the amounts of drugs-alcohol consumed so that the substances "helps" them commit the crime successfully. They perceive and seek the effects of drugs-alcohol as helpful in committing the crime. Such beliefs are associated with committing robberies as opposed to burglaries/thefts.

Thus, the central finding is that drug use, alcohol use, and criminality appear to be chronic near-daily behaviors in the life-styles of virtually all these subjects. With the exception of the consistently strong robbery-cocaine and robbery-heroin associations, other specific substances used before, during, or afterwards were generally not associated (or only weakly associated) with the three types of focal crimes.

NOTE 1 -- See Note on Significance Level at end of Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 6

INCOME FROM CRIME EVENTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR DRUGS-ALCOHOL

Introduction

The research literature shows a strong link among persons using cocaine-heroin and their crime. Although most explanations of the drugs-crime link assume that crime events are generated or promoted by drugs or drug use occasions, research demonstrating the role of specific drugs in specific crime events is unavailable. This chapter will examine one part of this "linkage:" whether and how specific types of crime events are associated with criminal income and expenditures for specific substances. That is, how much money do drug abusing offenders gain from different types of crimes, and how much criminal cash income do they expend for different substances?

Background

Several researchers (Anglin 1986b; Ball et al. 1981, 1983; Johnson et al. 1985; Nurco et al. 1985; Collins, Hubbard, Rachal 1985) report that the more regular the heroin or cocaine use, the higher the crime rate and criminal income. Moreover, criminal cash income is highest (generally over \$10,000 annually) during periods of daily and multiple daily use of these substances, but much lower during periods of less than weekly cocaine-heroin use.

A related finding is that the most serious crimes (robberies, assaults, and large burglaries) occur mainly during periods of daily cocaine-heroin use (Hunt, Lipton, Spunt 1986). During periods of weekly (or less) cocaine-heroin use, robberies and serious crimes exist at relatively negligible levels (Speckart and Anglin 1986a,b).

Explanations for these associations generally refer to the high cost of these substances and the degree of compulsion (due either to withdrawal syndrome or intense desire for euphoria) induced by the pharmacological properties of heroin and cocaine. It is generally believed that if the person has insufficient available money, criminal opportunities will be sought. Those who are desperate for funds may resort to robbery to obtain the largest amount of money as quickly as possible. After obtaining cash returns (including cash from sale of stolen goods), the offender is likely to spend most of that income to purchase cocaine-heroin and use it shortly afterwards. In this chapter, only the economic aspects are examined. We specify the monetary amounts received from specific types of crime events, document expenditures for specific substances (as well as for nonsubstance purposes), and show the proportion of criminal income expended for substances.

FINDINGS

Criminal Returns

How much money did these offenders gain from their focal crime? For the focal crime, each subject was asked to report whether he had gained any cash, any property or goods, and the dollar value of such returns. If goods or property were obtained and sold ("fenced"), the dollars received for each item were asked. These types of criminal returns have been summed and presented for the three types of focal crimes; frequency distributions are provided for both crime events and dollars earned in Table 6-1.

All robberies, but only 90 percent of burglaries and thefts, had cash returns. Cash was the usual return from robberies, with stolen goods mainly obtained in burglaries and thefts. The average robbery gained \$79; burglary gained \$112, and theft \$51 for an overall average of \$74 per crime per person. But much variation in dollar amounts for each offense class was evident; standard deviations were almost as large as the means.

Criminal returns were higher for robberies and burglaries, mainly because more of these crimes gained the offender over \$100 than thefts. Table 6-1 shows that 22 percent of the robberies gained \$100 or more, but these crimes gained over half of the robbery dollars. Likewise, half of the burglaries earned over \$100 or more, but gained three-quarters of the burglary dollars. Only 10 percent of the thefts netted \$100 or more, but these accounted for a quarter of the dollars.

Cash Expenditures

These offenders were asked directly how much of their criminal returns they had expended upon drugs and alcohol or for other purposes. In addition, subjects were asked whether and how much drugs or alcohol they gained from the crime. Since drugs or alcohol were in kind (not cash income) and were rarely obtained (by 6 subjects and never over \$20 worth), such amounts have been added to cash expenditures in Tables 6-2 to 6-4.

Expenditures for substances were very common (Table 6-2). Virtually all robberies had associated expenditures for drugs and/or alcohol compared with four-fifths of the thefts. While over half of the subjects spent money on alcohol, and less than a quarter spent money for illicit methadone, marijuana, and pills, such expenditures were not associated with the type of focal crime.

Table 6-1
Type and Amounts of Criminal Returns by Type of Focal Crime

Type and Amount of Criminal Return Crimes (Base N)	Type of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
Percent of crimes with any:	%	%	%	%
Cash stolen	98 a	28 b	22 c	56 d
Cash from sale of stolen goods	13 a	80 b	68 c	45 d
Cash returns	100 a	89	88	93 d
Frequency distribution of returns by crime				d
None	0	11	12	7
\$ 1-24	13	0	12	11
\$25-49	28	6	24	23
\$50-74	26	6	24	22
\$75-99	11	28	17	16
\$100-199	11	33	10	14
\$200 & over	11	17	0	8
Total	100	100	100	100
Volume of dollars earned via this crime (Base N for percentages below)	\$3,637	\$2,025	\$2,109	\$7,771
Percentage distribution of dollars earned	%	%	%	%
\$ 0-24	3	0	4	2
\$25-49	13	2	16	11
\$50-74	19	3	27	17
\$75-99	12	20	28	19
\$100-199	17	37	26	25
\$200 & over	36	37	0	27
Total	100	100	100	100
Mean \$s from crime	\$79 a	\$112	\$51 c	\$74 d
Standard deviation	\$75	\$79	\$40	\$64

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:
a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
d for three offense types (e.g., 3 X 2 chi square is significant).

Table 6-2
Types of Expenditures for Substances and Other Goods in Six Hours
After the Crime by Type of Focal Crime

Type and Amount of Criminal Income Crimes (Base N)	Type of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
Percent of crimes with cash expenditures for:	%	%	%	%
Any substance	98 a	88	81 c	89 d
Alcohol	57	53	56	56
Illicit drugs	93 a	88	81 c	87 d
Cocaine	70 a	53	39 c	55 d
Heroin	64 a	47	34 c	50 d
Illicit methadone	15	35	27	23
Marijuana	24	6	24	21
Pills/others	7	0	7	6
Nonsubstance (e.g. food)	84	78	73	79
Substance/Nonsubstance				
Both	78	72	68	73
Either	100	88	85	92
Frequency distribution of cash expenditures for drugs-alcohol				
None	2	12	20	11
\$ 1-24	16	12	32	21
\$25-49	38	12	22	27
\$50-74	22	41	17	23
\$75-99	4	24	10	10
\$100 and over	17	0	0	8
Total	100	100	100	100

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:
a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
d for three offense types (e.g., 3 X 2 chi square is significant).

The central finding is that about two-thirds of the robberies involved cocaine or heroin purchases, compared with about a third of the thefts. An overall association between type of focal crime and any substance expenditures is significant only because the association between robberies and cocaine-heroin is so substantial.

Three-quarters of the subjects made cash expenditures from criminal returns for nonsubstance purposes, but no association with type of focal crime was evident. Nonsubstance expenditures involved a wide variety of purchases: purchase of meals, food for home, money to family, pay off loans, buy clothes, carfare, etc.

Table 6-3 shows the average amounts and proportions of cash expenditures from criminal returns. Cash expenditures from robberies (\$59) upon drugs and/or alcohol is about twice as high (\$30) as from thefts. This difference is entirely due to higher expenditures upon cocaine and heroin, and not for other substances (alcohol, illicit methadone, marijuana, pills) or for other nonsubstance purchases. The proportions of crimes with expenditures for cocaine-heroin from robberies (67 percent) is not too much greater than for thefts and burglaries (55 percent).

Cash Expenditures to Criminal Income

How much criminal income from the focal crime was expended for drugs-alcohol and other purposes? Because several subjects had small amounts of cash (generally under \$10) prior to the focal crime and may have expended such money for substances, we have computed a ratio similar to a percentage, except that an individual's ratio of expenditures to criminal income may exceed 100 for some individuals.

Table 6-3
Frequency Distribution of and Mean Expenditures for Substances
and Other Goods After the Crime by Type of Focal Crime

Type and Amount of Expenditure(s) Crimes (Base N)	Type of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
Frequency Distribution of Expenditures for:	%	%	%	%
Alcohol	3	3	4	3
Illicit drugs				
Cocaine	34	20	31	30
Heroin	33	32	24	30
Illicit methadone	7	13	12	9
Marijuana	4	1	4	3
Pills/others	2	0	0	1
Nonsubstances	19	31	24	23
Total	100	100	100	100
Base N (Total dollars expended by persons committing these focal crimes)	\$3,279	\$1,262	\$1,635	\$6,176
Mean expenditures for:	\$	\$	\$	\$
Any substance e	59 a	51	30 c	46 d
Alcohol	2	2	2	2
Illicit drugs e	57 a	49	29 c	44 d
Cocaine	24 a	15	12 c	18 d
Heroin	24 a	24	9 c	18 d
Illicit methadone	5	10	5	6
Marijuana	3	1	2	2
Pills/others	1	0	*	1
Nonsubstance (e.g. food)	14	22	10	14 d
Substance+nonsubstance expenditures	73 a	72	40 c	60 d

* less than \$.50.

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:

- a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
- b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
- c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
- d for three offense types (e.g. 3 X 2 chi square is significant).

e due to rounding, these variables may be \$1 more or less than the sum of their components.

Table 6-4
 Ratio of Substance/Nonsubstance Expenditures to Total
 Criminal Returns by Type of Focal Crime

Type of Expenditure(s) Crimes (Base N)	Type of Focal Crime			All Crimes (105)
	Robberies (46)	Burglaries (18)	Thefts (41)	
Compared to total cash income from crime:				
Ratio (x 100) of cash expenditures for:				
Any substance	74 a	41 b	54 c	61
Alcohol	3	2	4	3
Illicit drugs	71 a	39 b	50 c	57 d
Cocaine	28 a	14	19	22 d
Heroin	30 a	14	15 c	21 d
Illicit methadone	8	12	12	10
Marijuana	4	*	4	3
Pills/others	1	0	*	*
Nonsubstance (e.g. food)	17	20	20	18
Both substances and nonsubstances	88 a	58 b	74	77 d
Unexpended Crime \$s	8	40 b	12	15

* less than \$.50.

See note 1; at the .10 significance level, this variable differs:

- a for robberies versus burglaries/thefts.
- b for burglaries versus robberies/thefts.
- c for thefts versus robberies/burglaries.
- d for three offense types (e.g., 3 X 2 chi square is significant).

These ratios are averaged in Table 6-4 (and will sum to almost, but not precisely, to 100).

Compared with thefts, robberies are associated with a higher ratio for cocaine (28 vs 19) and heroin (30 vs. 15), and for illicit drug use (71 vs. 50) and any substance use.

Approximately 15 percent of total criminal income remained unexpended at the time of the interview. Burglaries were most likely to have unexpended criminal income, so the ratio of drugs-alcohol expenditures to criminal income was lowest for this type of focal crime.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this chapter are evident. Robberies are associated with higher expenditures of criminal income for both cocaine and heroin. Expenditures for other substances (alcohol, illicit methadone, marijuana, pills) and nonsubstance purposes is not associated with the type of focal crime.

Focal robberies and burglaries are also associated with higher criminal incomes than focal thefts. Thus, offenders can spend more upon expensive drugs, cocaine and heroin, after robberies than after thefts. What is not clear is whether the type of event or the type of offender makes the major difference in the association between cocaine-heroin and criminal income or expenditures, a topic addressed in the next chapter.

Note 1 -- See Footnote 1 at end of Chapter 4.

Chapter 7

THE ROBBERY-HARD DRUG CONNECTION:

DO ROBBERS OR ROBBERIES INFLUENCE CRIMINAL RETURNS
AND COCAINE-HEROIN PURCHASES?

Robbery is one of the most serious street crimes in American society. Despite intensive police efforts to apprehend robbers, however, probably more than 98 percent of all robberies do not result in arrest (Inciardi 1984, 1986). Yet little is known about these and other crimes in which the offender is not apprehended. This chapter addresses that shortcoming by focusing upon "successful crimes" (from the offender's perspective) and primary outcomes of such behavior, the offender's criminal returns and post-crime purchases of cocaine and heroin (and other drugs). The primary analytic emphasis is whether crime income and expenditures for cocaine or heroin were influenced more by the types of persons (e.g., robber subgroups) or the types of crime events actually committed (e.g., robberies versus nonrobberies--mainly burglaries and thefts).

BACKGROUND

Analyses of such issues provide a better understanding of common explanations about why robbery may occur among cocaine-heroin users. One model attributes such linkages to pharmacological effects of the substances. Drug-abusing offenders "hopped up" on cocaine may be more likely to commit violent crimes like robbery in order to quickly gain cash for purchases of additional cocaine. Or heroin-abusing offenders may engage in robbery to avoid opiate withdrawal syndrome. Another

model stresses that only certain very deviant life-styles are associated with both robbery and cocaine-heroin use. In order to demonstrate a possible pharmacological effect of cocaine or heroin use, careful controls would be needed to account for the fact that high rate robbers are likely to be high rate users of cocaine-heroin.

Recent research has revealed important linkages between robbery and cocaine-heroin abuse. Among persons who commit this crime, robbery is most common during periods of daily cocaine-heroin use, but rare during nonuse or less than weekly cocaine-heroin use. Daily and multi-daily cocaine-heroin use is one of the most powerful predictors of robbery rates and criminal income (Chaiken and Chaiken 1982a; Chaiken 1986; Ball, Shaffer, Nurco 1983; Hunt, Lipton, Spunt 1984; Hunt et al. 1984; Johnson et al. 1985; Collins, Hubbard, Rachel 1986; Johnson, Lipton, Wish 1986; Speckart and Anglin 1986a,b). Virtually all such prior research has examined how offenders behave over given periods of time (months, years, etc.); the characteristics (especially criminal income and expenditures) of specific crime events have not been well documented.

Association of Robberies with Cocaine-Heroin Use.

In chapter 5 and 6, when compared with burglaries-thefts, robbery events were consistently associated with most measures of cocaine involvement and several measures of heroin use both before and after the crime such as: using cocaine before the crime, "needing" cocaine and heroin, listing them as goals for the crime, being under the influence of cocaine at time of crime, using cocaine-heroin after the crime, and spending criminal income for cocaine-heroin.

Given the existence of an association of robbery with higher criminal income and expenditures for cocaine-heroin, this chapter examines two alternative explanations: 1) Certain subgroups of robbers are more successful in committing crimes and gain sizable criminal incomes. They spend their larger criminal incomes upon the more expensive drugs, primarily cocaine or heroin. 2) Robberies, compared with burglaries-thefts, gain higher criminal incomes and are followed by larger dollar purchases of cocaine-heroin, regardless of the type of robber committing these crimes.

Returns from Crimes among Robbers

The first hypothesis is based upon a widely held belief that some robbers are more successful than others in selecting victims and obtaining large returns from their illegal activities (both robberies and other crimes). Prior typologies and classifications of robbers have not been particularly successful, however, at documenting higher robbery returns. The little evidence available suggests that the type of robber does not greatly affect the average returns from robbery. Among robbers in Harlem, daily heroin users annually committed an average of 27 robberies and earned over \$2,000 from robberies compared with irregular (0-2 days/week) heroin users who committed 12 robberies and earn about \$900 (Johnson et al. 1985:236-7). Nevertheless, the returns (an average of \$80) per robbery did not vary directly with regularity of heroin use. Nor did the 10 highest rate robbers earn more per robbery than lower rate robbers.

Returns from Robberies Versus Other Nondrug Crimes.

The second hypothesis derives from fear of robbery as a personal confrontation, and from federal victimization surveys showing that the average losses from robbery are generally higher than larcenies (BJS 1981:68; 1984, 1985b). Robberies and burglaries typically result in larger cash returns than thefts. Among Harlem heroin users, the average cash income per robbery (\$80) and burglary (\$80) was higher than shoplifting (\$30) and other larcenies (\$36). Little variability in the average returns per crime by frequency of heroin use was found (Johnson et al. 1985:232). Analyses of the dollar returns from various types of crimes is difficult to locate. Little research has documented the cash returns from various types of successful crimes among differing subgroups of offenders committing a variety of offenses. Research on burglary (Pope 1977c) shows few important associations between the characteristics of burglaries and the types of offenders committing them.

Thus, the limited available evidence suggests support for the null hypothesis: i. e., relatively little systematic variation is evident in criminal returns or cocaine-heroin expenditures either by type of drug user, by robber subtypes, or by type of offense.

Analytic Biases

In this chapter, we have systematically biased analyses towards finding an association between robbery events and criminal income and cocaine-heroin purchases. This bias is designed to offset most previous research which has examined offenders and ignored criminal events. In addition, since offender types and crime events are highly correlated, our analytic strategy was designed to document the importance of crime events when controlling for offender patterns of drug use and criminality. These analytic biases occur in three ways.

First, among offenders who reported more than one crime in the past 24 hours, the single most serious crime was selected; thus, robbery events were selected over burglaries and thefts. If multiple robberies were committed, the robbery with the largest return was selected. In short, the bias of both subject and event selection process would be toward support of the hypotheses of events: e.g., robberies should result in higher returns and expenditures for cocaine-heroin than burglaries-thefts, regardless of the type of person committing the offense.

Second, prior studies have typically computed average criminal returns across all respondents in the study, regardless of whether they committed specific offenses (e.g., robbery). For purposes of analyzing the outcomes of specific crimes and whether these resulted in purchases of cocaine-heroin, however, the inclusion of persons who are not "at risk" may greatly affect the magnitude of averages.

Thus, to examine the associations of robbery events upon cocaine-heroin purchases, subjects who had not committed robbery nor used cocaine-heroin recently (*"non"participants in the near past) are excluded from the denominator in computing percentages and mean amounts as well as from tests of significance.

Third, the statistical analyses are limited to subjects who reported one or more robberies in the past year (i.e. "active robbers") and who reported use of cocaine-heroin in the past month (i.e., active cocaine-heroin users). For purposes of visual comparison (but not statistical testing), the right-most column in Tables 7-1 to 7-4 contain data about the criminal returns and expenditures of "excluded subjects." This permits approximate comparisons of robbers who have committed burglaries-thefts with not-recent robbers who committed these same crimes.

Classification of Focal Crimes and Robber Subgroups

In this chapter, burglaries and thefts have been combined and labeled as property crimes and will be compared with robberies; these are the focal crime types.

*The quotes around "non" imply that these persons may have been active at some point in the past, but were not active during the reference period.

All subjects were also classified into one of three robber subgroups. Prior to asking questions about their focal crimes, subjects were asked, "In the past 12 months, how often did you do robbery: Never, 1-10 times, or more than 10 times?" Subjects are classified as: a) high robbers -- reported 11 or more robberies [1] in past year (N=45); b) low robbers -- 1-10 robberies in past year (N=44); and c) not-recent robbers -- no robberies in the past year (N=16 -- all except 3 of these reported robbery in other years).

Subjects were also asked "How many days in the past 30 days did you use cocaine (and heroin)? Every subject reported either cocaine or heroin use in the past 30 days. Thus, 89 subjects--the moderate plus low robbers--are "at risk" and are included in the statistical analyses below; only the 16 not-recent robbers are excluded.

FINDINGS

Association of Robber Types with Focal Crime Events.

A strong association, but not necessarily a perfect one, is evident between focal crime type and robber type (Table 7-1). Thus, two-thirds of high robbers compared with a third of low robbers committed focal robberies. Likewise, two-thirds of all focal robberies but a third of the focal property crimes were committed by high robbers. (Note: If the 16 not-recent robbers had been included, the statistical association would have been even stronger.[1])

In the following sections, the primary independent variable will be the focal crime type (robbery versus property crime) while robber type (low versus moderate) will be the primary control variable in

examining the associations with the dependent variables: the amount of criminal income earned from the focal crime, the dollar expenditures for cocaine-heroin (both separately and combined) and for other drugs.

Cash Income from the Focal Crime

Do robberies net more cash income than property crimes? Do high robbers gain greater cash income from their crimes than low robbers? Or do both type of crime and type of offender contribute separately to higher cash income from crime?

For all 105 subjects, robberies netted the average offender significantly higher income (\$79) than property crimes (\$70) (computed from Table 6-1). When the 16 not-recent robbers are excluded, however, robberies and property crimes resulted in the same average cash income (\$79 versus \$78--data not presented).

Among robbers with \$1 or more dollars of criminal cash income [this excludes 5 subjects who committed property crimes but had not sold stolen merchandise by the time of interview], the high robbers earned more than low robbers (an average of \$96 versus \$71--see top of Table 7-3 below) This was true even after statistically removing the contributions of the offense type. In short, not only did high robbers self-report more robberies during a year, but they earned more cash from their focal crimes (both from robberies and property crimes).

Table 7-1
 Distribution of Subjects Classified According to
 Robber Type and Focal Crime Type.

Type of Focal Crime Committed	Robber Subgroups		Total	p of Chi Square	Not-recent Robbers (Excluded)
	Low	High			
	Number of Subjects				
Property	29	14	43	.000	16
Robbery	16	30	46		0
Total	45	44	89		16
	Row Percentages				
	%	%	%		
Property	67	33	100		
Robbery	35	65	100		
Total	51	49	100		
	Column Percentages				
Property	64	32	48		
Robbery	36	68	52		
Total	100	100	100		
	Total Percentages				
Property	32.6	15.7	56.5		
Robbery	18.0	33.7	49.4		
Total	48.3	49.4	100.0		

Table 7-2

Percent Spending One or More Dollars from Focal Crime upon Cocaine-heroin and Drugs by Robber Type and Focal Crime Type.

Type of Focal Crime	Robber Subgroups		Total	p of Chi Square	Not-recent Robbers (Excluded)
	Low	High			

IN SIX HOURS AFTER FOCAL CRIME:

	Percent Spending Crime \$s for Cocaine-heroin			
Property	69	71	70	40
Robbery	67	90	80	ns
Total	68	84	76	
	Percent Spending Crime \$s for Cocaine			
Property	52	14	47	33
Robbery	63	73	70	.05
Total	58	59	58	
	Percent Spending Crime \$s for Heroin			
Property	35	57	42	27
Robbery	40	77	64	.01
Total	36	70	53	
	Percent Spending Crime \$s for Drugs Other Than Cocaine-Heroin			
Property	72	71	72	50
Robbery	69	73	72	ns
Total	71	73	69	
	Percent Spending Crime \$s for Any Illicit Drugs			
Property	90	86	88	67
Robbery	80	100	93	ns
Total	88	95	91	
	Number of Robbers (Base N)			
Property	29	14	43	16
Robbery	16	30	46	
Total	45	44	89	

Footnotes for Table 7-3 (next page)

Log transformed dollar amounts were entered into a hierarchical ANOVA F-test with crime type entered as the first factor; these groups are significantly different at:

- a - .10 level, c - .01 level,
b - .05 level, d - .001 level.

e - Among persons with \$1 or more dollars of criminal cash cash income. Braces [] contain number of subjects upon which means are computed.

Table 7-3
Expenditures for Cocaine-heroin After Focal Crime by
Robber Type and Focal Crime Type. [Only Among Robbers
Spending \$1 or More for Given Substance(s).]

Type of Focal Crime	Robber Subgroups		Total	Not-recent Robbers (Excluded)
	Low	High		
Mean Cash Income [e] from Focal Crime				
Property	\$73	\$121	\$88	\$56
	[26]	[12]	[38]	[14]
Robbery	67	85	79	
	[16]	[30]	[46]	
Total	71 c	96 c	83	
	[42]	[42]	[84]	
IN SIX HOURS AFTER FOCAL CRIME:				
Mean \$ Expended for Cocaine-Heroin				
Property	\$37	\$56	\$43	\$37
	[20]	[10]	[30]	[7]
Robbery	50	60	57	
	[11]	[27]	[38]	
Total	42 c	59 c	51	
	[31]	[37]	[68]	
Mean \$s Expended for Cocaine				
Property	\$26	\$49	\$31	\$25
	[16]	[4]	[20]	[6]
Robbery	28	38	35	
	[10]	[22]	[32]	
Total	27 a	40 a	33	
	[26]	[26]	[52]	
Mean \$s Expended for Heroin				
Property	\$32	\$45	\$38	\$22
	[10]	[8]	[18]	[5]
Robbery	39	34	36	
	[7]	[23]	[30]	
Total	35	37	36	
	[17]	[31]	[48]	
Mean \$s Expended for Drugs Other Than Cocaine-Heroin				
Property	\$14	\$15	\$14	\$12
	[21]	[10]	[31]	[9]
Robbery	11	16	15	
	[11]	[22]	[33]	
Total	13	16	14	
	[32]	[32]	[64]	
Mean \$ Expended for Illicit Drugs				
Property	\$37	\$56	\$43	\$32
	[26]	[12]	[38]	[11]
Robbery	49	65	60	
	[13]	[30]	[43]	
Total	41 d	62 d	52	
	[39]	[42]	[81]	

Footnotes are at bottom of Table 7-2 (previous page).

Expenditures of Criminal Income for Cocaine and Heroin

Almost three-quarters of criminal cash income was spent on drugs within six hours after the focal crime (see Chapter 6), mainly on cocaine and/or heroin. Below we examine whether the type of robber or focal crime type affects two critical decisions made by subjects.

After gaining criminal cash income, offenders must first decide which substance(s) to spend money upon. Second, they must decide how much to spend upon the chosen substance(s). The associations of these two critical choices with robber type and focal crime type are shown in Tables 7-2 and 7-3 respectively.

Table 7-2 shows that no significant associations of robber types and focal crime types exist with combined cocaine-heroin expenditures, other drugs, or all illicit drugs combined. An additive effect of both robber type and focal crime type is evident, however, in the percent spending some crime dollars on heroin. An interaction effect is evident for cocaine. The most interesting finding in Table 7-2 involves the substances chosen by the 16 subjects who were high robbers but who committed focal property crimes. Over half (57 percent) chose heroin, but very few chose cocaine (14 percent), and two chose both; among the three other subgroups, sizable proportions chose both cocaine and heroin.

When examining dollar amounts, the actual means are presented (Table 7-3) but log-transformed means are used for significance tests. A hierarchical analysis of variance [2] is

employed; the type of focal crime (robbery versus property--the independent variable) is introduced first, the robber type (low versus moderate--the control variable) second, and interaction effects last. This permits the independent variable first opportunity to account for conjoint variability; thus, the statistical results are biased towards a finding that the focal crime type (robbery versus property) accounts for expenditures upon cocaine-heroin.

Different findings emerge when analyses are focused upon the dollar amounts expended by subjects who spend one or more crime dollars for specific substances (Table 7-3). Among purchasers of cocaine, high robbers (\$40) spend significantly more than low robbers (\$27); the crime type (statistically introduced first) does not have an important effect upon the amounts spent for cocaine. Thus, even after statistically removing the effect of focal crime type, high robbers spent significantly more criminal income than low robbers on cocaine, and (via summation) spent more on cocaine and/or heroin, and for all illicit drugs. On the other hand, neither robber type nor focal crime type was associated with the amounts expended on heroin among heroin purchasers, nor upon the amount expended for drugs other than cocaine-heroin by purchasers of such drugs.

Although not included in the statistical analyses in Tables 7-2 and 7-3, the 16 subjects who were "not-recent" robbers [3] were among the least active of all subjects in the percent who purchased each substance and in the dollar amounts spent for each substance among purchasers. They also had the lowest cash income from the focal crime.

DISCUSSION

The above analyses provide a relatively clear answer to the question: Is it the offender or the crime which brings about high crime income and expenditures for drugs? Where significant associations are evident, the robber type was the primary factor influencing higher criminal income and expenditures for cocaine-heroin (but not other illicit drugs).

This finding is true even though our subject selection and statistical procedures were biased towards supporting "type of crime" explanations.[2] Although significant zero order associations of focal crime type with total criminal cash income and expenditures for cocaine and heroin were found (Chapter 6), the focal crime type had no statistically significant impact upon criminal income nor upon expenditures for cocaine-heroin or other drugs when robber type was controlled.[3]

CONCLUSIONS

Why does robber type emerge as such an important variable in explaining cash income from the focal crime and expenditures for drugs? The data in this chapter and Chapter 3 provide a basis for plausible interpretations about why robbers who report more than 10 robberies annually are more "successful" in gaining criminal cash income and expending it for cocaine-heroin than those who commit 1-10 robberies annually.

The high robber appears to live a very complex lifestyle featuring the most extreme levels of involvement in many different behaviors. They are most likely to commit more than 10

crimes a year in many different offense classes, both nondrug and drug sales (and to be marauders--Chapter 3). They are also more likely to be daily and multidaily users of cocaine-heroin and other drugs than low robbers.

Surprising, the greater life-style complexity of high robbers was also associated with greater returns and choices of and amounts expended upon cocaine and heroin. Particularly interesting are the 12 high robbers who committed property crimes and spent such income for drugs at the time of interview. The major surprise is that they were quite unlikely (14 percent) to choose cocaine (Table 7-3). These data suggest that such high robbers appear to choose drugs other than cocaine (typically heroin) when they commit property crimes, but to choose cocaine if they commit robberies.

This chapter suggests, at least for these subjects and the for the focal crimes included in this analysis, that one subgroup, the high robbers, was more "successful" in raising higher cash income and expended more dollars upon their chosen drugs (primarily cocaine) from their robberies as well as burglaries or thefts than their counterparts (lows or not recent robbers).

Future research with larger samples and a broader array of different offenses across time are needed to further validate the findings reported here. Moreover, if some subgroups of robbers are more successful in committing large numbers of different crimes at high rates and gaining larger criminal incomes, future research based upon criminal justice samples may also be able to develop techniques for targeting high rate robbers among the

large number of persons arrested for robbery for future policies designed to help focus police work, prosecution, sentencing, and community supervision practices. Concrete recommendation for shifting current criminal justice policies towards drug-abusing offenders are being advanced in parallel products authored by persons affiliated with the Interdisciplinary Research Center (Johnson, Lipton, and Wish 1986; Chaiken and Johnson 1987; Lipton and Wexler 1987; Wexler, Johnson, and Lipton 1987).

NOTES

1. Data not presented in detail show that among the 30 high robbers who committed a focal robbery, 26 subjects reported committing 50 or more robberies annually. Only 7 other such very high rate robbers committed burglaries or thefts. Thus, among the 89 persons who self-reported one or more robberies in the past year, 37 percent reported over 50 robberies annually and 29 percent committed a focal robbery.
2. That is, we recruited subjects who had committed nondrug crimes in the past 24 hours and selected the one most serious crime they committed. Only active (in the past year) robbers were included in the statistical analyses. In a hierarchical ANOVA, the focal crime type (property versus robbery) was introduced as the first factor so it could account for the jointly shared variation.
3. A quarter of all focal property crimes (16 of 61) were committed by persons who had not committed robbery in the past year and were not "at risk" for robbery. The effects of robbery type and focal crime type were statistically controlled and analyzed for two major choices which offenders make.

REFERENCES

- Anglin, M. Douglas. 1986. Narcotics use and crime. Presented to Drugs and Crime Seminar. San Francisco, May.
- Ball, John C. 1986. The hyper-criminal opiate addict. Pp. 81-104 in Bruce D. Johnson and Eric Wish (eds.), Crime Rates Among Drug Abusing Offenders. Final Report to National Institute of Justice. New York: Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.
- Ball, John C., John W. Shaffer, and David N. Nurco. 1983. The day-to-day criminality of heroin addicts in Baltimore: A study in the continuity of offense rates. Drug and Alcohol Dependence 12(1):19-142
- Ball, John C., Lawrence Rosen, John A. Flueck, and David N. Nurco. 1981. The criminality of heroin addicts when addicted and when off opiates. Pp. 39-65 in James A. Inciardi, (Ed.), The Drugs-Crime Connection. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- _____. 1982. Lifetime criminality of heroin addicts in the United States. Journal of Drug Issues 3:225-239.
- Blumstein, Alfred, Jacqueline Cohen, Jeffery A. Roth, and Christy A. Visher (eds). 1986. Criminal Careers and "Career Criminals." Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). 1981. Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1979. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Justice.
- _____. 1983a. Report to the Nation on Crime and Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- _____. 1983b. Prisoners and Drugs. Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- _____. 1984. The Economic Cost of Crime to Victims. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Justice. (Special Report)
- _____. 1985a. Household Burglary. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Justice. (Bulletin).
- _____. 1985b. Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1983. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Justice.
- _____. 1986. The Use of Weapons in Committing Crimes. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Justice. (Special Report)
- Chaiken, Marcia R. 1986. Crime rates and substance abuse among types of offenders. Pp. 12-54 in Bruce D. Johnson and Eric Wish (eds.), Crime Rates Among Drug-Abusing Offenders. Final Report to National Institute of Justice. New York: Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Chaiken, Jan, and Marcia Chaiken. 1982a. Varieties of Criminal Behavior. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand.

Chaiken, Jan, and Marcia R. Chaiken (with Joyce E. Peterson). 1982b. Varieties of Criminal Behavior: Summary and Policy Implications. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand.

Chaiken, Marcia, and Bruce D. Johnson. 1987. State Strategies for Dealing with Varieties of Drug-Involved Offenders. Research in Brief. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice (Forthcoming).

Collins, James J., Robert L. Hubbard, J. Valley Rachal. 1985. Expensive drug use and illegal income: A test of explanatory hypotheses. Criminology 23(4):743-64.

Collins, James J. Jr. (Ed.). 1981. Drinking and Crime. New York: Guilford Press.

Collins, James J. 1986. The relationship of problem drinking to individual offending sequences. Pp. 89-115 in Alfred Blumstein, Jacqueline Cohen, Jeffery A. Roth, and Christy A. Visher (eds.), Criminal Careers and "Career Criminals," Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

DeLeon, George. 1984a. Program-based evaluation research in therapeutic communities. Pp. 69-87 in Frank M. Tims and Jacqueline P. Ludford (eds.), Drug Abuse Treatment Evaluation: Strategies, Progress, and Prospects. Research Monograph Series 51. Rockville, Md.: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

_____. 1984b. The Therapeutic Community: Study of Effectiveness. Rockville, Md.: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Des Jarlais, Don C., Herman Joseph, Vincent P. Dole, James Schmeidler. 1982. Predicting post-treatment narcotics use among patients terminating from methadone treatment. Advances in Alcohol and Substance Abuse 2(1):57-68.

Dictionary. 1966. The Random House Dictionary of the English Language: Unabridged Edition. New York: Random House.

Greenwood, Peter W., with Alan Abrahamse. 1982. Selective Incapacitation. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand.

Gropper, Bernard. 1985. Probing the Links Between Drugs and Crime. Research in Brief. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Huizinga, David H., and Franklyn W. Dunford. 1985. The delinquent behavior of arrested individuals. Boulder, Colo.: Behavioral Research Institute. Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. Las Vegas, April.

Hunt, Dana E., Douglas S. Lipton and Barry Spunt. 1984. Patterns of criminal activity among methadone clients and current narcotics users not in treatment. *Journal of Drug Issues* (Fall):687-702.

Hunt, Dana E., Douglas S. Lipton, Douglas Goldsmith, and David Strug. 1984. Street pharmacology: Uses of cocaine and heroin in the treatment of addiction. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 13:375-87.

Inciardi, James A. 1979. Heroin use and street crime. *Crime and Delinquency* (July):335-46.

_____. 1984. *Criminal Justice*. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.

_____. 1986. *The War on Drugs*. Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield.

Johnson, Bruce D., Barry Glassner, Julia Loughlin, Cheryl Carpenter. 1986. *Drugs and Alcohol in Adolescent Delinquency*. Final Report to the National Institute of Justice. New York: Interdisciplinary Research Center and Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Johnson, Bruce D., Paul Goldstein, Edward Preble, James Schmeidler, Douglas S. Lipton, Barry Spunt, and Thomas Miller. 1985. *Taking Care of Business: The Economics of Crime By Heroin Abusers*, Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

Johnson, Bruce D., Douglas S. Lipton, and Eric Wish. 1986. *Facts about Cocaine and Heroin Abusers and Some New Alternatives to Incarceration*. Summary report to the National Institute of Justice. New York: Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Johnson, Bruce D., and Eric D. Wish. 1986a. *Crime Rates Among Drug-Abusing Offenders*. Final Report to National Institute of Justice. New York: Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

_____. 1986b. *Highlights from Research on Drug and Alcohol Abusing Criminals*. Summary report to the National Institute of Justice.

Lettieri, Dan J., M. Sayers, and H. Pearson (eds). 1980. *Theories of Drug Abuse: Selected Contemporary Perspectives*. NIDA Research Monograph 30. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Lindesmith, Alfred. 1965. *The Addict and the Law*. New York: Random House.

Lindesmith, Alfred. 1980. A theory of opiate addiction. In Dan Lettieri (ed.). *Theories of Drug Abuse: Selected Contemporary Perspectives*. NIDA Research Monograph 30. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Lipton, Douglas S., and Harry K. Wexler. 1987. Recidivism Reduction for Incarcerated Drug Offenders. In Marcia Chaiken (ed), forthcoming Research monograph, Cambridge, Abt Associates, and Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

McAulliffe, William E., and Robert A. Gordon. 1974. A Test of Lindesmith's theory of addiction: the frequency of euphoria among long term addicts. American Journal of Sociology 79:795-840.

_____. 1980. Reinforcement and the combinations of effects: Summary of a theory of opiate addiction. Pp. 137-141 in Dan J. Lettieri, M. Sayers, and H. Pearson (eds). Theories of Drug Abuse: Selected Contemporary Perspectives. NIDA Research Monograph 30. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Nurco, David N., John C. Ball, John W. Shaffer, and Thomas E. Hanlon. 1985. The criminality of narcotic addicts. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease 173(2):94-102.

Pope, Carl E. 1975. Sentencing of California Felony Offenders. Analytic Report, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1977a. Crime Specific Analysis: The Analysis of Burglary Incidents. Analytic Report, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1977b. Crime Specific Analysis: An Empirical Examination of Burglary Offender Characteristics. Analytic Report, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1977c. An Empirical Examination of Burglary Offense and Offender Characteristics. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service.

Robins, Lee N. 1973. A Follow-up of Vietnam Drug Users. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____. 1974. The Vietnam Drug User Returns. Special Action Office Monograph. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Room, Robin, and Gary Collins (eds). 1983. Alcohol and Disinhibition. Nature and Meaning of the Link. Research Monograph 12. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse.

Sells, Saul B. 1974. Effectiveness of Drug Abuse Treatment. Vols. I and II. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger.

Sells, Saul B., and D. Dwayne Simpson. 1976. Effectiveness of Drug Abuse Treatment. Vols. III, IV, and V. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger.

Simpson, D. Dwayne, and Saul B. Sells. 1982. Effectiveness of treatment for drug abuse: An overview of the DARP research program. *Advances in Alcohol and Substance Abuse* 2(1):7-29.

Speckart, George, and M. Douglas Anglin. 1986a. Narcotics use and crime: A causal modeling approach. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 2:3-28.

_____. 1986b. Narcotics Use and Crime: An Overview of Recent Research Advances. Presentation to Drugs, Alcohol, and Crime Conference, sponsored by National Institute of Justice. San Francisco, California.

Strug, David L., Eric D. Wish, Bruce D. Johnson, Kevin Anderson, and Tom Miller. 1984. The role of alcohol in the crimes of heroin abusers. *Crime and Delinquency* 30(4):551-67.

Wexler, Harry K., Bruce D. Johnson, and Lipton. 1987. Criminal Justice System Strategy for Treating Drug Offenders in Custody. Research in Brief. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice (forthcoming).

Wish, Eric D., Elizabeth Brady, and Mary Cuadrado. 1984. Drug Use and Crime in Arrestees in Manhattan. Paper presented at the 47th Meeting of the Committee on Problems of Drug Dependence, New York, Narcotic and Drug Research Inc.

Wish, Eric D., Elizabeth Brady, and Mary Cuadrado. 1986. Urine Testing of Arrestees: Findings from Manhattan. New York: Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Wish, Eric D., Mary Cuadrado, and John A. Mortorana. 1986. Estimates of drug use in intensive supervision probationers: Results from a pilot test. *Federal Probation* December: 4-16.

Wish, Eric, and Bruce D. Johnson. 1986. The impact of substance abuse upon criminal careers. Pp. 52-88 in Alfred Blumstein, Jacqueline Cohen, Jeffery A. Roth, and Christy A. Visher, *Criminal Careers and "Career Criminals,"* Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Wish, Eric D., Bruce D. Johnson, David Strug, Morris Chedekel, and Douglas S. Lipton. 1983. Are urine tests good indicators of the validity of self-reports of drug use? Paper presented at meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Denver, Colorado.