U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

National Institute of Justice / *Issues and Practices*

Characteristics of Different Types of Drug-Involved Offenders

About the National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice is a research branch of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Institute's mission is to develop knowledge about crime, its causes and control. Priority is given to policy-relevant research that can yield approaches and information that State and local agencies can use in preventing and reducing crime. The decisions made by criminal justice practitioners and policymakers affect millions of citizens, and crime affects almost all our public institutions and the private sector as well. Targeting resources, assuring their effective allocation, and developing new means of cooperation between the public and private sector are some of the emerging issues in law enforcement and criminal justice that research can help illuminate.

Carrying out the mandate assigned by Congress in the Justice Assistance Act of 1984, the National Institute of Justice:

- Sponsors research and development to improve and strengthen the criminal justice system and related civil justice aspects, with a balanced program of basic and applied research.
- Evaluates the effectiveness of justice improvement programs and identifies programs that promise to be successful if continued or repeated.
- Tests and demonstrates new and improved approaches to strengthen the justice system, and recommends actions that can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments and private organizations and individuals to achieve this goal.
- Disseminates information from research, demonstrations, evaluations, and special programs to Federal, State, and local governments, and serves as an international clearinghouse of justice information.
- Trains criminal justice practitioners in research and evaluation findings, and assists practitioners and researchers through fellowships and special seminars.

The Director of the Institute is appointed by the President of the United States, and upon confirmation by the Senate, serves at the President's pleasure. The Director establishes the research and development objectives of the Institute. The Director has final authority to approve grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements, and maintains responsibility for fiscal operations of the Institute. In establishing its research agenda, the Institute is guided by the priorities of the Attorney General and the needs of the criminal justice field. The Institute actively solicits the views of police, courts, and corrections practitioners as well as the private sector to identify the most critical problems and to plan research that can help resolve them.

James K. Stewart
Director

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice
Office of Communication and Research Utilization

Characteristics of Different Types of Drug-Involved Offenders

by

Marcia R. Chaiken
and
Bruce D. Johnson

February 1988

NCJ 108560

Issues and Practices in Criminal Justice is a publication of the National Institute of Justice. Designed for the criminal justice professional, each *Issues and Practices* report presents the program options and management issues in a topic area, based on a review of research and evaluation findings, operational experience, and expert opinion on the subject. The intent is to provide criminal justice managers and administrators with the information to make informed choices in planning, implementing, and improving programs and practice.

Prepared for the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, by Abt Associates Inc. under contract number OJP–86–C–002. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. Authors are Marcia R. Chaiken of Abt Associates Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Bruce D. Johnson of Narcotics and Drug Research Inc., New York City.

National Institute of Justice

James K. Stewart
Director

The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the activities of the following program Offices and Bureaus: National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Office for Victims of Crime.

Contents

Introduction

Offenders who *use* drugs range from petty thieves to violent robbers; those who *sell* drugs range from young, relatively innocent high-school students to middle-aged, long-term addicts. Dealing effectively with a diverse criminal population requires replacing stereotypical images of junkies with a realistic view of the characteristics of drug-involved offenders. Police, prosecutors, and other criminal justice practitioners must know who the offenders are, what crimes they commit, where they commit crimes, and what can be done to prevent them from victimizing others.

Unfortunately there is no single answer and no one simple solution. Each variety of offender may need a different response from the criminal justice system.

This paper describes different types of offenders who use and sell drugs. It first examines types of drug users and offenders in the adolescent population, then their adult counterparts. Drawing on current research, the paper incorporates observations and interviews with young people across the Nation, clients in drug treatment programs, offenders on the streets of major cities, and offenders incarcerated in jails and prisons in many States. It summarizes findings about different forms of drug use and their relationship to destructive behaviors, using data drawn from rich indepth studies of small groups of offenders as well as national surveys.

Those who only want to understand more about the drug problem faced by the justice system need such data, as do legislators and practitioners who must decide how to address the problem. Presenting the data in an age progression provides relevant information both for practitioners and others who deal with adolescents and for those who deal with adults. However, the many similarities between the most serious types of juveniles and adult drug-involved offenders indicate the need for a concerted strategy against these offenders. One such strategy is discussed in the conclusion of this report.

Types of drug-involved offenders

The types of adolescent and adult drug-involved offenders identified by researchers are briefly described in Tables 1 and 2. In general, those presented in Table 1 represent progression in drugs and crime involvement, though many low-level users and offenders never move to a more active type. Because juvenile and adult offenders are dealt with by separate divisions of the justice system,[1] studies of drug-involved offenders generally have concentrated on either adolescents or adults. Most types of adolescents described in this paper are not officially delinquents. Although researchers have learned about their involvement with drugs and other illegal activities through self-reports, the vast majority have never been apprehended by police or other law-enforcement agents.

The portraits of these young drug users presented here are not necessarily intended to encourage law-enforcement agencies to devote greater resources to adjudicating them. The troublesome behavior of most drug-involved youth is often attributable to inadequate adult supervision and is most often transitory; a majority stops committing illegal acts upon becoming adults. These youngsters are described to detail the widespread and pervasive nature of drug use and distribution among youngsters, and to encourage community organizations to provide supervised drug-free activities for teens.

Two types of adolescents described do require more juvenile justice resources: The small number of the most seriously drug-involved who are already coming to the frequent attention of police and juvenile authorities, and the few young high-rate violent dealers who evade arrest for most of their crimes. Unless they are identified and diverted into programs that provide the context and skills for more constructive lifestyles, research indicates both groups are more likely than any other type of delinquent to continue committing crimes as adults, including numerous violent offenses and vast numbers of drug deals.

Unlike adolescents, most adults who use drugs do not engage in other forms of illegal behavior.[2] Even among those who commit crimes, most adult drug-involved offenders are not violent and commit crimes at low rates. Yet they constitute the bulk of the population dealt with by police, prosecutors and other criminal justice practitioners. This report describes specific types of these criminals—including high-level dealers, women drug-involved offenders, and smugglers—and some of the special problems they present to the criminal justice system.

Two types of adults described here are older versions of the most seriously involved adolescents: The adult predatory offenders who are frequently arrested and the high-rate predatory offenders who rarely are caught. Although these types constitute only a small proportion of adult drug-involved offenders, they are responsible for a high proportion of violent crimes and thus justify intensive criminal justice attention.

Table 1
Types of drug-involved offenders

Type of offender	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Occasional users			
Adolescents	Light to moderate or single-substance, such as alcohol, marijuana, or combination use.	Driving under influence; truancy, early sexual activity; smoking.	None to little.
Adults	Light to moderate use of single substances such as hallucinogens, tranquilizers, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, or combination use.	Driving under influence; lowered work productivity.	None to little.
Persons who sell small amounts of drugs			
Adolescents	Moderate use of alcohol and multiple types of drugs.	Same as adolescent occasional user; also, some poor school performance; some other minor illegal activity.	Minimal juvenile justice contact.
Adults	Moderate use of alcohol and multiple types of drugs including cocaine.	Same as adult occasional user.	None to little.

(continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Types of drug-involved offenders

Type of dealer	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Persons who sell drugs frequently or in large amounts			
Adolescents	Moderate to heavy use of multiple drugs including cocaine.	Many involved in range of illegal activities including violent crimes; depends on subtype (see Table 2).	Dependent on subtype (see Table 2).
Adults	Moderate to heavy use of multiple drugs including heroin and cocaine.	Depends on subtype (see Table 2).	Dependent on subtype (see Table 2).

Table 2
Types of dealers who sell drugs frequently or in large amounts

Type of dealer	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Top-level dealers			
Adults (only)	None to heavy use of multiple types of drugs.	Major distribution of drugs; some other white-collar crime such as money laundering.	Low to minimal.
Lesser predatory			
Adolescents	Moderate to heavy drug use; some addiction; heroin and cocaine use.	Assaults; range of property crimes; poor school performance.	Low to moderate contact with juvenile or adult justice system.
Adult men	Moderate to heavy drug use; some addiction; heroin and cocaine use.	Burglary and other property crimes; many drug sales; irregular employment; moderate to high social instability.	Low to high contact with criminal justice system.
Adult women	Moderate to heavy drug use; some addiction; heroin and cocaine use.	Prostitution; theft; many drug sales; addicted babies; AIDS babies; high-risk children.	Low to moderate contact with criminal justice system.

(continued)

(Table 2 continued)

Types of dealers who sell drugs frequently or in large amounts

Type of dealer	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Drug-involved violent predatory offenders:			
The "losers"			
Adolescents	Heavy use of multiple drugs; often addiction to heroin or cocaine.	Commit many crimes in periods of heaviest drug use including robberies; high rates of school dropout; problems likely to continue as adults.	High contact with both juvenile and adult criminal justice system.
Adults	Heavy use of multiple drugs; often addiction to heroin or cocaine.	Commit many crimes in periods of heaviest drug use including robberies; major source of income from criminal activity; low-status roles in drug hierarchy.	High contact with criminal justice system; high incarceration.
The "winners"			
Adolescents	Frequent use of multiple drugs; less frequent addiction to heroin and cocaine	Commit many crimes; major source of income from criminal activity; take midlevel role in drug distribution to both adolescents and adults.	Minimal; low incarceration record.

(continued)

(Table 2 continued)

Types of dealers who sell drugs frequently or in large amounts

Type of dealer	Typical drug use	Typical problems	Contact with justice system
Adults	Frequent use of multiple drugs; less frequent addiction to heroin and cocaine.	Commit many crimes; major source of income from criminal activity; take midlevel role in drug distribution to both adolescents and adults.	Minimal; low incarceration record.
Smugglers	None to high.	Provide pipelines of small to large quantities of drugs and money.	Variable contact.

Recent findings about adolescent drug use

The most recent findings about adolescent drug use reflect the enormous drug problem faced by the justice system. Over the past few decades, the number of adolescents using alcohol, marijuana, and other illicit drugs increased dramatically. Self-report data collected from children in the past 10 years found that over 25 percent of youngsters 13 to 17 used marijuana or other illicit drugs within the prior 12 months.[3] Over 35 percent of seniors in high school reported having had 5 or more drinks in a row within the prior 2 weeks. By 1981, two-thirds of high-school seniors reported having used marijuana or other illicit drugs sometime in their lives.

In recent years, the proportion of high school seniors who reported use of drugs dropped to 61 percent; however, this overall decline ended in 1985.[4] Moreover, the use of certain drugs, including cocaine, did not peak in the early 1980's; the proportion of youngsters who used these drugs continued to rise.[5] Compared with other countries, even other technologically advanced nations, our children are more extensively involved with drugs and alcohol.[6]

In our country, adolescents most often begin using these substances between the ages of 13 and 15 when they are in grades 7, 8, and 9.[7] The primary factors that promote use are the general availability of alcohol or drugs, friends who are users, lack of parental supervision, and lack of attachment to school.[8] The involvement of adolescent users in other destructive behavior is strongly associated with the number and types of harmful substances they use; the more substances they use, the greater their chance of being involved in serious destructive or assaultive behavior.[9]

Approximately half the adolescents who abuse substances consume only alcohol. However, close to one-third use both alcohol and marijuana, and over 10 percent use multiple types of drugs. Youngsters who use multiple drugs, such as PCP, barbiturates, amphetamines, cocaine, heroin, or psychedelics, are also likely to use marijuana and alcohol frequently.[10]

Girls' use of drugs differs from boys' in several ways. In general, girls are significantly less likely to be users.[11] Girls are more likely to use amphetamines and other drugs for weight control; they are less likely than boys to use cocaine, PCP, and most other drugs.[12] However, this difference lessened from 1975 to 1983. Recently, girls' use of alcohol has become more similar to boys,[13] and girls are almost as likely to report having a drug problem.[14] Among adolescents who report committing illegal acts, girls are just as likely as boys to report frequent consumption of many substances.[15]

Delinquency and adolescent use of drugs

Although the pervasiveness of adolescent drug use is itself alarming, it also may indicate other forms of delinquency. Youngsters who use multiple drugs

are generally more likely to be seriously delinquent than those who use only alcohol and marijuana.[16] However, both alcohol/marijuana and multiple drug users are more likely to practice health-threatening, risk-taking behavior. Those who use drugs—even only alcohol or marijuana—are more likely to smoke, be sexually active, and ride around in cars with drivers either drunk or on drugs.[17] Over 75 percent of boys who use alcohol and marijuana commit minor assaults, vandalism, or other public disorder offenses. Both boys and girls who drink and use marijuana or other drugs are more likely to be truant and to steal.[18] While these are a serious concern for educators and other community members, most adolescents who use drugs or commit occasional crimes do not come to the attention of the criminal or juvenile justice system.[19]

Although the use of most drugs has remained the same or declined among youth in recent years, cocaine use continues to rise.[20] Most youngsters on cocaine also use alcohol and marijuana several times a week; many also use other drugs such as psychedelics and stimulants.[21] This is a particular problem in urban areas in the Northeast and the West.[22] Unlike marijuana use, which begins in junior high or early in high school for nearly 90 percent of users, cocaine use typically begins after ninth grade. Moreover, the proportion of youngsters who become regular users of cocaine after experimentation has grown.[23]

About half the youngsters who frequently use multiple drugs were delinquent before they began illicit drugs. Minor crimes such as theft often precede or coincide with serious drug involvement. Once frequent use of multiple types of drugs begins, however, chances are relatively high that these youngsters will commit a wide range of crimes, more and less serious. Boys tend to overt aggressive acts. Girls are more likely to be involved in more covert property crimes, such as shoplifting and petty theft.[24] Both boys and girls who use drugs are likely to sell drugs.

Adolescents who distribute small amounts of drugs

Adolescents who distribute drugs are not necessarily involved in other or more serious criminal activity. Most sell marijuana, amphetamines, and tranquilizers less than once a month to support their own use.[25] Their buyers are almost always known to them—brothers and sisters, cousins, friends, or acquaintances of friends. Arrangements for sales are made over the phone, in school, or in places where youngsters congregate. However, they typically distribute drugs in homes or cars—not in public places.[26] Most of these adolescents do not consider these activities "serious" crimes. For example, a girl who used marijuana and other drugs, commented:

> . . . I don't consider it dealing. I'll sell hits of speed to my friends and joints and nickel bags [of marijuana] to my friends, but that's not dealing.[27]

This notion is reinforced by the relatively small probability of these transactions being treated as crimes.[28] Persistence in other, nondrug offenses is more likely to bring seriously drug-involved youngsters to the attention of

the juvenile and criminal justice system. Most adolescents who sporadically distribute small amounts of drugs do not have a flagrantly delinquent lifestyle and therefore are rarely apprehended.[29]

Since these youths conceal their illicit behavior from most adults and are likely to participate in many conventional activities with children their age, criminal justice practitioners can take little direct action to prevent occasional adolescent sellers from distributing drugs and recruiting new users. However, in several jurisdictions police, sheriffs, and other practitioners are cooperatively developing educational programs to provide other children with the skills to resist recruitment.[30]

Adolescents who frequently sell drugs

Although most youngsters who sporadically distribute small amounts of drugs are not seriously delinquent, a small number, most often multiple-drug users or heroin or cocaine users, are high-rate dealers[31] who link the adult world of drug distribution and the sporadic adolescent distributors. Although many of them are daily users of drugs, they may not meet the stereotype of the "strung-out junkie." Like many other adolescents, their lives revolve around getting out of school, hanging out and socializing, fast food, and movies. They also perform a central role among kids who regularly get high.

Youngsters who distribute drugs weekly often have an adult dealer who "fronts" or supplies them with drugs on credit. They in turn supply other youngsters who pay in cash. Most of the money is returned to the adult supplier; the rest is a commission that the youngster rapidly spends for cigarettes, beer, and other adolescent accoutrements.[32] Also, the youngster often keeps some drugs for personal use and shares drugs offered by the other adolescents he supplies.

For example, Gallo, a 17-year-old dealer, smokes about 10 joints of marijuana a day and frequently uses other drugs. His mother works and his home has become an after-school hangout and drug distribution point. According to Gallo,

> . . . [after school], there's about 10 people in my house. [After they buy drugs] they want to hang out. I'm getting high for free.[33]

Youngsters who distribute drugs weekly are more likely to sell drugs in public than children who sporadically sell small amounts. Although most drug distribution takes place in cars or homes, more public spots commonly used are schools, parks, swimming areas, and other places where teenagers congregate.[34] Typically, these transfers occur episodically; therefore, the probability of apprehension is low.[35]

Adolescents who distribute drugs and commit many other types of crimes

By far the most serious adolescent dealers are those who use multiple substances and commit both property and violent crimes at high rates. Only about 2 percent of all adolescents pursue serious criminality *and* use multiple types of illicit drugs. Such youths commit over 40 percent of the total robberies and assaults by adolescents. Additionally, they are responsible for over 60 percent of all teen-age felony thefts and drug sales.[36] They are more likely than any other type of juvenile offender to continue committing crimes as young adults.[37] Among multiple drug users, girls are as likely as boys to become high-rate persistent drug-involved offenders, whites as likely as blacks, and middle-class adolescents raised outside cities as likely as lower-class city children.[38]

Most research has focused on boys in cities. Seriously delinquent drug-involved city boys are frequently hired by adult or older adolescent street drug sellers as runners. Loosely organized into crews of 3 to 12, each boy generally handles relatively small quantities of drugs—for example, two or three packets or bags of heroin. They receive these units "on credit," "up front," or "on loan" from a supplier and are expected to return about 50 to 70 percent of the drug's street value.[39]

In addition to distributing drugs, these youngsters may act as lookouts, recruit customers, and guard street sellers from customer-robbers. They typically are users of marijuana and cocaine, but not heroin. Moreover, in some cities, dealers and suppliers prefer to hire distributors who do not "get high" during an operation.[40] But their employment as runners is not generally steady; it is interspersed with other crimes including robbery, burglary, and theft. When involved in selling drugs, they generally work long hours and facilitate many small transactions. They are rarely arrested for these activities since, when police approach, they and other runners flee in all directions.[41]

A relatively small number of youngsters who sell drugs develop excellent entrepreneurial skills. Their older contacts come to trust them, and they parlay this trust to advance in the drug business. By the time they are 18 or 19 they can have several years of experience in drug sales, be bosses of their own crews, and handle more than $500,000 a year. However, there is a high level of violence associated with the position of crew boss. Violent tactics are used both by and against crew bosses to regulate the trade.[42] But given the rewards, youngsters who achieve this position find the risk worthwhile.

For example, Darryl, a youngster in Harlem, started as a runner when he was 9 and was part of a clique of older major dealers before he was 19. He was the boss of a crew that sold heroin and cocaine. His income allowed him to indulge his taste for expensive clothes and cars; he simultaneously owned a Mercedes, BMW, and Cadillac.[43]

Youngsters like Darryl earn great respect among the other drug-involved adolescents in their community. Many work for him and dream of having his clothes, cars, and customers. However, most other youngsters who are integral to the street drug trade do not have the skills to succeed, and most either stop or become so dependent on drugs that they have continuing contacts with the justice system.

Adolescents who are most likely to cycle in and out of the justice system

Unlike youngsters who develop "successful" careers, crimes committed by other high-rate, delinquent, drug-involved urban boys are more opportunistic, less organized, and more likely to result in failure, including arrest.[44] Young offenders who are habitually and frequently high on a variety of drugs are especially likely to be caught doing crimes. Their high drug consumption effectively bars them from joining drug distribution networks except at the very lowest levels.

They may earn some drugs by steering customers to a seller in a "copping" area, "touting" or advertising drug availability for a dealer, or acting as a lookout; however, they are not often considered trustworthy enough to handle money or drugs. Not infrequently they bungle other criminal pursuits. For example:

> Buster is almost always stoned on ludes and beer. He is continually getting caught robbing and is in and out of treatment centers. Once he and another boy robbed [sic] a jewelry store. They smashed the window with a brick and the window fell on them, knocking both of them out. The store owner called the cops and an ambulance.[45]

Youngsters like Buster frequently start using drugs and committing serious crimes at much younger ages than most delinquents. Such boys often initiate property and violent crimes, and such girls begin prostitution and theft, before they are 15. Yet juvenile authorities are more likely to intervene in the lives of these children after they have accumulated a record of a relatively large number of arrests. Ironically, by the time most seriously delinquent youngsters are judged to be in need of remedial or correctional action, they are approaching the age when the vast number of delinquents spontaneously stop committing crimes—or they are so deeply entrenched in a criminal, drug-involved lifestyle that ordinary measures taken to treat or deter them from crime in the future are largely ineffective.[46]

Drug-involved adolescents who continue to commit crime as adults

Although over two-thirds of drug-using juvenile delinquents continue to use drugs as adults, close to half stop committing crimes.[47] More is known about the reasons why delinquents start using drugs and committing crimes than about why some stop and others continue. The few studies[48] that have fol-

lowed delinquent youngsters into adulthood have shown that, in general, youngsters are most likely to continue to be offenders as adults if:

- they come from poor families,
- they have other criminals in their family,
- they do poorly in school,
- they started using drugs and committing other delinquent and antisocial acts at a relatively early age,
- they used multiple types of drugs and committed crimes frequently, and
- they have few opportunities in late adolescence to participate in legitimate and rewarding adult activities.[49]

There is some evidence that low nonverbal IQ and poor physical coordination also increase the probability of juvenile offenders continuing as adults.[50] However, researchers basically do not know why some of the most deeply involved adolescents drop out of crime while others continue as adults like Darryl or Buster.

Types of adult drug-involved offenders

Unlike adults who were persistent, serious, drug-involved delinquents as adolescents, most adults who use drugs do *not commit* crimes other than possessing illegal substances; however, they do create a substantial market for marijuana, amphetamines, and trendy drugs such as cocaine. Most adolescents who smoked marijuana regularly in high-school are likely to continue as young adults. For example, in New York 52 percent of men who used marijuana regularly in high school continued to use drugs as adults.[51] Moreover, after leaving high school, a substantial proportion of young people may start drinking heavily and at that point become involved with other drugs. Many young adults (ages 18 to 22) in college, at jobs in cities, or traveling away from parents increase their use of drugs and contacts with friends and acquaintances who use and sell drugs. As they assume greater responsibility for jobs, marry, or become parents, however, most greatly reduce their drug and alcohol consumption.[52]

Young adults, including middle-class and upper-class men and women, traditionally develop a unique subculture that emphasizes innovation and experimentation with the latest fads, including drugs. As specific drugs gain a reputation for dangerousness, they are dropped, and new drugs become fashionable. However, motivations and justifications for drug use appear to be similar. Reasons given for the 1980's use of cocaine echo the 1970's reasons for the use of PCP and the 1960's reasons for use of LSD—to experience altered states of thinking, seeing, and feeling.[53]

Although the use of drugs is hazardous to the physical, emotional and cognitive development of these young adults,[54] the vast majority do not threaten others with felonious acts. Even among young adults in treatment for drug use, most are not involved in serious or frequent criminal behavior.[55] Crimes are more likely to be committed by daily or almost daily users of cocaine or heroin than by other types of drug users.[56] Fortunately, less than 1 percent of young adults use heroin or cocaine so frequently.[57]

Most adult offenders who use drugs are involved in dealing drugs. However, many dealers also commit other types of crimes, not specializing in dealing alone. More typically, they commit *combinations* of crimes. Sellers who are primarily nonviolent supplement their dealing activities by shoplifting, forging checks, using stolen credit cards, and other property crimes. Some drug-selling offenders also burglarize homes and businesses in addition to committing theft and other property crimes.[58] The most serious drug-involved offenders, the violent predators, may also commit a range of more and less serious crimes including theft, drug sales, assaults, and robbery.[59]

Most offenders commit crimes less than once a month; however, a small number are very active, committing crimes every week or nearly every day

they are free to do so.[60] Generally, the most active and violent criminals began committing crimes, including violent crimes, as young adolescents. These offenders frequently used heroin or multiple other drugs as youngsters, and they continue to use drugs daily or almost daily as adults. They are unlikely to be married or regularly employed as adults.[61] On the other hand, less active drug-involved offenders who confine their illicit activities to drug selling and property offenses are more likely to start doing crimes and using drugs as adults and to be more socially stable.[62]

The following sections describe some of the types of adult drug users/offenders studied by researchers. As with the discussion of adolescents, this examination is by no means exhaustive; rather it suggests the variety of patterns of drug use and criminal lifestyles associated with them.

Outwardly respectable adults who are top-level dealers

Small drug sales among adult users are common; however, relatively few of these dealers distribute large quantities. Close to 10 percent of the young adults in this country sell drugs, mainly marijuana; about 5 percent sell other illegal drugs as well.[63] Most young adult sellers sell small quantities of drugs to a limited number of people. Their sales occur infrequently, usually less often than once a month, and privately. They are carried out less for monetary profit than to obtain drugs for the sellers' own use.[64] However, a small number of outwardly respectable young adult dealers sell large quantities of drugs to support themselves, some in luxurious lifestyles.[65]

Although many undergraduates at colleges and universities around the country know the one or two middle-level "pound dealers" on campus, most noncollegiate regional and wholesale distributors, for obvious reasons, are extremely cautious about their activities. Few studies have collected data about them. Even the handful of researchers who eventually came to know high-level dealers well found them at first superficially indistinguishable from noncriminal young professionals. However, dealers who distribute kilograms or more of drugs rarely are drawn from upscale professions, nor are they likely to have worked their way up from the streets.[66]

Unlike poor, minority-group members like Darryl, who consciously worked at becoming a dealer as a way to climb out of poverty,[67] wholesale dealers seem to drift into this line of work from many different walks of life. Most frequently they are drawn from professions and occupations with minimal stability, irregular work hours, and a high tolerance for drug abuse. Former graduate students, musicians, other performing artists, and barkeepers are among those who become dealers in their mid-20's.[68]

Prior to entering the trade, they are generally frequent users of drugs and attracted to the upper-level dealers' fast, extravagant lifestyle of partying, play, and cocaine snorting. Through friendships with people supplying them with drugs, they learn about the business and form connections with smugglers. Their first transactions are generally middle-level deals, limited

to buying one to five pounds of cocaine. Initially, they are often apprehensive about the risks of arrest, but those who continue find such risks part of the job's allure.[69]

Top-level dealers usually buy drugs by the kilo and sell by the pound. In general, the higher the quantity of the drugs they sell, the lower the number of business contacts they have—and the more likely they are to distribute drugs only to people they know well and in whom they have a certain degree of trust.[70] Young adults like Darryl form the link between them and distributors who sell ounces, grams, or "bags" of drugs to consumers. Middlemen "lieutenants" also insulate top-level dealers against risk of arrest and carry out the violent tactics used to keep the low-level dealers and customers in order.[71] But, because the drug business is extremely competitive and loosely organized, few top-level dealers can maintain a consistent and relatively secure distribution network for a year or more.[72]

Although a few top-level dealers remain in the business 10 years or more, limited research suggests that stability at the top of the trade is quite rare. The fast life and cutthroat business tactics contribute to burnout in a relatively short time. However, even though they may turn to legitimate and less lucrative occupations for a while, former top dealers in legitimate jobs may miss the luxuries more accessible through illicit trade and return to dealing or turn to smuggling.[73]

Top-level dealers frequently cycle in and out of the trade until they are in their mid- or late 30's. Each time they return to the drug trade, they are likely to be a little less active. Many eventually shift over into a legitimate "scam" that utilizes the business skills they developed selling drugs. Others continue to deal in smaller quantities for a relatively long time to supplement other legal income. A small number die from the physical effects of drugs or from a violent attack by a disgruntled competitor or customer.[74] Top-level dealers also may have their careers interrupted by a jail or prison term, but they are less likely to be incarcerated than dealers who also commit other types of crimes.[75]

Smugglers

Yet another group with whom criminal justice practitioners must deal are smugglers.[76] Research on drug smugglers has been limited to indepth studies of small numbers. Those about whom we know the most are generally men, approaching middle-age or older, who have excellent organizational skills, established connections, capital to invest, and a willingness to take large business risks. In general the business of smuggling is loosely organized, competitive, and populated by individual entrepreneurs. The specific people who are smugglers shift and change as old sources become the target of law enforcement, as new sources become available, or as smugglers tire of the corrupt practices endemic to illegal trade. Frequently top-level dealers move into the smuggling end of the drug trade and smugglers become top-level dealers.

The people who actually carry drugs into the country are extremely diverse. Depending on the drugs they handle and the country where the drugs originate, people who transport illegal drugs into the country vary widely in age, nationality, occupation, economic status, and the extent to which they personally use drugs.

Bulky drugs, such as marijuana, require relatively large containers during transport. Before the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency slowed down the Mexican marijuana market, large numbers of relatively unskilled independent entrepreneurs could contract to drive drugs across the border. Currently marijuana is more often being transported long distances in large quantities using boats or planes by the more organized and skilled owners of these modes of transportation, the smugglers.

Concentrated drugs such as cocaine, on the other hand, are somewhat more easily transported. Thirty kilos of uncut cocaine can fit into two large suitcases. Smugglers hire a wide variety of people to actually transport heroin or cocaine. They include wealthy jet-setters who use drugs, or poor immigrants who do not use drugs but are willing to transport them in trade for airline tickets or money.

Adult predatory drug-involved offenders who are frequently arrested: "losers"

Adults like Buster, who became deeply involved in predatory crime and drug use in early adolescence, are likely to be among the highest rate, most dangerous offenders who come to the attention of the criminal justice system.[77] They frequently use multiple types of illicit drugs, including heroin, cocaine, amphetamines, marijuana, and alcohol. Many are daily users. Because they did poorly in school, they have few skills for employment. They work off and on, but most of their money comes from family members or from crime. Most have been incarcerated as juveniles, many for robbery. The threat of incarceration does not appear to deter them from committing a variety of crimes, including robbery, assaults, burglary, theft, and drug sales.[78]

Being incarcerated—and committing different types of crimes almost every day they are free—is a way of life for them, their friends, and often their family members. A relatively large number have fathers or brothers who are also felons. They practice a range of different types of crimes. Although they stage a great number of robberies, they may commit an even greater number of burglaries, thefts, and drug sales. When apprehended, they thus are likely to be arrested for theft or for a small drug sale, although they may have robbed someone just a few days before.[79] Kit is one example of this type of violent predator.

> Kit is a 26-year-old robber-dealer who habitually uses heroin and cocaine. He was first incarcerated at age 15 for attempted murder. His activities

for four days in April included: A street robbery in which he took the victim's watch and $150, then he shoplifted fruit, rice, beans and milk. The next day he sold 20 bags of heroin for which he received a commission of $175 cash, and $50 of heroin for his own use. The next day, he had 22 transactions of heroin and cocaine, for which he received a commission of $100 in heroin; he also beat up a man, for which he received $225 from the husband of the victim's girlfriend.

Kit was arrested for burglary and spent three days in jail. He entered a guilty plea and was fined $200. As soon as he was released, he got $250 in heroin, rebagged it, sold it for $550, and used most of the profit to pay his fine.[80]

Although Kit lives in New York City, the same type of drug-involved offenders operate in major cities around the country, including Los Angeles,[81] Miami,[82] New York,[83] Baltimore,[84] Chicago,[85] and Detroit.[86] To support their own drug use, they sell or help distribute hundreds of small units of drugs each year on the streets and in other public places. Additionally, each year they are free they are likely to commit other types of crimes—hundreds of thefts or many burglaries, and a few robberies and assaults. Others carry out weekly robberies, combined with several assaults, burglaries, or thefts.[87] Although arrested for only a small percent of the crimes they commit, they are incarcerated frequently, often for relatively long periods; however, they are also likely to begin committing many crimes as soon as they are released. Parole is not likely to deter them; they simply fail to report.[88]

Adult predatory drug-involved offenders who are rarely arrested: "winners"

Perhaps more a problem than high-rate arrestees are the young high-rate "winners" who also commit hundreds of crimes each year but evade arrest for long periods.[89] More successful than offenders who get caught several times each year, they are likely to have started both property and violent crimes at very early ages—and even as youngsters they managed to evade arrest. Moreover, like Darryl, they are likely to advance rapidly in the drug trade and become lieutenants or crew-bosses.[90]

On the streets, they are known for their calculated violence. The assaults, robberies, or other crimes they commit are typically carefully planned and carried out. High rate "winners" are more likely to work with partners than high-rate offenders who are arrested frequently; they are more likely to hire lower-level offenders to act as guards and lookouts and to carry out parts of their crimes that are most visible and carry the highest risk of apprehension.[91] They are distinctively different from the high-rate losers, who are arrested frequently, in their use of drugs. Although "winners" are likely to use drugs such as marijuana and cocaine, they are not likely to be heroin users or daily users of other opiates.[92]

High-rate "winners" usually are younger than the predators who frequently are arrested. Ultimately, some lose control of their drug use and become addicted daily users. Eventually, some of them are arrested and convicted. Little is known about the careers of the majority of this type offender as they reach age 30 or more. However, their criminal careers may stretch from age 10 to age 24 or 25; 14 or 15 years, uninterrupted by the justice system."[93]

Less predatory adult drug-involved offenders

Most adult drug-involved offenders are less serious criminals than robbers like Kit. They often have graduated from high school and have fairly regular legitimate employment. They usually commit thefts, pass bad checks, or break into cars and steal things, but they generally do not commit crimes that involve violence."[94]

Their participation in the drug trade is generally peripheral and transitory."[95] They provide short-term services for drug sellers to earn a few dollars or in return for drugs for their own use. They may bag drugs or inject an addict or provide temporary shelter for a dealer. Some run "shooting galleries" for addicts where they rent hypodermic needles and syringes, and occasionally they may sell small quantities of drugs."[96] Although they perform various jobs for dealers and other drug users, most don't seem to have the stomach or stamina to routinely face the incipient violence of the street trade. The number of crimes they commit depends on the amount and cost of drugs they use and the amount of drugs they receive in barter for their drug-related services. Even the users who are most addicted fluctuate in the amount of drugs they use. When they are using expensive drugs such as heroin daily or more, they are likely to commit several crimes a day."[97] For example,

> Nadine, 24, was a regular heroin user; she had two babies, and worked erratically. She supported her drug use with welfare money she received for her children, money she received from selling her food stamps and articles she lifted in shops, and money she stole in bars from men who left change on the counter. Her apartment was used as a shooting gallery by other addicts who shared their heroin with her."[98]

Nadine's high rate of petty theft is typical of many nonpredatory offenders—both women and men, especially middle-aged men—who are heroin users. Additionally, Nadine also represents the special problems of women who are seriously drug-involved.

Women who are drug-involved offenders

Women who are drug-involved offenders constitute another distinct group with whom criminal justice practitioners must deal. In general women are far less likely than men to use almost all illicit drugs."[99] However women *offenders* are just as likely to be using drugs as male offenders."[100] These

women are not likely to be high-rate robbers or assaulters,[101] but about one-third of addicted women offenders are prostitutes. Others, like Nadine, commit many thefts.[102]

Few become top-level or even mid-level drug dealers. Over half, however, play an active role in the lowest levels of the drug trade and facilitate as many sales as men who are also involved at the lowest levels.[103]

Many of these seriously drug-involved women have children; 70 percent of addicted women studied in San Francisco were mothers.[104] Women who continue to inject drugs during pregnancy may have infants born addicted. Additionally, because they frequently share needles with other addicts, a relatively high proportion of these women test seropositive for AIDS virus,[105] and infants of these seropositive women are at high risk of contracting AIDS. The children who survive early infancy, like Nadine's children, are often malnourished, neglected, and surrounded by high-rate dangerous criminals. There is little doubt that this environment increases the risk of these babies ultimately becoming criminals themselves.

Many of the highest-rate female offenders like Nadine avoid prostitution; others who are prostitutes have relatively frequent arrests. However even women who frequently come to the attention of the criminal justice system are less likely to receive effective drug treatment than men. Most programs available for drug-involved offenders have been structured to meet the needs of male offenders.[106] Moreover, the need to provide even minimal care for their children or fear of loss of custody prevents many women drug-involved offenders from entering residential treatment programs.[107]

What can the criminal justice system do?

It is not reasonable to expect criminal justice practitioners alone to put an end to sales of illicit drugs, given the diversity of the people involved in using, selling, and distributing them, the low visibility of the sites in which most transactions are made, the early age at which children start using drugs, and the loose and shifting organization of drug-involved offenders. It is even less reasonable to expect these practitioners to stop the use of illicit drugs.

A large proportion of drug users and drug-involved offenders are youngsters. Achieving even a substantial reduction in the use and sales of illicit drugs will require long-term concerted efforts by educators, health and mental health practitioners, and juvenile justice agencies to reduce availability of drugs, to counteract pressures for initiation of use, and to curtail continued abuse.[108]

The criminal justice system can have a significant impact on some of the worst problems associated with drug use—by effectively concentrating resources on the small number and particular types of offenders who are most seriously involved with drugs and who commit crimes at extremely high rates. Ideally, programs should address all users and offenders. Given limited resources, the emphasis necessarily must be on programs and practices that take drug distributors off the streets and reduce the amount of drugs they use. This in turn can reduce the numbers of violent predatory crimes and property crimes. Moreover, disrupting the activities of the most active dealers can also disrupt ongoing easy access to large quantities of drugs, and interrupt their distribution by youngsters in public urban drug markets.

Current knowledge suggests these methods for concentrating resources on the most active offenders:

- Improving methods to identify high-rate dangerous drug-involved offenders;[109]
- Replicating and testing programs previously found to effectively reduce their use of drugs;[110] and
- Coordinating criminal justice system efforts to supervise and deal with these high-rate dangerous drug-involved offenders.

Improving methods for identifying high-rate dangerous drug-involved offenders

Police, prosecutors, and other practitioners in many jurisdictions have formed special units or programs to increase arrests, convictions, and sentences of the highest-rate, most dangerous persistent offenders.[111] Some special units focus on people who sell drugs. Research findings suggest that arrests of

offenders who frequently sell drugs publicly are more likely to capture persistent high-rate and violent offenders than arrests of those who sell drugs in less visible settings.

Generally, police and prosecutors prefer to allocate scarce resources to dealing with crimes such as robbery or burglary that are publicly perceived as more serious than sale of a small amount of drugs[112] and can result in longer prison or jail sentences. Research shows that many convicted of robbery and burglary are persistent drug-involved criminals, and that a small number of them distribute drugs at very high rates.[113]

Although the small numbers who commit crimes at extremely high rates are likely to rob and sell drugs publicly, most people who are arrested for these crimes are not high-rate offenders. However, it is hard to accurately separate the highest-rate offenders from lower-rate offenders by examining their criminal records. Simple counts of all prior felony convictions or incarcerations and prior convictions for drug sales or possession *alone* are not adequate. This information is misleading because two types of offenders come to frequent criminal justice attention: Offenders whose frequency of apprehension reflects their high rates of crime, and offenders who are basically unprofessional, inept, low-rate offenders.[114]

Information that can help distinguish between them includes:

- A prior conviction for robbery, burglary, arson, forcible rape, sex crime involving a child, kidnap, or murder;
- Failure to complete a previous sentence (e.g. through escape); and
- Pretrial release status (on bail or own recognizance) when arrested for a new crime.[115]

Information that is *not* routinely available but could significantly improve our ability to distinguish between high-rate and lower-rate drug-involved offenders includes:

- Convictions for robbery as a juvenile,[116] and
- Indications of **persistent** and **frequent** use of drugs.[117]

Analysis of arrestees' urine for specific drugs is already being routinely carried out in a small number of jurisdictions. However, a single "positive" is not evidence of either persistent or frequent drug use. Only repeated positive readings collected over time can be considered indicative of persistent or frequent drug use. Therefore, urinalysis results must be maintained on official records and applied only after a pattern of persistent or frequent drug consumption has been established.[118]

Replicating programs demonstrated to reduce drug use

For many of the most serious offenders, regular involvement in crime and drugs, with intermittent incarceration, is a way of life. Simply arresting and

incarcerating them is not likely to have a long-term effect on their drug use or behavior. Once released, many continue to use drugs and commit crimes.

However, most do not continuously commit crimes at high rates; the rates at which they sell drugs and commit other crimes appears to be closely associated with the intensity of their cocaine or heroin use.[119] The costs of drug use, in large part, are responsible for these fluctuations.[120] Criminal behavior is likely to desist or lessen during days of abstinence or greatly reduced consumption.[121]

Therefore, one realistic goal is to reduce the frequency of use and amount of drugs consumed by offenders who are regular users of heroin or cocaine. Studies of the effectiveness of treatment and rehabilitation programs for drug-involved offenders most generally have resulted in pessimistic findings.

Recently, however, more optimism has been generated by outcome studies of a small number of programs, including a few that take place in prisons and continue with care after release;[122] these prison-initiated programs do appear to reduce participants' involvement with drugs and crime.[123] Although it will be necessary to replicate these programs and evaluate their effectiveness for other offenders before confidently suggesting large-scale implementation, they hold the promise of reducing the amount of crime committed by drug-involved offenders.

Cooperative efforts to concentrate resources on the most serious offenders

The most effective concentration of resources on high-rate serious drug-involved offenders requires coordination between criminal justice agencies within and across jurisdictions. By working together to build strong cases, police and prosecutors can reduce the number of serious drug-involved criminals who are released after arrest because of procedural or evidentiary problems. Criminal history and drug-use records supplied by police and parole officers can be used by prosecutors and probation officers to provide judges with information needed to detain dangerous offenders before trial and to sentence convicted offenders to effective drug programs.

By working with program providers in the community, correctional staff in jails and prisons can increase the chance that released drug-involved offenders receive assistance in staying drug free. Parole and probation officers can reduce the numbers of recidivists who commit many crimes before they are rearrested, by cooperating with police. A concerted effort can do much to reduce the burden which seriously drug-involved offenders place on the criminal justice system, and allay the havoc they create for their families, communities, and country.

Notes

1. Offenders who are 13, 14 or 15, if apprehended, are almost always handled by the juvenile justice system. Adolescents of high-school age, youngsters approximately 16 to 18, straddle the ages that are used to legally define offenders as adults or juveniles. In some States their crimes are handled by the criminal justice system; in other States the same offenses are handled by the juvenile justice system. Young adults, people in their late teens to mid-20's, are legally responsible for their own actions. However, when they are initially convicted of a crime in many jurisdictions, they are adjudicated as "first-time offenders," even if they were adjudicated for offenses as juveniles. Older people who have accumulated more years of legal responsibility, if not social responsibility, are referred to in this report as adults.

2. Compare Elliott et al., 1963; Kandel and Yamaguchi, 1985; DeLeon, 1984; Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986.

3. See, for example, Elliott et al., 1985.

4. Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1985, 1986.

5. Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986; Miller, et al., 1982.

6. Kandel, 1984; Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986.

7. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986.

8. Simcha-Fagan and Schwartz, 1986.

9. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985.

10. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Huizinga, 1986; Johnson and Wish, 1986a.

11. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986.

12. Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986; Kandel and Yamaguchi, 1985.

13. Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986.

14. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985.

15. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Huizinga, 1986; Kandel, Simcha-Fagan, and Davies, 1986.

16. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Weis and Sederstrom, 1981; Huizinga, 1986.

17. Jessor, 1982; Elliott and Morse, 1985; Elliott, Huizinga, and Ageton, 1985.

18. Elliott et al., 1983; Huizinga, 1986.

19. Huizinga and Dunford, 1985; Elliott, Dunford, and Huizinga, 1987.

20. Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986.

21. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986; Kandel, Murphy, and Kraus, 1985.

22. Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986.

23. Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986; Kozel and Adams, 1985; Abelson and Miller, 1985.

24. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Kandel, Simcha-Fagan, and Davies, 1986; Simcha-Fagan and Schwartz, 1986; Weis and Sederstrom, 1981; Huizinga, 1986; Johnson and Wish, 1986a, 1986b; Dunford and Elliott, 1984; Dembo et al., 1987.

25. Johnson and Wish, 1986a; Carpenter et al., 1988; Elliott and Huizinga, 1985.

26. Carpenter et al., 1988.

27. Carpenter et al., 1988.

28. Huizinga and Dunford, 1985.

29. Elliott, et al., 1983; Huizinga, 1986; Dembo et al., 1987.

30. DeJong, 1987; Burchard and Burchard, 1987.

31. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Huizinga, 1986; Carpenter et al., 1988.

32. Johnson et al., 1986; Carpenter et al., 1988.

33. Carpenter et al., 1988.

34. Carpenter et al., 1988.

35. Carpenter et al., 1988; Huizinga and Dunford, 1985.

36. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Johnson and Wish, 1986a, 1986b; Wish and Johnson, 1986.

37. Elliott and Huizinga, 1985; Elliott, Dunford, and Huizinga, 1987; Elliott, Huizinga, and Morse, 1986; Kandel, Simcha-Fagan, and Davies, 1986.

38. Huizinga, 1986; Huizinga and Elliott, 1987; Watters, Reinarman, and Fagan, 1985.

39. Johnson et al., 1985; Mieczkowski, 1986; Williams and Kornblum, 1985.

40. Mieczkowski, 1986.

41. Williams and Kornblum, 1985; Mieczkowski, 1986.

42. Mieczkowski, 1986; Goldstein, 1985; Fagan, Pieper, and Moore, 1986.

43. Williams and Kornblum, 1985.

44. Fagan, Pieper, and Moore, 1986; Fagan, Pieper, and Cheng, 1987; Fagan, Hansen, and Jang, 1983.

45. Williams and Kornblum, 1985.

46. Fagan, Pieper, and Moore, 1986; Fagan, Pieper, and Jang, 1983; Dembo et al., 1987.

47. Kandel, Simcha-Fagan, and Davies, 1986; Huizinga and Elliott, 1985.

48. See Blumstein, Farrington, and Moitra, 1985, for a review.

49. Huizinga and Elliott, 1986, 1987; Fagan, Pieper, and Moore, 1986; Fagan, Hansen, and Jang, 1983; Blumstein et al., 1986.

50. Blumstein, Farrington, and Moitra, 1985.

51. Kandel and Andrews, 1987; Kandel and Logan, 1984; Kandel and Yamaguchi, 1987.

52. Kandel and Yamaguchi, 1985, 1987; Kandel and Logan, 1984; Kandel et al., 1986; Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986.

53. Lerner and Burns, 1979; Carey, 1968; Goode, 1970; Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1985.

54. Durell and Bukoski, 1984.

55. DeLeon, 1984; Sells and Simpson, 1976.

56. Ball et al., 1981, 1982; Johnson et al., 1985; Kandel, Murphy, and Kraus, 1985; Sanchez and Johnson, 1987.

57. Kozel and Adams, 1985; Kandel and Yamaguchi, 1987; Kandel et al., 1986.

58. Johnson et al., 1985; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1985, 1987.

59. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1987; M. Chaiken, 1986; Johnson et al., 1985; Johnson and Wish, 1987.

60. Ball et al., 1981, 1982; Ball, Shaffer and Nurco, 1983; Ball, 1986; Johnson et al., 1985; Johnson and Wish, 1987; Sanchez and Johnson, 1987; Wish and Johnson, 1986.

61. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1984; Fagan, Hansen, and Jang, 1983; Johnson et al., 1985.

62. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982.

63. Blum, 1972; Johnson, 1973; Single and Kandel, 1978; Clayton and Voss, 1981; Elliott et al., 1983; Elliot and Huizinga, 1985; Johnson and Wish, 1986.

64. Goode, 1970; Carey, 1968; Clayton and Voss, 1981; Carpenter et al., 1988.

65. Waldorf, 1987; Adler, 1985; Reuter, 1987.

66. Adler, 1985.

67. Williams and Kornblum, 1985.

68. Adler, 1985.

69. Adler, 1985.

70. Adler, 1985.

71. Goldstein, 1985; Johnson et al., 1985; Johnson and Wish, 1987; Carpenter et al., 1988; Goode, 1970; Adler,

1985; Spunt et al., 1987; Waldorf et al., 1977; Waldorf, 1987; Johnson and Hamid, 1987.

72. Adler, 1985.

73. Adler, 1985.

74. Adler, 1985.

75. Adler, 1985; Reuter, 1987; Reuter and Kleiman, 1986; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1984, 1987.

76. This section is based on Adler, 1985; Reuter and Kleiman, 1986; Reuter, 1987.

77. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1987; Johnson et al., 1985; Hansen et al., 1985.

78. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1987; Johnson, et al., 1985; Hansen, et al., 1985.

79. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1987; M. Chaiken, 1986; Johnson et al., 1985.

80. Johnson et al., 1985; Hanson et al., 1985.

81. Klein and Moxen, 1986; Bullington, 1977.

82. Inciardi, 1979; Inciardi, 1986; Inciardi and Pottieger, 1986.

83. Johnson et al., 1985; Johnson and Wish, 1986a, 1986b, 1987; Sanchez and Johnson, 1987; Wish and Johnson, 1986.

84. Ball, Shaffer, and Nurco, 1983; Ball et al., 1981, 1982.

85. Weibel, 1986.

86. Mieczkowski, 1986.

87. M. Chaiken, 1986; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1985, 1987; Ball et al., 1981, 1982; Johnson et al., 1985; Wish and Johnson, 1986.

88. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1987; Ball, 1986.

89. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1985.

90. Mieczkowski, 1986; Williams and Kornblum, 1985.

91. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1985.

92. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1985.

93. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1985.

94. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982.

95. Waldorf et al., 1977; Waldorf, 1987; Johnson et al., 1985.

96. Johnson et al., 1985; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982; Goldstein, 1981.

97. Ball et al., 1981, 1982; Ball, 1986; Ball, Shaffer, and Nurco, 1983; Johnson et al., 1985; Speckart and Anglin, 1986a, 1986b; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982; M. Chaiken, 1986; Sanchez and Johnson, 1987.

98. Abstracted from Johnson et al., 1985: 154.

99. Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1986; Miller et al., 1982.

100. Sanchez and Johnson, 1987; Wish, Brady, and Cuadrado, 1986.

101. Sanchez and Johnson, 1987; Inciardi, 1979.

102. Sanchez and Johnson, 1987; Wish, Brady, and Cuadrado, 1986; Inciardi, 1979; Inciardi and Pottieger, 1986; Rosenbaum, 1981.

103. Inciardi, 1979; Inciardi, 1986; Inciardi and Pottieger, 1986; Sanchez and Johnson, 1987; Datesman, 1981.

104. Rosenbaum, 1981, 1982.

105. Centers for Disease Control, 1987.

106. Rosenbaum, 1981, 1982.

107. Rosenbaum, 1982; Rosenbaum and Murphy, 1984.

108. DeJong, 1987; Durell and Bukowski, 1984.

109. Wish, Toborg, and Bellassai, 1987.

110. Wexler, Lipton, and Johnson, 1988.

111. See, for examples: Forst, 1983; Martin, 1986; Springer, Phillips, and Cannady, 1985; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1987.

112. Center for Studies in Criminology and Criminal Law, 1980.

113. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1987.

114. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1985.

115. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1987.

116. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1985; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1987.

117. See virtually all papers by Ball, Chaiken and Chaiken, Johnson, Nurco, and Shaffer.

118. For a discussion of urinalysis, see Wish, Toborg, and Bellasai, 1987.

119. Ball et al., 1981, 1982; Ball, Shaffer, and Nurco, 1983; Speckart and Anglin, 1986a, 1986b; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, 1984, 1985; M. Chaiken, 1986; Sanchez and Johnson, 1987.

120. Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982; M. Chaiken, 1986; Johnson et al., 1985.

121. Ball, et al, 1981, 1982; Ball, 1986; Speckart and Anglin, 1986a, b.

122. Wexler, Lipton, and Johnson, 1988; Wexler and Williams, 1986.

123. Johnson, Lipton, and Wish, 1986; Platt, 1986; Ross and Gendreau, 1980; Wexler, Lipton, and Johnson, 1988; Wexler and Lipton, 1985.

References

Abelson, Herbert I., and Judith D. Miller, 1985. "A decade of trends in cocaine use in the household population": 35–49 in Nicholas J. Kozel and Edgar H. Adams, eds., *Cocaine Use in America: Epidemiologic and Clinical Perspectives*. Research Monograph Series 61. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Alder, Patricia A., 1985. *Wheeling and Dealing: An Ethnography of Upper-Level Drug Dealing and Smuggling Communities*. New York, Columbia University Press.

Ball, John C., Lawrence Rosen, John A. Flueck, and David N. Nurco, 1981. "The criminality of heroin addicts when addicted and when off opiates": 39–65 in James A. Inciardi, ed., *The Drugs-Crime Connection*. Beverly Hills, Sage.

Ball, John C., Lawrence Rosen, John A. Flueck, and David N. Nurco, 1982. "Lifetime criminality of heroin addicts in the United States." *Journal of Drug Issues* 3: 225–239.

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., 1986. "The hyper-criminal opiate addict": 81–104 in Bruce D. Johnson and Eric Wish, eds., *Crime Rates Among Drug Abusing Offenders*. Final Report to the National Institute of Justice. New York, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Blum, Richard, 1972. *The Dream Sellers*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Blumstein, Alfred, Jacqueline Cohen, Jeffrey A. Roth, and Christy A. Visher, eds., 1986. *Criminal Careers and "Career Criminals."* Washington, D.C., National Academy Press.

Blumstein, Alfred, David P. Farrington, and Soumyo Moitra, 1985. "Delinquency careers: innocents, desisters, and persisters": 187–219 in Michael Tonry and Norval Morris, eds., *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research* 6. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Bullington, Bruce, 1977. *Heroin Use in the Barrio*. Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books.

Burchard, John D., and Sara N. Burchard, 1987. *Prevention of Delinquent Behavior*. Beverly Hills, Sage.

Carey, James T, 1968. *The College Drug Scene*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

Carpenter, Cheryl, Barry Glassner, Bruce D. Johnson, and Julia Loughlin, 1988. *Kids, Drugs, Alcohol, and Crime*. Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books, forthcoming.

Centers for Disease Control, 1987. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, March 27.

Center for Studies in Criminology and Criminal Law, 1980. *National Survey of Crime Severity: Final National Level Geometric Means and Ratio Scores by Offense Stimuli Items*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.

Chaiken, Marcia R., 1986. "Crime rates and substance abuse among types of offenders": 12–54 in Bruce D. Johnson and Eric Wish, eds., *Crime Rates Among Drug-Abusing Offenders*. Final Report to the National Institute of Justice. New York, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Chaiken, Jan, and Marcia Chaiken, 1982. *Varieties of Criminal Behavior*. Santa Monica, Rand Corporation.

Chaiken, Marcia, and Jan M. Chaiken, 1984. "Offender types and public policy." *Crime and Deliquency* 30, 2: 195–226.

Chaiken, Marcia R., and Jan M. Chaiken, 1985. *Who Gets Caught Doing Crime?* Bureau of Justice Statistics Discussion Paper. Washington, D.C.

Chaiken, Marcia, and Jan M. Chaiken, 1987. *Selecting "Career Criminals" for Priority Prosecution*. Submitted to the National Institute of Justice, Waltham, Massachusetts, Brandeis University.

Clayton, Richard R., and Harwin L. Voss, 1981. *Young Men and Drugs in Manhattan: A Causal Analysis*. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse: 99–173.

Datesman, Susan K., 1981. "Women, crime and drugs": 85–104 in James A. Inciardi ed., *The Drugs-Crime Connection*. Beverly Hills, Sage.

DeJong, William, 1987. *Arresting the Demand for Drugs: Police and School Partnerships to Prevent Drug Abuse*. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.

DeLeon, George, 1984. *The Therapeutic Community: Study of Effectiveness*. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Dembo, Richard, Mark Washburn, Eric D. Wish, Horatio Yeung, Alan Getreu, Estrellita Berry, and William R. Blount, 1987. "Heavy marijuana use among youths entering a juvenile detention center." *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs* 19, 1: 47–56.

Deren, Sherry, 1986. "Children of substance abusers: A review of the literature." *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 3: 77–94.

Dunford, Franklyn W., and Delbert S. Elliott, 1984. "Identifying career offenders with self-reported data." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 21: 57–86.

Durell, Jack, and William Bukoski, 1984. "Preventing substance abuse: The state of the art." *Public Health Reports* 1: 23–3.

Elliott, Delbert S., Susanne S. Ageton, David Huizinga, Brian Knowles, and Rochelle J. Canter, 1983. *The Prevalence and Incidence of Delinquent Behavior, 1976–1980*. Boulder, Colorado, Behavioral Research Institute.

Elliott, Delbert S., and David Huizinga, 1985. "The relationship between delinquent behavior and ADM problems." Proceedings of the ADAMHA/OJJDP research conference on juvenile offenders with serious drug, alcohol, and mental health problems. Washington, D.C., OJJDP.

Elliott, Delbert S., and Barbara Morse, 1985. "Drug use, delinquency, and sexual activity." In C. Jones and E. McAnarney eds. *Drug Abuse and Adolescent Sexual Activity, Pregnancy, and Parenthood*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

Elliott, Delbert S., David Huizinga, and Barbara Morse, 1986. "Self-reported violent offending: A descriptive analysis of juvenile violent offenders and their offending careers." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 1, 4: 472–514.

Elliott, Delbert S., Franklyn W. Dunford, and David Huizinga, 1987. "The identification and prediction of career offenders utilizing self-reported and official data": 90–121 in John D. Burchard and Sara N. Burchard, eds., *Prevention of Delinquent Behavior*. Beverly Hills, Sage.

Fagan, Jeffrey, Elizabeth Pieper, and Yuteh Cheng, 1987. "Contributions of victimization to delinquency in inner cities." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (forthcoming).

Fagan, Jeffrey, Karen Hansen, and Michael Jang, 1983. "Profiles of chronically violent delinquents: An empirical test of integrated theory of violent delinquency": 91–120 in James Kleugal, ed., *Evaluating Juvenile Justice*. Beverly Hills, Sage.

Forst, Brian, 1983. "The prosecutor's case selection problem: 'career criminals' and other concerns," in Daniel McGillis, Susan Estrich, and Mark Moore, eds., *Dealing with Dangerous Offenders, Volume II*. Cambridge, Harvard University.

Goldstein, Paul J., 1981. "Getting over: Economic alternatives to predatory crime among street drug users": 67–84 in James A. Inciardi, ed., *The Drugs/Crime Connection*. Beverly Hills, Sage.

Goldstein, Paul J., 1985. "Drugs and violent behavior," *Journal of Drug Issues* (Fall): 493–506.

Goode, Erich, 1970. *The Marijuana Smokers*. New York: Basic Books.

Hanson, Bill, George Beschner, James M. Walters, and Elliott Bovelle, 1985. *Life With Heroin: Voices From the Inner City*. Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books.

Huizinga, David, 1986. "Relationships between delinquent and drug-use behaviors in a national sample of youths": 145–194 in Bruce D. Johnson and Eric D. Wish, eds., *Crime Rates Among Drug Abusing Offenders*. New York, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Huizinga, David, and Franklyn W. Dunford, 1985. "The delinquent behavior of arrested individuals." Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Las Vegas, Nevada, April.

Huizinga, David and Delbert S. Elliott, 1986. "Reassessing the reliability and validity of self-report delinquency measures." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 2, 4: 292–327.

Huizinga, David and Delbert S. Elliott, 1987. "Juvenile offenders: Prevalence, offender incidence, and arrest rates by race." *Crime and Delinquency* 33, 2: 206–223.

Inciardi, James A., 1979. "Heroin use and street crime." *Crime and Delinquency* July: 335–46.

Inciardi, 1986. *The War on Drugs. Heroin, Cocaine, Crime and Public Policy*. Palo Alto, California, Mayfield Publishing Company.

Inciardi, James A., and Anne E. Pottieger, 1986. "Drug use and crime among women narcotics users: An empirical assessment." *Journal of Drug Issues* 16, 1: 91–106.

Jessor, Richard, 1982. "Critical Issues in Research on Adolescent Health Promotion" in T.J. Coates, A.C. Peterson, and C. Perry, eds., *Promoting Adolescent Health*. New York, Academic Press.

Johnson, Bruce D., 1973. *Marijuana Users and Drug Subcultures*. New York, Wiley-Interscience.

Johnson, Bruce D., and Ansley Hamid, 1987. "Critical dimensions of crack distribution." Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Montreal, Canada, November.

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, Massachusetts, Lexington Books.

Johnson, Bruce D., Barry Glassner, Julia Loughlin, and 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., 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.

Johnson, Bruce D., and Eric D. Wish, 1986b. "Highlights from Research on Drug and Alcohol Abusing Criminals." Summary report to the National Institute of Justice. New York, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Johnson, Bruce D. and Eric D. Wish, 1987. *Criminal Events Among Seriously Criminal Drug Abusers*. Final Report to the National Institute of Justice. New York: Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.

Johnston, Lloyd D., Patrick M. O'Malley, and Jerald G. Bachman, 1985. *Use of Licit and Illicit Drugs by America's High School Students, 1975–1984*. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Johnston, Lloyd D., Patrick M. O'Malley, and Jerald G. Bachman, 1986. *Drug Use Among American High School Students, College Students, and Other Young Adults, National Trends Through 1985*. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Kandel, Denise B., 1984. "Substance abuse by adolescents in Israel and France: A cross-cultural perspective." *Public Health Reports* 99, 3: 277–283.

Kandel, Denise B., and John A. Logan, 1984. "Periods of drug use from adolescence to young adulthood: I. Periods of

risk for initiation, continued use, and discontinuation." *American Journal of Public Health* 74, 7: 660–666.

Kandel, Denise B., Debra Murphy, and Daniel Kraus, 1985. "Cocaine use in young adulthood: Patterns of use and psychosocial correlates": 70–110 in Nicholas J. Kozel and Edgar Adams, eds., *Cocaine Use in America*. Research Monograph 61. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Kandel, Denise B., and Kazuo Yamaguchi, 1985. "Developmental patterns of use of legal, illegal, and medically prescribed psychotropic drugs from adolescence to adulthood": 193–235 in C.L. Jones and R. J. Battjes, eds., *Etiology of Drug Abuse: Implications for Prevention*. Research Monograph 56. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Kandel, Denise B., Mark Davies, Dan Kraus, and Kazuo Yamaguchi, 1986. "The consequences for young adulthood of adolescent drug involvement." *Archives of General Psychiatry* 43: 746–754.

Kandel, Denise B., Ora Simcha-Fagan, and Mark Davies, 1986. "Risk factors for delinquency and illicit drug use from adolescence to young adulthood." *Journal of Drug Issues*, Winter: 67–90.

Kandel, Denise B., and Kenneth Andrews, 1987. "Processes of adolescent socialization by parents and peers." *International Journal of Addictions* 22, 4: 319–342.

Kandel, Denise B., and Kazuo Yamaguchi, 1987. "Job mobility and drug use: An event history analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 92, 4: 836–78.

Klein, Malcolm W., and Cheryl Moxen, 1986. *Gang Involvement in Cocaine "Rock Trafficking."* Grant Application to the National Institute of Justice. Los Angeles, University of Southern California.

Kozel, Nicholas J., and Edgar H. Adams, eds., 1985. *Cocaine Use in America: Epidemiologic and Clinical Perspectives*. Research Monograph 61. Rockville, Maryland, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Lerner, Steven E., and R. Stanley Burns, 1979. "Youthful phencyclidine (PCP) users," Chapter 14 in George Beschner and Alfred S. Friedman, *Youth Drug*. Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books.

Martin, Susan E. and Lawrence W. Sherman, 1986. *Catching Career Criminals, The Repeat Offender Project*. Washington, D.C., Police Foundation.

Mieczkowski, Thomas, 1986. "Geeking up and throwing down: Heroin street life in Detroit." *Criminology* 24, 4: 645–666.

Miller, Judith D., Ira Cisin, H. Gardner-Keaton, P.W. Wirtz, Herbert I. Abelson, and Patricia M. Fishburne, 1982. *National Survey on Drug Abuse: Main Findings*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Platt, Jerome J, 1986. *Heroin Addiction: Theory, Research and Treatment (second edition)*. Malabar, Florida, Krieger.

Reuter, Peter, 1987. Personal communication based on NIJ-sponsored research in progress.

Reuter, Peter, and Mark A.R. Kleiman, 1986. "Risks and prices: An economic analysis of drug enforcement": 289–340 in Michael Tonry and Norval Morris, eds., *Crime and Justice* 7. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Rosenbaum, Marsha, 1981. "Women addicts' experience of the heroin world: Risk, chaos, and inundation." *Urban Life* 10(1) 1: 65–91.

Rosenbaum, Marsha, 1982. "Getting on methadone: the experience of the woman addict." *Contemporary Drug Problems*, spring: 113–143.

Rosenbaum, Marsha, and Sheigla Murphy, 1984. "Always a junkie?: The arduous task of getting off methadone maintenance." *Journal of Drug Issues* (summer): 527–552.

Ross, Robert R. and Paul Gendreau, 1980. *Effective Correctional Treatment*. Toronto, Canada, Butterworths.

Sanchez, Jose E., and Bruce D. Johnson, 1987. "Women and the drugs-crime connection: Crime rates among drug-abusing women at Rikers Island."

Journal of Psychoactive Drugs 19, 2: 205–216.

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

Simcha-Fagan, Ora and Joseph E. Schwartz, 1986. "Neighborhood and delinquency: An assessment of contextual effects." *Criminology* 24, 4: 667–695.

Single, Eric and Denise Kandel, 1978. "The role of buying and selling in illicit drug use": 118–128 in Arnold S. Trebach, Ed., *Drugs, Crime, and Politics*. New York: Praeger.

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

Speckart, George and M. Douglas Anglin, 1986b. "Narcotics use and crime: An overview of recent research advances." Presented to Drugs, Alcohol, and Crime Conference, sponsored by National Institute of Justice, San Francisco, California.

Springer, J. Fred, Joel Phillips, and Lynne Cannady. *The Effectiveness of Selective Prosecution by Career Criminal Programs*. Executive Summary. Sacramento, California: EMT Associates.

Spunt, Barry J., Paul J. Goldstein, Douglas S. Lipton, Patricia Bellucci, Thomas Miller, Nilda Cortez, Mustapha Khan, and Andrea Kale, 1987. "Systemic violence among street drug distributors." Presented at American Society of Criminology, Montreal, Canada, November.

Waldorf, Dan, Shiegla Murphy, Craig Reinarman, and Briget Joyce, 1977. "An Ethnography of Cocaine Snorters." Washington, D.C., Drug Abuse Council.

Waldorf, Dan, 1987. "Business practices and social organization of cocaine sellers." Presented at the American Society of Criminology, Montreal, Canada, November.

Watters, John K., Craig Reinarman, and Jeffrey Fagan, 1985. "Causality, context, and contingency: Relationships between drug use and delinquency." *Journal of Contemporary Drug Problems* (December).

Weibel, Wayne, 1986. Personal communication.

Weis, Joseph G. and John Sederstrom, 1981. "The prevention of serious delinquency: What to do?" Washington, D.C., National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Wexler, Harry K. and Douglas S. Lipton, 1985. "Prison drug treatment: The critical 90 days of re-entry." Presented at American Society of Criminology, San Diego, California, November.

Wexler, Harry K. and Ronald Williams, 1986. "The 'Stay 'N' Out' therapeutic community: Prison treatment for substance abusers." *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs* 18, 3: 221–230.

Wexler, Harry K., Douglas S. Lipton, and Bruce D. Johnson, 1988. "A criminal justice strategy for treating drug offenders in custody." Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice, forthcoming.

Williams, Terry M., and William Kornblum, 1985. *Growing Up Poor*. Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books.

Wish, Eric D., Mary A. Toborg, and John P. Bellassai, 1987. "Identifying Drug Users and Monitoring Them During Conditional Release." Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice.

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., and Bruce D. Johnson, 1986. "The impact of substance abuse on criminal careers": 52–88 in Alfred Blumstein, Jacqueline Cohen, Jeffrey A. Roth, and Christy A. Visher, eds., *Criminal Careers and "Career Criminals."* V. II. Washington, D.C., National Academy Press.

*U.S. G.P.O. 1988-202-045:80016