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CHAPTER I

PROBLEM AND PURPOSE

A current dilemma confronting the criminal justice system concerns the development of a unified program to deal with the narcotic dependent person. On the one hand, the criminal justice system is designed to protect the public; at the same time, a comprehensive approach must be undertaken to provide treatment alternatives to those offenders addicted to opiates (NDATC 1976). Long-term experimentation is required to determine at what point in the criminal justice process the addict offender should be differentiated from the non-addict offender for diversion or treatment. Of more immediate concern is whether general distinctions can be made between addict and non-addict offenders from the viewpoint of

1 Narcotic addiction is a complex condition surrounded by controversy. Much of the controversy centers on the lack of precision in explaining physical dependence (National Commission of Marijuana and Drug Abuse 1973). This paper agrees with the World Health Organization's suggestion that "dependence" is the preferable terminology prefixed by the particular drug of concern, in this case opiates. On the other hand, opiate dependence as a literary restraint becomes unwieldy given the focus of this research effort. As will become clear, the subjects are, for the most part, street users. Furthermore, as street addicts, the drug of choice (Rubington 1967) is almost exclusively heroin. Many of the studies in this area utilize various nomenclature when referring to them. As a result, it is beneficial to use the terms heroin and narcotic addiction and opiate dependence interchangeably. Such an approach facilitates the use of descriptive material and research citations.
potential risk to society.

It is the intent of this study to determine whether differences exist between the addict offender and non-addict offender in the types of crime committed, especially those crimes considered violent. A multifaceted approach to types of crime will examine whether addict and non-addict offenders differ in the commission of those crimes of a person and/or violent nature from both a legal and behavioral perspective. In addition, this study will explore the impact of certain demographic and background characteristics on the relationship of addiction to violent crimes. A secondary purpose of this project will be to evaluate the importance of the findings for social intervention programs.

Introduction

Historically, the narcotic problem has been a law enforcement concern. The American policy was prevention through legal repression and containment (Lindesmith 1966). Such an approach was consistent with the public's view of the addict as a social outcast and not an immediate threat to the community. Today, drug abuse is considered a major social problem (Raab 1973; Eckerman 1971). As recently as 1971 a poll "reported that in the course of the year the illegal use of drugs had risen from seventh place to third place in the American public's list of most important national problems" (Raab 1973:284).
The dramatic shift in public attitude is often attributed to the spread of narcotic use in epidemic proportions\(^1\) (Hunt 1974; Kolodney & Daetz 1970; Raab 1973), and the parallel concern over the increase of youth involvement in the "drug scene" (Blum 1967a; 1969a). More importantly, "the use of heroin . . . had spread to those segments of the youth population who are not expected to be 'alienated' from society" (Raab 1973:284). It became clear that the narcotic problem was no longer confined to a particular geographic location, socioeconomic level, or age group (Eckerman 1971; Glaser 1974; Greenberg & Adler 1974; Akers rev.).

These changes in the drug using population gave rise to a growing alarm over the correlates of narcotic use, particularly crime and violence (Glaser 1974; Eckerman et al. 1971).

The government's response to these developments has been the creation of a comprehensive national policy and a billion dollar "drug-industrial complex" consisting of various federal, state and

\(^1\)An increase of epidemic proportions is supported by certain authors as empirically demonstrable. Yet the measures and populations used may be seriously questioned. It is probably the case that the hidden nature of the problem precludes accurate appraisals (National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse 1973). However, there does seem to be a consensus among knowledgeable sources that some increase in the number of addicts is one source of public fear and awareness. It has also been suggested that the amount of increase may be spurious and actually reflect better identification procedures, the spread to middle class neighborhoods, visibility, etc. (Raab 1974; NDATC 1976).
local drug agencies (National Commission of Marijuana and Drug Abuse 1973). However, recent efforts toward the prevention and control of narcotic abuse have increasingly relied on the participation of the criminal justice system (NDATC 1976). The increasing number of addicts and the parallel rise in crime rates seriously question the effectiveness of a law enforcement approach (NDATC 1976). It is estimated that one of every four offenders has a narcotic problem (California 1974). In order to confront the narcotic addict's involvement in crime, the criminal justice system has been mandated to expand its efforts in the direction of treatment and diversion. A substantial part of intervention is based on current knowledge of the drug-crime issue. A neglected aspect of research on the subject has been the types of crime committed by addicts.

Part of the neglect may be due to a number of studies conducted in the area of crime and addiction prior to the mid-sixties. During the early part of the century, dope fiend myths depicting addicts as crazed persons were prevalent. It was not uncommon to find the media supporting such a subjective overview of narcotics and crime (Brecher et al. 1972; Lindesmith 1940; Schur 1966). Many social scientists became interested in the relationship between addiction and crime to prevent the proliferation of drug fiend myths and the growing number of repressive drug laws. Consequently there is considerable research available to refute any
direct connection between the opiates' chemical action and violent behavior (Blum 1969a; Tinklenberg 1972). On the contrary, opiates are generally characterized by their sedative, depressant actions.

Another reason for the lack of current research in the area is the traditional belief among social scientists that addicts are overwhelmingly property criminals. This belief is based on certain theoretical principles regarding the pharmacological effects of the drug on the body and empirical studies conducted earlier which tend to differentiate the addict from the non-addict criminal. Such a view contradicts the current concern of the public and some government officials over the addict's involvement in serious crime, especially violence (Greenberg & Adler 1974).

While public consensus may be a misleading gauge for problem identification, it may be an indicator of problem impact and changes. It should be recalled that a major reason for the recent display of citizen and official concern was the apparent changes in addict characteristics, particularly youth involvement. In general, when the target population of concern is seen to be unstable, findings must constantly be reevaluated.¹ The addict population is seen to be

¹For a discussion of the possible impact of changes in the target population on results, the reader is encouraged to read Frances Simon's Prediction Methods in Criminology, 1971. While she concentrates on parole prediction, the methodological considerations go beyond the specific subject matter.
unstable because of documented change in demographic characteristics.\textsuperscript{1} Therefore, it would seem that current practices, beliefs or recommendations rooted in earlier research may not be valid today and should be reevaluated.

The criminal justice system assumes the addict to be distinct from the non-addict criminal (NDATC 1976). Yet the basis for this belief is sometimes different among the various components of the criminal justice system. Police may respond to addicts as violent (Blum 1969b) while corrections may parole them on the basis of non-violent tendencies. Given the widespread attention directed towards addicts in the criminal justice system, one must question the traditional basis which distinguishes the addict from his non-addict counterpart.

The Problem and Related Issues

One of the generalizations commonly held among those interested in the field of narcotics and criminality is the belief that addicts commit proportionately more property crimes than non-users. Two sources form a substantial part of this generalization, one empirically based and the other theoretically derived.

\textsuperscript{1}In contrast to the public fears of ever-increasing numbers, extensive documentation exists for the change in addict characteristics, especially the youth involvement (Blum 1967a; 1969b; Greenberg \& Adler 1974; Eckerman 1971).
First, it has become popular to cite "abundant" research (Blum 1967a; 1969b) focusing on this relationship. Although the same citations are usually referred to, they are seldom critically evaluated on the basis of their data.1

A recent study reviewed the data in this area with the intention of comparing the results and reevaluating the conclusions. "A search of approximately 200 sources revealed only four studies containing data amenable to statistical analysis!" (Swezey & Chambers 1974:160). The limitations in the remaining four studies (i.e., sample bias, data sources, etc.) led to the conclusion that "such factors obviously introduce large amounts of uncontrolled variance into the sample; nevertheless these data, as well as those of the other sources, appear to be among the best available" (1974:166). Chambers (1974) and Eckerman et al. (1971) have also noted several methodological shortcomings in earlier studies on narcotics and crime, particularly with regard to sample limitations.

In many instances, studies have been limited by either the selection process or the source of the sample. For example, the utility of treatment programs as a source of narcotic related

---

1Some reviews have noted questionable practices, such as robbery classified as a property crime, and most recognize the discrepancies in the findings. However, few reviews directly evaluate the data base (see Swezey & Chambers 1974 and Greenberg & Adler, 1974 for exceptions).
crime is severely limited since few addicts seek voluntary assistance. Those forced to participate are biased by the selection criteria for admittance. Furthermore, the selection of a control group (if any is used) is usually constructed from another source which jeopardizes comparability. (Swezey & Chambers 1974). The lack of control groups in earlier studies led Eckerman et al. (1971) to observe that while earlier research indicates addicts to be under-represented among violent crimes, such conclusions must be considered tentative.

The theoretical aspect of the property argument is that since a narcotic habit is expensive to support, the object of the crimes committed is to produce revenue in the form of different non-violent property crimes. In addition, pharmacologically, narcotics are seen to have multiple effects characterized by drowsiness and lethargy (Dealing with Drugs, 1972). This implies that many addicts are withdrawn and bored, therefore, the sedative effect of opiates lead some writers to point to the incompatibility of the drug and violent acts. Kolb, in 1925, stated: "All preparations of opium capable of producing addiction inhibit aggressive impulses and make psychopaths less likely to commit crimes of violence. (p. 88). On a more subtle level, Finestone noted that "addiction thus appears to . . . the inclination to violent crime" (1957:77). Such characterizations are not limited to earlier research. Schur, in 1965, presented
similar observations.

But the most significant facts about addict crime in the United States today seem to be that addiction reduces the inclination to engage in violent crimes and that persistent involvement in petty theft or prostitution . . . is an almost inevitable consequence of addiction (p. 139).

It becomes clear that various writers viewed the pharmacological properties of opiates or the subsequent state of addiction as affecting the type of crime committed. The implications were not only directed towards the categories of crime but in some instances specific acts. Maurer and Vogel (1967) indicate that the probability of an addict committing sexual offenses is reduced since opiates tend to suppress sexual desires.

Such arguments are based on the effects of the drug while in the body. It is well documented that withdrawal effects occur if a person is addicted and cannot obtain the drug (National Commission on Marijuana Drug Abuse 1973; Brecher 1972). This withdrawal syndrome is devastating on the person experiencing it. The need for the drug produces an overwhelming desire to obtain it—-it can easily lead to desperation. For instance, in the same study cited above, Kolb recognizes that "the factor most important is the desire to secure the drug in order to avoid the discomfort caused by the lack of it" (1925:75). Kolb assumes the addicts will commit non-violent property crimes to support this desire and need. Subsequently, it can be inferred that non-addicts without the intervening
impact of addiction are more likely to commit violent crimes.

While Kolb, Finestone and others pioneered many advances in the area of narcotics and crime, the relationship implied by the soothing effects of drugs and subsequent action is misleading since both recognize the intense desperation experienced by addicts to secure the drug. In other words, the drug's soothing effects have no logical relationship to the type of crime committed to attain it. There is no evidence available to determine the physiological mood of the narcotic addict when a crime is committed. On the contrary, it would seem that criminal activity occurs when the sedative effect has diminished (Tinklenberg 1972; Glaser 1974). Since it is generally assumed that the crimes committed by addicts are to sustain their habit, it becomes academic whether the acquisition is primarily to obtain the drug's effect or to avoid withdrawal.

A derivative of the traditional belief that addicts will commit non-violent property crimes is that they will commit crimes of acquisition (Dealing with Drugs 1972). Obviously the latter statement is more inclusive than the former. More specifically, it does not address the behavior involved in obtaining the ends nor does it imply the intervening impact of a drug's effect. Depending on the data base, both of these statements may be partially true. Addicts could commit primarily non-violent, property crimes of an acquisitive nature (i.e., burglary, larceny). However, given the
observation that most non-addict criminals also commit crimes of
acquisition (F. B. I. 1975; M. S. P. 1975), the magnitude of any
observed differences become very important in attributing it to a
specific condition (addiction) or situation (cost of habit).

Similarly, another explanation related to habit maintenance
is that addicts, more than non-addicts, must avoid crimes involving
greater risk. Given the studies which show most addicts have been
arrested and incarcerated (Finestone 1957; Inciardi & Chambers
1974) and the observations regarding the withdrawal symptoms of
discomfort, rationality and desperation, the strength of the argument
rests on comparative findings with a group of non-addict criminals.
Operating on a rational model, the non-addict as well as the addict
seeking gain would select the least risky yet sufficiently productive
alternative.

Each of these perspectives share a premise relating an aspect
of addiction (habit maintenance) to a category of crimes. Yet the
terminology is not interchangeable. Acquisition may or may not
involve violence (robbery vs. burglary). It has become common
practice to combine studies using modified terminology to describe
the addict's involvement in crime. The confusion is compounded
by those studies which use violent and/or person offenses as
synonymous terms when examining types of crime. Such a proce-
dure is justified only if the specific crimes involved are identical.
Yet the terms person and violent are seldom defined and classification systems vary widely. Subsequently it becomes difficult to describe the addict's involvement in violent crimes from earlier data bases, especially from the viewpoint of how they differ from non-addict criminals.

The distinction between the addict and non-addict criminal are further weakened by certain methodological and conceptual practices. One issue in defining types of crime is the proper classification of robbery as either a property, person or violent crime.

Robbery as a type of crime plays a major role in the area of addiction. It is one of the most frequently committed offenses by addicts (Eckerman 1971; Greenberg & Adler 1974). The magnitude of any observed differences between addicts and non-addicts are minimized by the categorization of robbery as a property crime.

The UCR, which is often used in criminological research, categorizes it with violent crimes. Although controversy surrounds the UCR classification of robbery, it becomes minimal when the purpose and definition for inclusion is considered. The National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence noted, "It classifies homicide, rape, robbery and assault as 'violent' crimes because they involve

---

1The UCR, Kozel (1974) and Eckerman (1971) all provide the classification systems used to determine person/violent crime. Yet none of them consist of the same offenses.
the doing or threatening of bodily injury" (Crimes of Violence 1966: Ch. 22).

Those who classify robbery as a property crime base their classification on the ends, NOT the means of the action. Since the consequence of robbery is acquisition, the potential violence involved is not considered (Gould 1974:73).

Such a position becomes tenuous when the possible implications are examined. For instance, Blum mentions a study where rape is not considered violent because it involved the theft of sex (1969:73). Such extensions of acquisition through reductionism whereby a series of complex actions are limited to one aspect of it jeopardizes the utility of the findings. However, to assume that all robberies are violent in nature would be just as erroneous. In some cases, robbery is legitimately classified as a property crime. An excellent example is purse snatching. Yet the discrepancy involved with the various forms of robbery is a fault of classificatory systems that do not differentiate degrees of behavior (Eckerman 1971).

Excluding these exceptions, more recent studies are recognizing the threat of violence or assault as reasons for including it under person/violent crimes (Inciardi & Chambers 1974; Kozel 1972).

A recently released study by the Vera Institute of Justice provides a poignant description of robbery and its impact on public perception.
For most citizens, "robbery" conjures up a frightening set of images: street muggings, retail stick-ups and other incidents in which a threatening stranger confronts and demands money from a terrified victim. It is a crime of violence—stealing by force or threat of injury—and because the robber is thought to be a predatory rather than a spontaneous criminal, he may be the archetypal "real" violent felon in the public imagination (1977:63).

Of interest is the observation that robbery is the only crime of violence primarily directed at strangers. It is seldom, if ever, victim precipitated or victim controlled. Because of the discrepancies involved with robbery classifications, this thesis suggests that the most appropriate procedure depends on both the definition of person and violent crimes used and the intentions or purpose of the study.

Directly related to the conceptual problems surrounding robbery is the general procedure of crime measurement. In areas of deviance, especially crime, researchers have traditionally been forced to rely on arrest records or other "official" legal sources. Many of the studies that found addicts commit proportionately more crimes against property than non-users were based on arrest sheets or records that simply list the crime. Discrepancies occur on a large basis between official statistics and the actual crime. It is incorrect to assume that an arrest or conviction on a rap sheet necessarily reflects the context of the crime. To list crimes committed by addicts on a register and divide them among property versus person offenses as an indication of seriousness is tenuous.
(Eckerman 1971; Swezey & Chambers 1974). In other words, the behavior involved in a crime is not necessarily reflected in what the offender is charged with or convicted of. For instance, in a recent review of 30 crimes of larceny from a person which is traditionally classified as a property crime under larceny, 95% were assaultive in nature. It is a common procedure to plea bargain from a robbery to a larceny. A more extreme example may occur in the case of rape. Frequently, it is difficult to obtain a victim's cooperation because of the ramifications of a public trial. However, if there are multiple charges in connection with the offense (i.e., a person breaks into an apartment and rapes a woman resulting in a B & E and rape), the state may continue prosecution on the B & E and obtain a conviction. As a result, in certain instances a property crime may be assaultive. More importantly, a key variable such as robbery could be underestimated. While the impact on general criminological research may be minimal, it could be critical for addiction and types of crime.

The preceding discussion suggests that the basis for the belief that addicts will commit substantially more property crime than non-addicts is questionable. Without a clear theoretical argument, the distinctions between addict and non-addict criminals are primarily of an empirical nature. Yet it has been shown that the data base for current generalizations is also questionable. It is
the intention of this study to reassess the empirical basis for the
relationship of addiction to crime from the viewpoint of whether
addicts differ from non-addicts in certain types of crimes committed.

The particular category of crimes demanding most attention
are those commonly referred to as violent. It was shown earlier
that while a majority of the research in this area indicates addicts
are underrepresented among violent crimes, the lack of a compar­
able control group restricts the ability to differentiate them from
non-addict offenders. Eckerman (1971) has noted that

The issue which should be of concern in all studies is not
whether users of various drugs commit serious crimes,
particularly of a violent nature, because this is an estab­
lished fact. The overriding question is do drug users of
whatever drug variety commit a disproportionate number
of serious crimes when compared to non-drug users?
(p. 18)
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

There is a general consensus that no direct causal relationship exists between narcotics and crime (National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, 1973). Twentieth Century research has virtually eliminated a clear, simplistic causal model based on direct behavioral effects. At the same time, it has clarified those properties of opiates which may contribute to or determine the relationship with crime. A major concern surrounds the psychological and pharmacological reinforcement potential and the risk liability opiates present to both, the individual and society (National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse 1973).

The continued use of a narcotic leads to tolerance and dependence. While physical dependence is characterized by the presence of withdrawal symptoms when opiates cannot be obtained, tolerance is the development of tissue resistance to the effects of opiates so that larger doses are required (Dealing with Drug Abuse 1972; Irwin 1973). It is the fear of withdrawal that will most likely force an addict to resume its use at any cost (Lindesmith 1965; Winick 1967). Because the drug must be purchased, the increased amount has obvious monetary implications.
Psychological dependence, on the other hand, represents the continual desire or craving for the drug because of its perceived positive effects. Because of the direct reinforcement of the drug on the central nervous system, the drug-risk liability is high.

From a historical and contemporary viewpoint, these pharmacological considerations have focused attention on the indirect results of opiates (i.e., withdrawal), as opposed to the immediate effects of their use (i.e., sedation). Given the physiological need for narcotics in an addict, it is not surprising to find that many perspectives center on the satisfaction of this need (Lindesmith 1965; Blum 1969a; Glaser 1974). In addition, these perspectives invariably identify another element of the narcotics/crime phenomena--American drug legislation.

The laws governing narcotic use generally label any narcotic-related behavior as criminal. Although it is legal to be an addict (Robinson v California 1962), it is illegal to possess or sell narcotics. The previous discussion on addiction and the risk liability of narcotics indicates an interesting situation has developed whereby social policy reinforces criminal behavior. Because of the addicting qualities of the drug, users are forced to obtain the drug through illegal channels. The addict is drawn into an environment that many times encourages criminal behavior (Rubington 1967; O'Donnell 1966; Schur 1965).
The introduction of these pharmacological and legal dimensions into the addict-crime debate demonstrates the complex nature of the relationship. These considerations have also led to substantial agreement in the literature that a strong, indirect relationship exists between narcotics and crime (National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse 1973; Maurer & Vogel 1967).

Criminal Behavior

Because of the physiological need for the opiates and the legal restraints on use, a prominent theme in the literature concerns the process of acquiring and possessing the drug (Glaser 1974; Tinklenberg 1972; Rubington 1967; Winick 1967; O'Donnell 1966).

One of the earliest characterizations of procurement was by Leon Kolb. Kolb (1925) maintained that opiates did not induce violent behavior. At the time, he was presenting evidence to contradict the legal and public conceptions of the drug's direct behavioral effects. In addition, Kolb argued that the apparent increase in heroin addiction was the result of law enforcement which made possession a prisonable offense. The pioneering work by Kolb had an impact on subsequent literature in this area (Maurer & Vogel 1967). Many studies have pointed to the observation that heroin addicts are often victims of a harsh legal system (Lindesmith 1965; King 1974; ABA and AMA 1961).

Incorporating the physiological, legal and criminal dimensions,
some authors are able to specify the indirect relationship narcotics may have with crime. A schematic representation of the literature is seen in Figure 1.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{drug in body} &= \text{lethargy; pleasurable reinforcer} \\
\text{continuous use} &= \text{physical & psychological dependence} \\
\text{lack of the drug} &= \text{severe withdrawal symptoms} \\
\downarrow & \text{strong need has developed} \\
\downarrow & \text{acquisition (illegal purchase of the drug)}
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 1. The Physiological, Legal, and Criminal Elements of Narcotic Use

Because the use or possession of a narcotic is illegal, acquisition entails criminal behavior (O'Donnell 1966). The types of crime included in such a scheme would be drug offenses.

Many authors point to certain methodological and conceptual consequences of addressing drug-related offenses. Because of the precarious legal position of the addict, he may become involved in two sets of crime (Glaser 1974). One distinct set of crimes evolve from the possession or use of a narcotic. These do not require a victim and therefore may be classified as victimless crimes. The second set of offenses may be classified as street crimes. These are the traditional offenses which require a victim.
and criminal action. Regarding the former, it has been noted that "since all addicts are, by definition, violators of narcotic laws, arrest and conviction on this charge does not imply any further criminality" (Greenberg & Adler 1974:239). In addition, these violations present a bias in those studies comparing addicts with non-addicts since it is unlikely that a non-addict will be found guilty of possession with intent to use. In order to gauge the addict's involvement in particular types of crime, current practice suggests that those offenses which result from being defined an addict (i.e., possession of a narcotic) be controlled or eliminated when examining types of crime (Blum 1967a; Greenberg & Adler 1974; Eckerman 1971). The proper focus of attention should be on those crimes which are commonly referred to as non-drug offenses. Although such a procedure has an impact on the literature in that some earlier studies included drug offenses when determining the relationship between addiction and types of crime, it also provides support for the position of Kolb and others. Procurement may or may not involve criminal activities if drug offenses are excluded.

A primary reason for the prominence of the acquisition argument in the literature is that it allows for both drug and non-drug offenses (i.e., narcotic possession vs. burglary) to occur. Many studies have concluded that the addict is heavily involved in non-drug offenses (Dealing with Drug Abuse 1972; Winick 1967; Plair &
Jackson 1970). Extension into criminal activity often surrounds the monetary implications of addiction.

It is well documented that a heroin habit is expensive to maintain (Cushman 1971; Glaser 1974; Preble & Casey 1969; Eckerman 1971; Winick 1967). In some instances, costs may reach $100 or more a day (Tinklenberg & Stillman 1970; Glaser 1974). Therefore acquisition becomes difficult on a consistent basis. Under these conditions, many studies view criminal activity as the means for obtaining the necessary money (Dai 1970; Schur 1965; Glaser 1974; Pescor 1943; Duvall 1963). These observations extend the acquisition schema to include non-drug offenses (see Figure 2).
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**Figure 2. Acquisition Through Non-Drug Offenses**

Because of the recurrent need produced by addiction, the involvement in crime becomes extensive. Such an observation is supported by the economics of the black market network. It often requires five times as much merchandise to produce the necessary
monetary funds (Cushman 1971). For example, $50 worth of stolen goods would be needed to raise $10 in currency. Subsequently, the proponents of this reasoning continue the acquisition argument into the realm of types of crime committed. They are property crimes committed to purchase the drug. The narcotic addict will commit burglaries and larcenies with the intention of fencing the goods to obtain the necessary funds for a drug purchase.

Additional support for the acquisition through property crimes argument is also found in studies describing the addict's "lifestyle." The traditional description is the addict as a cowardly, withdrawn person. Because of his passive nature and the fear of confrontation, he is more apt to steal or commit petty property crimes to sustain his habit (Kolb 1925; Maurer & Vogel 1967; AFA/AMA 1961; Schur 1966). Another more contemporary description focuses on the addict's fear of detection. Because of the continual need of opiates, the addict avoids crimes involving a greater risk of detection or confrontation (Gould 1974; Plair & Jackson 1970). Property crimes involve less risk than violent or person offenses.

While these studies offer a rational approach to the addict's involvement in crime, the schema breaks down when some researchers infer a causal function on the type of crime. It should be kept in mind that causal is not used in the sense that the drugs' properties necessitate criminal behavior. Rather, forced into a criminal
subculture where immediate cash is necessary on a consistent basis, then the drugs' chemical effects in the body select the type of crime committed.

For instance, certain authors view the pharmacological effect of opiates while in the body (i.e., sedation) as a contributer or determinant of later criminal behavior (i.e., property crimes) (Kolb 1925; Finestone 1957; Schur 1965).

Overall the acquisition through property crimes argument provides a coherent method of tracing the literature development. More importantly, it provides a conceptual framework within which types of crime can be more fully understood and examined. Yet it would be misleading to suggest that all authors and researchers followed this format of reasoning in its entirety when conducting studies.

Some of the literature on the subject of narcotics and crime bears directly on the type of crime committed without necessarily inferring a relationship to the drug itself. They are usually described as property crimes such as burglary or theft. These studies are more empirically based and do not emphasize the motivation for procurement (Tinklenberg 1972).

The literature emphasis on the kinds of property crimes differs among reports with much of it reflecting a time period differential and changing views of the addict. The characterization of the
addict as a cowardly, withdrawn individual involved in petty theft has evolved into a view of the addict as a frantic, economic person. Preble's interesting description of a heroin user's life is in sharp contrast to earlier ones.

They are actively engaged in meaningful activities and relationships seven days a week . . . they are aggressively pursuing a career . . . . He is hustling (robbing and stealing), trying to sell stolen goods, avoiding the police, looking for a heroin dealer . . . . (1969:2)

Although the types of crimes remain mostly property in nature, the petty thievery is replaced by burglary, larceny and robbery.

It is interesting to note that the incidence of robberies gains significant attention throughout these descriptions. First in terms of its person/property element and second in terms of its apparent magnitude. Eckerman noted the precarious position of robbery in his study. "Only in the case of robbery, an offense variously listed as a Serious Crime Against the Person or a Property Crime, were 'Drug Users' more frequently charged" (1971:377). As a result, the addict's involvement in money-producing crimes or crimes of acquisition does not preclude violence.
Violent Behavior

In many ways, Kolb's article in 1925 and much of the previous literature on narcotics and crime was an attempt to focus attention on the scientific rather than the public opinion aspects of opiates. These studies evolved from the "dope fiend" myths (Ausubel 1958) and the legal persecution of addicts (Lindesmith 1965). The present literature concerning the violence relationship, however, differs significantly from earlier characterizations in both nature and content. First, it is not intended to infer a causal or inherent property to the drug or individual. Second, the findings are empirically derived and not mythically created. Yet, the emotionalism alluded to earlier concerning the effects of opiates on types of crimes can also be found in recent literature supporting the violent aspect of heroin addiction. Cushman's frequently cited article, "Methadone Maintenance in Hard-Core Criminal Addicts," (1971) is a very interesting example. Whereas Kolb (1925) and Finestone (1957) refer to the effects of heroin as an inhibitor to violent tendencies, Cushman appears to support the opposite position. "Expensive, violent, and criminal while using heroin, the patients change significantly after methadone" (p. 1774). It would seem that just as the earlier researchers were attempting to "sell" an idea, Cushman was trying to "sell" a program. The impact on type of crime (as opposed to personality features) is also made quite clear when he points out
that "an additional important dividend (as a result of methadone maintenance) to society was the cessation of violent crimes committed . . . ." (p. 1773).

A physiological basis has been cited for those proponents of violent tendencies aside from the frequently attacked dope fiend myths. In conjunction with the acquisition schema, interesting deviations occur. It was shown that addicts commit crime to avoid withdrawal and/or maintain their habit. Boshka et al.'s (1966) study with rats experiencing withdrawal distress led them to observe "spontaneous aggression or fighting behavior" (p. 542). While realizing that it is difficult (if not impossible at the present time) to induce drug-related criminal behavior experimentally, the devastating effects of withdrawal in man is quite clear. Ausubel (1958:22) has noted "he is anxious, irritable, and irascibly demanding of drugs." These effects contrast sharply with the lethargic properties of opiates while in the body.

The implications for violence on the basis of non-pharmacological variables has been commented on by Tinklenberg and Stillman in Violence and the Struggle for Existence (1970). While they support particular instances during withdrawal in which addicts may be more assaultive, they also note that "opiate users are likely to be drawn into the criminal world where violence is inherent" (1970:353). Although the physiological controversy can be dismissed
on the basis of a lack of direct evidence for either view, the changing perspectives of the addict which focus on the non-pharmacological aspects of addiction and crime are gaining acceptance (Inciardi & Chambers 1974).

One perspective that has had a tremendous impact on the literature is Preble and Casey's study, *Taking Care of Business* (1969). It was already shown that their discussion of the addict as an active, purposive individual was a direct contrast to the withdrawn, passive characterization.

The changing perspective of the addict in his environment has important implications with regard to the types of crimes committed by him. Preble and Casey's study makes this clear (1969:18) as they address the issue of the evidence supporting the property crime stereotype, "what these figures reveal is not that heroin users avoid crimes of violence as compared to non-addicts, but that they avoid crimes not involving financial gain, such as felonious assault."

They also note an important fact seemingly overlooked by others. "The main advantage of crimes against the person is that the yield is usually money which does not have to be sold at a discount, as does stolen property" (p. 18). Utilizing their figures of fencing (selling stolen goods), the 30% return of goods stolen, in conjunction with recent estimates of the cost of a heroin habit, lends more credence to his observations and conclusion. Returning to the
acquisition schema these interpretations of addict behavior alter the criminal behavior aspects.
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**Figure 4. Acquisition Through Monetary Return**

The change in viewpoint is empirically supported by some recent studies. Kozel et al. in their study of an offender population found that the "findings do not support a view of the addict offender as less likely to commit person crimes than is the non-addict offender" (1972:450).

Another recent report that examined a cohort of addicts over a four-year period found it appears "that crimes against the person are becoming increasingly prominent among addicts" (Stephens & Ellis 1975:486). These findings as well as Preble and Casey's (1969) redefinition of the addict offer a new perspective of the addict when contrasted with previous studies and beliefs in this area. Greenberg and Adler's (1974) extensive review of the literature on types of crime concluded that "contrary to early studies, the most recent evidence suggests that addicts commit primarily those crimes that yield a financial return, regardless of whether they are violent or
not" (1974:261). The appearance of violence has been noted in other areas of narcotics and crime (i.e., California 1971 regarding violent resistance to narcotics' arrests).

Additional information can be gained by looking at robbery. As previously shown, the occurrence of robbery among addicts increases over the years. Even in those studies which show addicts to have a propensity towards property crimes, the issue of robbery plays a critical role. According to Eckerman (1971), over 40% of the current heroin users in Chicago (one of six study sites chosen) were charged with robbery as compared to only 34% of the non-users. This is particularly noteworthy when one considers the fact that narcotic violations accounted for one-quarter of the charges. In addition, the New York study site showed current heroin users having proportionately more serious crimes against the person when robbery was included than the non-users (p. 200).

The issue of robbery was also considered by Kozel et al. (1972) who found no significant differences between addicts and non-addicts with type of crime. They found that "if robbery is excluded from the person category, the difference . . . tended toward significance . . . ." (p. 449). It can be concluded that no statistical significance occurred with or without robbery. However, because of sample attrition caused by the exclusion, severe reservations exist over generalizing the results.
The foregoing discussion has shown some studies which indicate a possible change in addict criminal behavior. This observation can be extended completely by a study mentioned in Greenberg and Adler's (1974:245) review that found a substantial amount of violent criminality among heroin abusers (Patch et al. 1972). In a sample of 829 cases selected from the Boston City Drug Program, it was found that almost half had been charged with violent crimes, most commonly assault and battery. Patch attributes the tenfold increase in index crimes in Boston since 1951 to the involvement of addicts in violent crimes. Gordon (1973:208) also points to an increase in violence. In his study of drug users, it was discovered that "in the narcotic group" offenders for violence rose from 13.3% to 53.2% after drug use \((p < .001)\).

These observations suggest that a change in addict behavior, especially with respect to violent crime, is empirically and conceptually demonstrable. However, it must be kept in mind that those studies indicating more violence occurring among heroin abusers are few in number.

Perhaps the most beneficial result of the more recent views and findings is a more realistic understanding of violence and addiction. Even those researchers who show a significant increase in

---

\(^1\text{Patch et al.'s study conducted in 1972 was not available to this researcher; therefore reliance on the above conclusion must be within the comments by Greenberg and Adler.}\)
violent crimes among heroin users are careful not to attribute the findings to a physiological state (Gordon 1973). In addition, although the acquisition schema accounts for the majority of crimes committed by addicts, it fails to explain the extent of behavior shown (Kozell et al. 1972). Addicts may, to a certain degree, commit violence not directly related to acquisition (i.e., felonious assault).

Since the mid-sixties, the addict's involvement in violent crimes has become primarily an empirical question. Although some studies indicate an increase in violent offenses, a few continue to support traditional findings (O'Connor et al. 1971). Given the lack of consensus in current research and findings, it is surprising to find a strong movement in the literature towards implementing social policy on the basis of traditional beliefs (National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse 1973).

Descriptions of the addict of the 1950's may be quite different from those of the 1960's and 1970's (Inciardi & Chambers 1974; Kolodney & Daetz 1970; Greenberg & Adler 1974). While the period of transition is difficult to specify, changes have been observed in a wide array of variables. Among these are: race (Scher 1966; O'Donnell 1976; Stephens & Slatin 1974); geographic origins and residence (Stephens & Slatin 1974; Blum 1967a); socioeconomic status (Blum 1967a; Kolodney & Daetz 1970); and age (Finestone 1957; Blum 1967a, 1969a; Inciardi & Chambers 1974; Greenberg.
During the first part of the century, the opiate-using population was primarily older whites of all socioeconomic levels. After World War II, a large proportion of lower-class minorities from large, urban areas became visible among the opiate-addicted population. The overrepresentation of lower-class minorities is still noticeable today. The most recent shift in addict characteristics has been the gradual increase of white, middle-class youths since the mid-sixties (Brecher et al. 1972; Akers). The continuous change in addict characteristics has resulted in a mixture of all socioeconomic levels, races and geographical locations (Eckerman 1971; Akers rev.).

Age, as a characteristic of the addict, has received the most attention. The age of addicts has progressively declined over the years (Eckerman 1971; Akers rev.). A possible explanation for the importance of a more youthful target population on types of crime may be found in statistics on violence. National and state data show most violence occurring among the younger (29 and below) offenders. Furthermore, the age categories 20-24 and 25-29 have proportionately more occurrences of certain offenses, i.e., robbery (Uniform Crime Reports 1974; Michigan Uniform Crime Reports 1974). Changes in the addict population may explain the apparent increase in violent behavior (Blum 1969b).
However, a second observation regarding earlier studies relegates such explanation to speculation. Several authors have seriously questioned past methodological practices in the field (Swezey & Chambers 1974; Greenberg & Adler 1974; Chambers 1974). These methodological criticisms extend to sample selection and bias, classification procedures and data collection practices. Subsequently, it is almost impossible to conduct an historical comparison to verify changes in behavior (Swezey & Chambers 1974).

A final limitation on providing an historical or contemporary assessment of the literature is the lack of distinction between those studies focusing on addicts alone as opposed to those studies using control groups. For example Eckerman et al.'s (1971) initial position that addicts are underrepresented among violent crimes when compared to non-users is based on a number of studies that failed to use a control group.

Given these limitations in the literature, the only apparent conclusion at this point seems to be that an overall appraisal is difficult. While it appears that much of the recent literature indicates some change in the types of crime committed, it also suggests any conclusions are at best tentative. Inciardi has summarized this issue (1974:204):

It is generally believed that addict criminality is impersonal and focused on non-violent property crime, when, by contrast, current addict criminality, typically circumscribes a wide variety of both property and personal offenses.
CHAPTER III

STUDY OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The preceding chapters have raised critical issues in the area of narcotics and criminality. Specifically it has been shown that:

1) The data (both in content and source) and theory supporting current generalizations concerning the narcotic addict and property crimes is questionable.

2) Certain methodological and conceptual shortcomings exist in the area of classifying the dependent variable, types of crime (i.e., person offenses). The classification of robbery as a violent or non-violent crime and the impact of plea bargaining on offense categories are generally ignored when classifying types of crime.

3) Confusion occurs over the use of different terminology when explaining addict behavior as a result of addiction. The terms violence, person offenses and crimes of acquisition are seldom defined and often used interchangeably.

4) A lack of separation exists between those findings pertaining to addicts alone and those comparing addicts with a control group. As a result it is difficult to develop an historical appraisal of the literature from the viewpoint of addict and non-addict offender differences.
5) Various discrepancies occur in the literature regarding
the commission of violent acts by narcotic users. Although
earlier research shows addicts underrepresented among
violent crimes, a few recent studies suggest these crimes
are increasing among narcotic addicts (Stephens & Ellis

It is the intention of this study:

1) To provide a descriptive overview of the sample studied
with particular attention towards addict and non-addict
offender differences and similarities.

2) To examine the impact of basic control variables (race,
age, etc.) on any differences that may exist.

3) To provide a test of the hypothesis that no differences
exist between addicts and non-addicts in the commission
of either violent or non-violent offenses. Implied in such
an analysis is whether the categories reflect legal disposi-
tions or actual behavior and whether person-related
crimes are synonymous with violent crimes. Subsequently,
a set of hypotheses will be developed to satisfy these
issues.

In summary, the primary research objective is to determine if
there is a basis for inferring differences between addict and non-
addict involvement in crime. Secondary considerations address the
practical utility of the findings. An examination of correlation ratios and explanatory variables will determine if any observed differences are substantial enough to warrant widespread application of diversionary programs or treatment alternatives solely on the criteria of addiction.

Hypotheses

HYPOTHESIS I: There is no difference between addict and non-addict offenders in the proportion of person or violent offenses committed.

This hypothesis addresses the question raised in the literature as to whether addicts and non-addicts differ in the types of crime committed. However, types of crime are determined by legal dispositions. A degree of imprecision in measurement exists due to legal categorization and definition. While the procedure ensures comparability with existing studies in the field, it ignores the behavior involved in a particular act. Recent innovations in crime measurement (Sellin & Wolfgang 1957) provide assistance in this respect.

The use of the Sellin/Wolfgang scale (1957) will measure the extent to which addicts commit crimes of a violent nature regardless of legal categorization.

HYPOTHESIS II: Addict and non-addict offenders do not differ in the use of violence during the
commission of an offense.

In summary, this study questions if it is possible to differentiate the addict from the non-addict on the basis of type of crime.

Population and Sample

The data used to test these hypotheses are part of a larger project on parole prediction. In this respect, the study may be viewed as a form of secondary analysis. However, the inclusion of selected variables in a large project had the obvious advantage of added resources and thoroughness.

The population considered in this study consisted of all inmates in Michigan paroled from January 1, 1971 through December 31, 1971. The sample represents 50% of the population or 2,200 subjects. The sample was drawn according to random procedures. The size of the random sample was based on the following considerations. First, a pilot study conducted by Douglas McKenzie and James Fairweather in 1974, found that many violent categories such as murder, kidnapping, etc., had few offenders. Second, a large random sample would insure representativeness of the general prison population as well as sufficient observations for statistical analysis. Finally,

1Douglas McKenzie is the Research Director for the Michigan Department of Corrections. James Fairweather is an Assistant Dean at Northwestern University. Although responsibility was shared by all researchers during this process, the author takes full responsibility for the comments and conclusions in this report.
although the criteria for this sample were based on the primary objective of parole prediction, the ramifications for any analysis of narcotic involvement became important. Since narcotic users generally represent approximately 20 to 25% of an institutionalized criminal population and since the present design calls for controlling or excluding narcotic violations, a smaller sample would inhibit statistical analysis. Furthermore, a unique aspect of the present study, as compared to many previous studies, is the random sampling of the inmate population.

A computer printout of all persons paroled in 1971 was obtained from the Bureau of Management Services of the Michigan Department of Corrections. The printout was coordinated with a random numbers table until the sample was completed.

The concentration on 1971 parolees also evolved from research considerations. First, discussions with corrections administrators established that 1970 would be the earliest date that the department's computer data would be reliable. Second, many data sources were not standardized until the late 1960's. Finally, the 1971 parole group would offer a minimum four-year follow-up period as required for parole prediction. A benefit of such a period for this study would be the additional data base mentioned earlier. Such a data base would enable future studies and more refined analysis of the drug offender through time.
In summary, the present study is based on a 50% (2200) random sample of inmates paroled in 1971. It is felt that the sample is representative of the general population of incarcerated offenders. For the most part, the findings should be applicable to both institutional and parolee behavior and characteristics.

**Data Collection**

Data were collected on 360 variables per individual. The magnitude of the task obviously necessitated strict supervision of coding, clear specification of variables, and adequate coder training. The Michigan Department of Corrections offered their full support and resources to the project. As emphasized before, the primary objective of the study was to produce a unique and practical parole prediction model. It can be confidently stated that this project represented the most comprehensive research effort ever initiated by the department. The three full-time researchers in the department were assured complete concentration on the project for variable construction and coding purposes. Furthermore, the department provided temporary separate facilities to prevent distractions during the coding phase. Two large suites were rented for nine months for data collection and five college students and graduates were temporarily hired to assist in the coding. Since various precautions and measures were taken to insure the best available data, a review of the data collection steps follows.
1. A sample of the 1971 parolee population files were pulled from the central office by the research staff for a pilot test of the variables. After the files were coded according to the variable list, they were closely examined in light of the following considerations:
   a) Is there sufficient information to code the variables?
   b) Is it specific enough to be considered reliable and valid?
   c) What were the best sources available in lieu of conflicting remarks?

2. The variables were revised according to the following procedures:
   a) Although a variable might have been deemed extremely useful, it was not retained unless it could be confidently found in the files. For example, assaultive family history, although very evident when reported (i.e., my father and mother constantly beat me), was not found in many cases where it could be reasonably suspected but was not clearly stated.
   b) If there were insufficient data or lack of information regarding a variable of concern, it would be dropped (i.e., a description of past offenses, although the number and type were listed, was not always available).
   c) If the file information was found to produce ambiguous
information leading to an arbitrary decision, the variable was excluded.

Also, extensive notes were taken during the pilot test to indicate other parallel or unique variables as well as shortcomings inherent in existing variables. After a review of the notes and coding sheets, a revised manual was designed. It should be pointed out that previous interviews with correctional personnel, as well as the pilot experience, resulted in a listing of primary and secondary data sources for each variable. Specific applications to the variables examined in this study will be presented in the next section.

3. A training session was held for the hired coders and each variable was examined.

4. Data collection did not begin until coder reliability was established. In most variables, no discrepancies occurred. However, on certain variables a minimum of 90 - 95% coder reliability was considered acceptable. Furthermore, coder reliability and training was initiated for each set of variables (preinstitutional, institutional and parole).

5. All researchers were assigned one or two coders for questions or problems.

6. Periodic meetings between the researchers were held and variables were redefined or specified to prevent arbitrary decisions.
The above description is a general overview of the data collection process leading to the development and implementation of the final coding manual.

Another aspect directly related to data collection was that all files on a person were requested. Since anyone, other than a first offender, could have multiple files from prior offenses, provisions were made with the Records Division of the Department of Public Health to ship all discharged files to the coding rooms. Such a procedure aided in the reduction of missing data and a more thorough analysis of the offender's history. In the event that information was not available in the Central Office file, an attempt was made to obtain it from the field or institutional offices. Outside of direct visits to Detroit, files were requested from all parole offices in the state. Field visits were also made to the State Prison of Southern Michigan (Jackson), the central location for discharged institutional files.

The final result of these data collection procedures was to produce a data base as valid and reliable as possible with the available resources. It is perhaps the largest and most comprehensive data base available in corrections. The variables subject to the present analysis reflect high intercoder reliability from primary sources.

Variables

The following variables were prepared after several discussions and revisions. Three sets of data were used to ensure a
historical as well as contemporary perspective of the subject in relation to them. Besides an explanation and definition of the variables involved, the appropriate data sources (primary and secondary) will be listed also.

Independent Variable:

Narcotic Dependent Person: A narcotic dependent person was defined as anyone addicted to a narcotic-type drug (belonging to the class of opiates) prior to incarceration on the instant offense. In an effort to formalize the definition further, the offender addict and paroled addict was defined "in terms of primary drug addiction. Primary drug addiction refers to a complex behavior pattern associated with the compulsive use of an opiate" (Bailey 1975:419).

Furthermore, following the typology of Bailey, all of the addicts included in this study belonged to the contracultural type. Bailey defined this category of addict as the "street addict" or "criminal addict." The variable would distinguish only those who were addicted from those who were not. Therefore, it was coded as a

---

1It should be noted that all studies in this field experience difficulty with identifying the drug-dependent person. It will become clear that the present study took great pains to obtain a total perspective of the individual before including him in this category. At the same time, the present study agrees with Eckerman (1971) that the possibility of a degree of imprecision may exist in this classification. As a result, studies should be partially evaluated on the efforts taken to reduce such a possibility. Unfortunately, most studies have failed to even provide a definition of the addict.
dichotomous variable. Although the Michigan Department of Corrections Master Tape contains information on "drug problem:" based on a graduated scale 1 to 5, it was believed to be unreliable for various reasons. At one time, a person could be considered addicted to any drug including marijuana. Secondly, a variable based on a scale determined by psychological or physical dependence would lead to many arbitrary decisions. The choice of narcotic addiction only was based on the high risk liability of psychological and physiological dependence. Such an extreme group could be more accurately identified. A narcotic-dependent person would have a "habit" to support which would become obvious through the use of multiple data sources. Although the term narcotics was used in defining this group, it can be confidently stated that heroin addict would be a more accurate description. Because of the nature of the population, most addicts were street users. Heroin as the drug of choice in this category of users is well documented (Winick 1967; Stephens & Slatin 1974; Williams 1975; O'Donnell 1966; Rubington 1967; Greenberg & Adler 1974) and became evident during the data-collection phase. Characteristics of the street "user" have been elaborated upon elsewhere (Bailey 1975; Stephens & Slatin 1974) and need not be commented on further.

In the present study, this variable represented high intercoder reliability and was clear in the data sources. The primary source
was the presence investigator's report that contained a standard section on drug and alcohol problems. The secondary source of treatment interviews was utilized only under specified conditions. For instance, if an earlier presence indicated a heroin habit or a current presence suggested a habit (marks on arm, withdrawal in jail, etc.), the treatment interview was used to verify the active status of the addict or supplement earlier suspicion. In almost all cases, the presence verified a habit. It is unlikely that an addict could "hide" a habit through all these sources and time periods. It should be remembered that an addict's habit can require up to $100 a day to maintain (Tinklenberg & Stillman 1974). Interviews with informants, family and relatives encompass the addict's daily activity and needs and would reveal a problem such as opiate addiction.

Personal Characteristics

Selected demographic data collected during the course of the study will be presented according to group assignment and total sample composition. Tables included will describe the sample involved and offer some indication of the differences and similarities between the groups. For example, levels of education will be presented for addicts and non-addicts. Percentage comparisons will determine if addicts in this sample are better educated or less education than the non-addict offender.
Control Variables

As emphasized throughout this report, the population of narcotic/heroin addicts has changed over the years with regard to certain characteristics. Depending on the studies examined and the years included, a list of such variables could be quite lengthy. Whether such a list is related to "clusters" of addict or the population as a whole is beyond the scope of this report. The variable age is significant in that it is noted continuously throughout the years (Stephens & Ellis 1975; Duvall 1963; DeFleur 1963; Firestone 1957; Blum 1969b; Pescor 1943; Plair & Jackson 1970; Lindesmith 1965; O'Donnell 1966). It also parallels changes in other areas of crime. A specific need to control for age "effects" in relation to crime has been suggested by Stephens and Ellis (1975).

Age: defined as the numerical age attained as of the last birthday. The birthdate year was subtracted from the commitment year to arrive at the age at instant offense. For control purposes, it is collapsed into more meaningful categories reflecting the younger/older composition of the population.

In addition to age, the variables race, marital status and community size of residence will be controlled. The possible impact of these variables on addiction-crime relationships has been suggested by various authors (Blum 1969a; Bailey 1975; Greenberg & Adler 1974; O'Donnell 1966).
Race: defined according to the offender's basic information sheet as White, Black, Indian, Chicano and Oriental.

Size of Residential Community: residence at time of instant offense. The city as specified in the presentence investigation was compared against the 1970 census of Michigan cities.

Marital Status: as described within the marital history section of the presentence at the time of the instant offense.

It can be reasonably assumed from the literature that these variables, particularly age, may have a theoretical and/or empirical association with addiction and crime. As a result, it will be determined if these variables account for or explain any relationship that may exist.

A final methodological procedure in this respect is the elimination of drug offenses. The focus of this research is on non-drug offenses (i.e., robbery vs. possession of a narcotic). By definition a heroin user is a criminal. Since only a heroin user can be convicted of possession with intent to use, it involves an unwarranted bias. Further support for this argument may be found in many studies (Blum 1967; Eckerman 1971; Swezey 1971; Greenberg & Adler 1974).

Drug Offenses: a crime defined solely through the use of a narcotic. The rationale for excluding this variable from the study has already been examined.
Dependent Variables: Violent/Non-Violent; Person/Property/Other; and Use of Violence

Perhaps the most critical aspect of any study examining the relationship between addiction and crime is the dependent variable. For this reason, a lengthy discussion of the rationale, definition and implications of its use follows.

There can be no doubt that any findings and conclusions will be influenced by how person or violent offenses are defined and employed. Yet almost all studies in this area fail to provide the elements of the crime category used or a working definition. Compounding this problem is the multitude of pitfalls involved in classification and data collection. Since some of these issues were discussed earlier, only those problems involved in developing a classification scheme will be presented below.

It has been shown that as many as 90% of certain cases receiving convictions may have involved "plea bargaining." A few authors have used arrest charges as one procedure for eliminating some of these problems. Yet it should be pointed out that because of the nature of the addict criminal, he may be more likely than the non-addict (Inciardi & Chambers 1971) to be arrested. As a result, a dual bias is at work when selecting the source of data. Most of the complications between arrest and conviction cannot be eliminated

---

1The reader is referred to Eckerman's study Drug Usage and Arrest Charges (1971) for an account of the immense problems encountered in summarizing and selecting crime classification systems.
due to the state of the science. They can only be noted as limitations. Since the present study is concerned with the most serious forms of behavior, these limitations do not appear to be a critical issue. However, it is serious when a charge or conviction does not reflect the actual crime. As a result, most studies inaccurately classify many crimes. The issue is made more complex when the crimes are collapsed into broad categories. The most applicable offense category in this regard is robbery.

The specific crime of "larceny from a person" is frequently plea bargained from robbery. In this study, the term robbery was used if in fact the elements of the crime included personal confrontation and assaultive behavior. As a result, the crime "larceny from a person" was coded in the larceny category only in instances such as purse snatching where harm or threat of harm is absent. Larceny from a person was the only offense systematically coded in this procedure. In the general case, where a crime clearly presented itself as a particular offense plea bargained to a lesser non-related charge, it was coded according to the behavior exhibited (i.e., felonious assault, larceny from a building). It must be kept in mind that the major consideration was to prevent an assaultive offense from being coded nonassaultive. The mixture of behavioral analysis with legal categories was necessary for classification purposes and to avoid compromising the practical utility of the findings.
Therefore, although the major problems of misclassification are minimized, a degree of imprecision must exist due to legal categorization. However, a more complete behavioral analysis was conducted using the Sellin/Wolfgang scale when the second research hypothesis was tested.

Another source of error occurs when using person/property dichotomies. Some studies fail to account for "other" categories involving crimes not defined as property or person. Since the interest is in types of crimes committed, the result is a truncated database (i.e., failure to include carrying concealed weapon). The extent to which these crimes are not listed with property crimes invalidates many results.

When misdemeanors and felonies are combined into a classification system without any explanation, classification is not clear. It is difficult to equate a bar fight between friends with a serious assault involving injury. The present study only considered felonies in the State of Michigan.

Finally, most studies examining types of crimes fail to define violence although it is critical when collapsing categories. Because violence is an integral concept related to both dependent variables, it will be discussed before the dependent variables are operationalized.

An in-depth analysis of violent crimes is not attempted.
Instead, the discussion provides an explanation of the research definition used and how it was derived.

The Definition of Violent Crime

For purposes of this report, a violent crime was defined as an act or situation that involved the use of or the threat of force on the victim by an offender to secure one's own end against the will of another; that which results or can result in the death or harm of a person; and/or the creation of a situation in which the life of an individual or groups is in jeopardy of bodily harm through the use of intimidation by an offender. In all violent crimes, the following elements must be present: a) the presence of a direct victim/offender relationship; and b) intimidation through force or the threat of such.

The FBI Uniform Crime Reports include those offenses that involve the doing or threat of bodily injury. The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence stated that "all would probably agree . . . that criminal violence involves the use of or the threat of force on a victim by an offender" (1969 Vol. 11:6). The elements force, the threat of force, and the need for a personal victim were considered essential in developing a working definition for this report. At the same time, exaggerated use of the concept occurs

---

1This definition has been modified from those offered by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (1969 Vol. 11), Abby Berlin (1971) and the Uniform Crime Reports.
in many studies. The present intent is to examine those crimes characterized by violent or nonviolent behavior and as such is not interested in secondary or indirect victims resulting from burglary. In this respect, it would also be profitable to retain some element of a person/property division. Carol Spencer (1966) presented two related definitions of violence in her analysis of the violent offender: actual violence involving bodily injury or attempted bodily injury and potential violence which involved the threat of bodily harm.

Again, although agreeing with the elements included, the concept can be exaggerated in research use. Spencer includes carrying a concealed weapon as indicative of potential violence. While it is obvious that a gun is a potential source of harm if one ignores the time frame of use, it distorts the actual intent of violence contained in criminal acts. When one considers that many, if not most, of those offenders processed through the criminal justice system have been involved in such an offense, it becomes questionable to define it as a violent act. Other considerations in this respect are that the legal statute may include instances of a gun under a car seat regardless of whether the subject is driving or owns the vehicle and whether it is loaded or not. Furthermore, in the City of Detroit, such an act is a common and accepted occurrence. Perhaps the greatest concern is the flexibility of this charge in the arrest and disposition process, especially in plea bargaining.
The present study wanted to control for such liberal uses of the term. On the other hand, some researchers restrict the use of violence to those acts where injury is actually inflicted. Such a process of reductionism is absurd if the intent is to categorize crimes. It systematically reduces violence to the status of a roulette wheel. An act is not violent unless a person is killed or seriously injured. For instance, if a person holds a gun to a victim's head and states, "Give me your money or I'll blow your head off," it is not violent unless he proceeds to do so.

The present study attempted to depict violence as it occurs and is experienced in reality between the extremes noted above. Since the process of classification is based on a behavioral analysis (or acting out behavior), such an approach appears consistent. When examining the use of violence, some discrepancies may evolve from the emphasis on categorizing the violent offender as opposed to a violent crime. This paper is NOT concerned with developing a typology of the violent criminal but with violent crimes committed by an offender group.

Dependent Variable No. 1--Type of Crime: Legal categorization as person/property/other and violent/nonviolent

When examining addiction with types of crime committed, the literature often suggests that addicts tend to commit less person crimes of a nonviolent nature than non-users. In actuality, such
statements are addressing two issues: first, that addicts commit more property crime (or less person offenses) and second, the crimes committed are less violent than non-users. Unfortunately, unless person and violent crimes are defined as synonymous, they cannot be treated the same. Pedophiliacs (child molesters) obviously commit crimes against the person yet are generally considered non-violent. As a result, the above propositions cannot be tested as a single relationship. Since there are numerous systems of classifying person and violent crimes and since none of the authors in this field provide a definition or an explanation of the dependent variable, it is impossible to acknowledge whether they are equating them as the same phenomenon or speaking to two separate dimensions. 2

Past studies have not specified the composition of person crimes nor violent classification systems. As a result, the present study will directly test the hypothesis that addicts tend to commit propor-

---

1To the author's knowledge, this is the first study in the area of addiction and crime that will directly confront the issue of person and violent classification schemes. It examines the terms independently and recognizes inherent differences as well as similarities between the terms. It questions whether they can be used synonymously as a dependent variable.

2Eckerman (1971) was the only author known to this writer to thoroughly discuss the problems associated with determining the seriousness of crimes with existing classification systems and an explanation of his procedure. He used serious crimes against the person. However, when discussing the findings, he states "Non-users (are) charged more often with a combination of crimes of violence" (p. 378).
tionately fewer crimes than nonaddicts in addition to less person offenses.

The categories used to determine types of crime are derived from the traditional classification systems of criminological research (i.e., assault, robbery). However, whenever feasible, crime categories will reflect behavioral content and not legal precedent (although legal categories are used for classification purposes).

Based on the previous definition of violence, the specific offenses were collapsed into violent/nonviolent categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIOLENT</th>
<th>NON-VIOLENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>&quot;Arson&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>Burglary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Larceny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Forgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bribery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malicious Destruction of Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Offenses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 It should be noted that except in the instance of kidnapping, the violent category is consistent with the UCR classification.

2 As stipulated earlier, inclusion within this offense category was the result of a behavioral analysis. Therefore, larceny from persons which were in fact a plea bargain from robbery and included a direct confrontation of a victim were classified robbery and not larceny.

3 As is true of most classification systems and some offense groups, arson contains instances of both assaultive and nonassaultive behavior. For this reason, it is put in italics.
Person/Property/Other

For purposes of categorizing offense groups into Person, Property, and Other criminal classification systems, the Statistical Guide--Offense Category--Sequence of Michigan was used. It was selected because it is consistent with similar schemes and provides a thorough list of specific crimes (Murder I, Murder II, etc.) included within an offense category (Homicide, Assault, etc.) and their appropriate Michigan Criminal Law Act (MCLA) code.

It can be posited that inclusion within a person offense would be the direct involvement of a person as victim in the crime. The primary action of the offense is towards a person. Property crimes would include those crimes that do not necessitate the presence or direct involvement of a person as victim and the primary action is directed at property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENSE AGAINST PERSONS</th>
<th>PROPERTY CRIMES</th>
<th>OTHER CRIMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>Desertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>Gambling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>Int. Legal Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>Int. Public Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Bribery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | Malicious Destruc-
                          | tion          |

The "Other" category is not always included in studies examining criminal relationships with addiction. Furthermore, the exclusion is not explained or accounted for unless it is latently
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included within property offenses. It is impossible to ignore "Other" crimes without truncating the database. If the primary objective is to examine addicts and types of crime, it is necessary to account for those crimes committed. As Eckerman (1971:38) points out, "A number of crimes cannot, of course, be classified within this system (UCR) including those normally designated as crimes without victims."

Dependent Variable No. 2--Use of Violence: Type of crime as a behavioral category

The use of violence differs considerably from the preceding dependent variable, types of crime. First, it is totally derived from a behavioral analysis of the act. Second, the first dependent variable directly addresses the past and present research as stated in the literature. It answers the questions of types of crime in relation to addiction. As such, it must be examined from the perspective of legal categories. The dependent variable, use of violence, examines the role violence plays in the commission of a crime regardless of categorization. It controls for any errors or imprecision resulting from the use of these categories.

A review of past procedures indicated most authors simply list the crimes in the form of a frequency distribution (obtained from another source, primarily "rap sheets") and collapsed them into person and property crimes. As a result, determination of
whether an offense was violent could not be made analytically. In their introduction and/or conclusion, it was assumed person/violent were equated. Inherent in these procedures have been the problems of plea bargaining, legal categories, and the lack of information and variable specification. The first three are frequently the unavoidable consequences of secondary analysis. As a result, the analytic approach to violence was severely limited. Although certain measures were taken in this study to "clear up" the data to a certain extent so that observations were more consistent with reality and robbery was not misclassified, a degree of imprecision must exist due to categorization.

The variable use of violence directly assesses whether a particular act behaviorally analyzed and not legally classified is, in fact, violent or potentially violent in its content. In order to operationalize it, the previous working definition of violence was used. It contained the elements a) the presence of a direct victim/offender relationship, and b) intimidation through force or the threat of force. A component of the Sellin/Wolfgang scale (1964) was utilized as a direct measure of this definition. Although the entire scale has criminological significance, only the component intimidation is used. In their discussion of intimidation, Sellin and Wolfgang explain, "this is an element in all events in which one or more victims are threatened with bodily harm or some other serious consequence for the purpose of forcing
the victim(s) to obey the request of the offender(s) . . . " It can be noted that such a use of the concept is consistent with both--the use of violence in this study and most definitions in the criminological field.

A person experiences intimidation as a component of violence. As used in this study, it is characterized by its directness and nature (threat or occurrence of harm). The comprehensiveness of this approach is exemplified by the following examples: 1) arson, where a person is in the house and the primary target of action, 2) robbery, where the offender confronts the victim, and 3) burglary, where the victim is awakened and confronted by the burglar and threatened. Each of these episodes contains a violent or potentially violent act.

The following examples indicate similar circumstances where violence is not present: 1) burglary, where the person wakes up and the offender flees out of fear of detection (no confrontation or threat), 2) arson, where a store owner burns his building down for insurance, and 3) larceny from a person, where the offender grabs a purse off a counter and flees. More importantly, the definition clearly excludes sex offenses such as gross indecency, where it occurs between two consenting parties. It should be clear by now that many offense categories and specific crimes differ considerably as to the content and nature of the act.

Limitations

A few comments regarding the population studied should be
made. Females were not included due to the small representation in the population. As of December 31, 1970, females constituted 3% of all incarcerated offenders in Michigan. They are also underrepresented in the addict-offender population. Furthermore, few (if any) studies in this area have included females. Besides the reasons stated above, consideration of the effects of sex on any relationship would be necessitated. A final consideration taken into account was the reliability of the data available for females. At the time of this study, female felons were housed at the Detroit House of Corrections (DeHoCo). Since they were supervised locally, data would not be compatible in all areas.

Another aspect to be considered is the nature of the population studied. Most studies in this area concentrate on confined populations. In this respect, the present report does not differ. The use of an offender population appears consistent with the objectives of this study. Besides the concentration on the most serious forms of criminal behavior exhibited by addicts, they also represent the greatest concern of the public and law enforcement. At the same time, the question of how representative an institutionalized sample is must be considered before generalizing to different populations. The problem of representativeness is applicable to any segment of the criminal justice system where findings are based on officially recognized offenders.
The use of a sample in 1971 has both advantages and disadvantages. Most of the reasons for its selection have been stated. An additional advantage directly relevant to addiction was the absence of treatment programs that would encourage probation. In this report, the addict and non-addict offenders should not differ in dispositions given and consequently no bias is suspected. At the same time, parolees in 1971 would generally have committed their offense in 1969. Although this time period is consistent with the most recent research conducted, it cannot address the issue of change within the last seven years.

Finally, the focus of this and other studies on one particular time period (i.e., the time an offender committed the offense) may have certain methodological ramifications. The exclusion of drug offenses may ignore the previous or unknown involvement in non-drug offenses at the time of arrest.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

The purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss the findings as they relate to addiction and types of crime. Specifically, it will compare the commission of crimes of a person/violent nature by addict and non-addict offenders.

The first section will describe the personal and demographic characteristics of the sample. The approach consists of a basic tabular presentation of the data. The demographic data collected include age, education, marital status, race, and city size of residence. Another aspect to be presented is the frequency distribution of instant offense crimes for the addict and non-addict groups. The impact of excluding drug offenses will be discussed in this context. The final section deals specifically with the objectives of this study and will test the hypotheses presented in Chapter III. Since they address the relationship of addicts to crime from different perspectives, they will be analyzed and discussed separately. Included within the analysis of the hypotheses will be a separate discussion of robbery and the impact of the selected control variables age, race, marital status and city size.
Demographic Characteristics

Offender characteristics become more clearly understood if addicts and non-addicts are separated for purposes of analysis. Such a procedure will serve several functions. First, it provides a more accurate description of the "typical offender" with which to compare the addict offender. Second, because addicts usually comprise approximately 25% of an offender population, it is more profitable to compare addicts and non-addicts with percentage distributions thereby standardizing for group size.

At the same time, a separate presentation of the total sample will allow the use of all frequencies thereby eliminating unnecessary confusion. Since the primary emphasis of the section is a descriptive overview of the sample studied with regard to personal and demographic characteristics, it allows a brief opportunity to describe the impact of any differences or similarities of the addict and non-addict on the total offender profile.

Characteristics of Offenders without Regard to Drug Use

Age. The paroled offenders in this study are, for the most part, young. As Table 4.1 illustrates, most offenders are 24 or under (61.4%) with the age category 20 through 24 having the largest single representation (38.5%). The overall youthfulness of the sample is highlighted by the observation that less than 21% of the sample is 30 or over.
The age composition of the sample supports the general arrest and conviction statistics that indicate the under 30 population as more prone to arrest, conviction and subsequent prison disposition.

Table 4.1

Frequency and Percent Distribution of Total Sample*
by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number N</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number N</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 and under</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19 and under</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>24 and under</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>29 and under</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>34 and under</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 40</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>44 and under</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>All offenders</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total sample consisted of 2033 offenders. However, in certain cases, a particular variable could not be obtained or determined and therefore the table totals indicate the amount of missing data.

Race. Because of the small frequencies in categories other than Caucasian and Negro, the variable race was recoded into white and non-white. It was found that non-whites (52%) comprise the majority of the paroled offenders.

Table 4.2

Distribution of Offenders by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Marital Status. The majority of offenders have never been married at the time they committed the instant offense. Those parolees who have been divorced and remarried are included in the married category which represents only 21.5% of the total sample. Although not included in Table 4.3, only 17.9% of the paroled offenders were married for the first time during the instant offense. These findings are probably reflective of both the youthfulness of the offenders and marriage as an indicator of a stable, responsible life pattern (Gottfredson 1965).

Table 4.3

Frequency and Percent Distribution of Total Sample* by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status at Time of Offense</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Law</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total sample consisted of 2033 offenders. However, in certain cases, a particular variable could not be obtained or determined and therefore the table totals indicate the number of missing data.

Education. The majority of offenders in this sample had attained at least a 9th grade education. However, only 11% completed high school. The lack of a formal education corresponds with the general lack of skills often found among this population (Glaser 1969).
Table 4.4

Frequency and Percent Distribution of Total Sample by Formal Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and Percent by Education</th>
<th>Cumulative Number and Percent by Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4 grades</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or other School</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City Size. Table 4.5 supports previous findings (FBI 1976; MSP 1976; MDC 1976) that the majority of offenders come from large cities. In the present sample, 52% were from cities with a population of over 100,000. The largest single group of offenders were from large metropolitan areas of over 500,000 (38.8%). On the other hand, it is interesting to observe that a large proportion of offenders are from small cities and towns. Approximately two offenders in five are from cities with populations of under 50,000.

The above data indicate that the majority of offenders in this sample are young, single and non-white with less than a high school education and originating from large urban cities. It should be noted, however, that race and city size had substantial frequencies in other categories. In both these instances, there is almost a 50/50 chance of the offender being white or from a smaller size city (100,000 or less).
Table 4.5

Distribution of Offenders by City Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>City Size</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000 and under</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>10,000 and under</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>50,000 and under</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - 100,000</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>100,000 and under</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 - 250,000</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>250,000 and under</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,001 - 500,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>500,000 and under</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 500,000</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>All offenders</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of Addicts and Non-addicts

The precise nature of the addict offender as part of the larger aggregate of incarcerated individuals is not clearly understood. Their contrast with the non-addict counterpart and the subsequent influence on total group composition is the subject of this section.

A review of Table 4.6 shows the differences and similarities between the addict and non-addict groups. Although differences emerged on all characteristics, the groups are most similar in terms of age, education and marital status. The addicts are slightly younger and better educated.

By comparison, the most significant differences occur among the groups with respect to racial composition and city size (p < .001)

1Because of the sample size, most characteristics were significant at the .05 level. For this reason, attention is focused on differences of such a magnitude as to have an impact on total sample composition. For instance, although age was significant as categorized,
Table 4.6

Personal and Social Characteristics of Addict and Non-addict Offenders (in percents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Addict N = 479</th>
<th>Non-addict N = 1553</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 or younger</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or older</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 or less</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 through 11</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 or more</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated or Divorced</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - less than 10,000</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 10,000 to 50,000</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 50,000 to 100,000</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 100,000 to 250,000</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 250,0001 to 500,000</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - greater than 500,000</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with addicts being overrepresented among minorities and coming from large urban areas (over 500,000). The most interesting finding in this regard is the influence of the addict group on the traditional view of the typical offender. He is usually viewed as originating from large, industrial cities. If addicts are excluded from the offender sample, it results in the majority of offenders coming from cities of 100,000 or less. The same observation can be made with race. Excluding those offenders with drug addiction problems, the majority of offenders are white. While the overrepresentation of non-white offenders from large urban areas among addicts is consistent with previous findings (Blum 1967a, Blum 1969b), it raises an issue regarding the impact of specific behavioral dependencies (i.e., heroin, alcohol, etc.) on the ecology of crime. It also supports the contention that addiction is more often found in areas where other social problems are concentrated (Blum 1967; Nurco 1972).

The occurrence of addiction by race indicates that among white offenders only a small proportion (12.2%) have a narcotic problem. By comparison, approximately one of three (34%) non-white offenders are addicted to narcotics. The concentration of addiction among non-whites supports the previous conclusion. An

its meaning was obscured by the fact that both groups are predominantly young.
examination of those offenders originating from large urban areas of over 500,000 population indicated over 37% were addicts. City size does appear to increase the likelihood of an offender having a narcotic problem.

**Drug Offenses**

Throughout this report it has been recommended that drug offenses be controlled or eliminated from the sample. As the literature review suggested, the proper emphasis for examining addict and non-addict criminal involvement should be on non-drug offenses (Eckerman 1971; Greenberg & Adler 1974). Subsequently all addicts and non-addicts\(^1\) convicted of a drug offense will be excluded from the analysis of the dependent variable. Of immediate concern is the impact on the distribution of instant offense crimes for addict and non-addict offenders.

Since specific crimes for which an offender was convicted provide the basis for examining the types of crime categories, a percentage distribution serves several purposes. First, it shows

\(^1\)Although unlikely, it is possible for a non-addicted person to use heroin and be convicted of the offense. As explained earlier, it is difficult to distinguish those convicted of possession from those involved in sales because in the late 1960's it was common to have a blanket charge of dangerous drugs. At the same time, consideration would have to be given to those addicts who sell only to support their own habit. Consequently, the procedure of excluding all drug offenses appears to be the most appropriate alternative while recognizing a small degree of imprecision exists.
the distribution of the crimes included in the subsequent classification systems. Second, it provides a basis for observing which crimes account for most criminal behavior. It also provides the reader with the ability to independently analyze and address the issues confronted in this paper.

The impact of excluding drug violations on the offense distribution is presented in Tables 4.7 and 4.8. These tables indicate the percentage distribution of instant offenses with and without drug violations. As shown in Table 4.7 (with the drug offenses included), burglary is the most frequently committed crime for both addicts and non-addicts. Also, the offenses of burglary, larceny, and robbery account for most crimes committed whether the offender is classified an addict or non-addict (63.1% and 59.5% respectively). The most interesting observation for the two samples is the identical proportion of those offenders committing robberies (20.7% for both groups). Furthermore, while addicts are underrepresented in assaultive crimes not involving gain, these crimes occur relatively infrequently. As the total distribution indicates, the more serious forms of crime such as homicide and rape are a relatively small proportion of all crimes committed.

Table 4.8 shows the impact of eliminating drug violations. Overall, the impact is to provide a proportional increase in the other specific offenses, especially among addicts. For instance,
Table 4.7

Percentage Distribution of Instant Offense Crimes with Narcotic Violations Included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Category</th>
<th>Total N=2028</th>
<th>Narcotic Addicts N=479</th>
<th>Non-addicts N=1549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious Dest.</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desertion</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Legal Process</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Public Utility</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-addict offenders committed proportionately more burglaries than addicts when drug offenses are included. The exclusion of drug offenses indicates addicts and non-addicts commit proportionately the same amount of burglary. Another major function of excluding drug offenses from further analysis will be to reduce the number of offenses found in the "other" category and consequently
Table 4.8

Percentage Distribution of Instant Offense Crimes with Drug Offenses Excluded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Category</th>
<th>Total N=1912</th>
<th>Narcotic Addicts N=397</th>
<th>Non-addicts N=1515</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious Dest.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desertion</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Legal Process</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Public Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

increase property crime differences between samples.

A particular observation regarding the two groups should be noted. Whereas earlier they committed proportionately the same amount of robberies, the addicts in this sample now tend to commit more (24.9% vs. 21.2%).
Test of Hypotheses

The major emphasis of the study is a reexamination of the basic relationship of addiction to types of crime committed. Because of the confusion surrounding the proper definition of the dependent variable, types of crime, the present research effort takes a multifaceted approach to the addict's involvement in crime. In order to adequately examine the addict's involvement in violence, a set of hypotheses was developed. Because the data examined are of the nominal variety it was decided to use the Chi Square statistic ($X^2$). "This technique allows for the testing of the equality of distributions as well as for testing for general type associations between variables" (Eckerman 1971:93). The significance level chosen to evaluate the tests was 5% (.05).\(^1\)

An additional consideration for nominal data and contingency tables relates to the size of the sample. Because the sample in this study is large (N = 2200), small differences can emerge as significant. In the case of large samples, it has been recommended\(^2\) that a measure of association be computed to appraise the theoretical or practical significance of any findings. Given the

\(^1\)Discussion of the findings will report the nature of differences (i.e., less likely; more than) from a statistical viewpoint of whether they could have occurred by chance.

\(^2\)The importance of correlations in the case of large samples and contingency tables is elaborated on in Blalock (1972).
secondary interest of this study in the practical utility of the findings, the strength of a relationship is as important as its existence. As a result, Kruskal's tau will be formulated and discussed for each relationship found to be statistically significant. Tau \( t \) was selected on the basis of certain properties. First, it is not restricted to the 2 X 2 table format. Subsequently the hypotheses may be compared using the same measure of association. Second, tau is asymmetric. Because addiction has been specified as the independent variable, tau is preferable to symmetric measures. Symmetric measures may consider either variable as dependent and therefore different values can be obtained. Most importantly, tau can be directly interpreted as a proportional reduction in error "when predicting classes of the dependent variable" (Reynolds 1977:34). In this case, tau indicates the proportion of error that is reduced in predicting types of crime when addiction status is known as compared to "guessing" the type of crime committed without knowledge of whether a person is an addict or not. Defined in this manner, the importance of a relationship can be evaluated.\(^1\)

Types of Crime

It will be recalled that to test the hypothesis regarding addiction

\(^1\)For a more detailed discussion of the properties of PRE (proportional-reduction-in-error) measures in terms of their advantages and limitations, the reader is referred to Blalock (1972) and Reynolds (1977).
and type of crime two components are utilized. The first separates person, property and other crimes and the second focuses on the categories of violent and non-violent.

**HYPOTHESIS I a:** Addicts and non-addicts do not differ in the commission of types of crime (defined as person-property-other).

The data bearing on this hypothesis are presented in Table 4.9. The results indicate that significant differences emerge between the two groups. Specifically, addicts are less likely to commit crimes against the person than non-addicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Addict Offenders</th>
<th>Non-addict Offenders</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>115 (29.0%)</td>
<td>564 (37.2%)</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>266 (67.0%)</td>
<td>896 (59.1%)</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16 (4.0%)</td>
<td>55 (3.6%)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nature of addiction to the specific crime categories was also examined. The results indicated that when property crimes are compared with non-property crimes, addicts not only commit
significantly fewer person crimes but significantly more property crimes. The "other" category of crimes showed no difference. Since these crimes are primarily "victimless" offenses, it appears that addicts and non-addicts commit proportionately the same amount of these types of crimes.

Having established that a statistically significant overall relationship exists between the groups, consideration is given to the extent or strength of the relationship. While addicts and non-addicts differ in the commission of person offenses, the percentage difference is less than 9% (29% of the addicts versus 37.2% of the non-addicts). In previous studies, the differences have generally been larger. The same observation can be made with property crimes. The overall relationship in this case, utilizing Kruskal's tau, is .003. The breakdown by offense categories shows little difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>tau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreting tau as a proportional reduction of errors in guessing the type of crime an offender will commit when addiction status is known indicates the presence of a very weak relationship. As a result, knowledge of whether a person is an addict or not does not help in predicting the type of crime committed. The proportional reduction of errors would be only .3%.
HYPOTHESIS I b: Addicts and non-addicts do not differ with respect to types of crime committed (defined as violent/non-violent).

This hypothesis attempts to focus only on those crimes generally considered violent. Because certain person offenses are not necessarily violent, it represents a more conservative approach to dichotomizing behavior for these groups. Table 4.10 presents the data relevant to this hypothesis. While the groups differ significantly in the commission of violent crimes with addicts less likely to be involved in them, the magnitude of $X^2$ in conjunction with the sample size tends to reduce the importance of this finding. The percentage difference is smaller than that found in Hypothesis I a. The observed difference of 6% results in a $t_b$ of only .002. Subsequently although differences exist, they do not appear to have any substantive importance. Again, interpreting $t_b$ as the proportional reduction in errors, knowing whether a person is an addict or not would only result in a .2% reduction in error when predicting whether he will commit a violent crime.

Although these findings appear to support the belief that addicts commit significantly less person and less violent offenses than non-addicts, the strength of the relationship must be suspect. For practical significance in a sample this large, a stronger relationship would need to be present. Of secondary interest is the observation
Table 4.10

Relationship of Addiction to Types of Crime Categorized as Violent and Non-violent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>Addict Offenders</th>
<th>Non-addict Offenders</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>113 (28.5%)</td>
<td>523 (34.5%)</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent</td>
<td>284 (71.5%)</td>
<td>992 (65.6%)</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 5.22 \quad df = 1 \quad p < .05 \]

that regardless of the strength of either relationship, addicts and non-addicts differ less in the amount of violent crime than person crimes. Percentage differences indicated a 9% difference between addicts and non-addicts in committing person-type offenses, but only a 6% difference among violent crimes.

It was also noted earlier that a few studies have utilized frequency distributions with drug offenses included. Because of the possible implications for comparability, the present analysis was conducted under both conditions. Although a tabular presentation is not shown, the following results emerged.

Whereas addicts and non-addicts would have differed in the commission of person offenses, it is not true of property crimes. In fact, if drug offenses are included, non-addicts committed proportionately more property crimes (57.8% vs. 55.5%) than addicts.
Such a finding is a direct function of drug offenses being neither a person or property offense. In the case of violent versus non-violent offenses, the inclusion of these offenses has a negligible affect. While addicts commit less violent offenses, the difference is less than 10% between the groups. Finally, regardless of which frequency distribution is examined, the correlation between addiction and types of crime remains extremely small.

The Use of Violence

It has been pointed out that a central feature of any inquiry into violence among offenders should account for the classification errors as much as possible. While classification schemes provide a useful function, given data limitations and restraints, another alternative would be to focus on behavior regardless of the particular act. According to Table 4.10, 28.5% of the addicts and 34.5% of non-addicts committed crimes traditionally referred to as violent. However, in certain instances, violence or potential violence may occur in situations that do not fall into these categories. The present hypothesis concentrates on the use of violence as one such alternative to classification restraints. It will be recalled that violent crimes in this research paper were defined as offenses with the following elements: a) the presence of a direct victim/offender relationship, and b) intimidation through force or the threat of force.
The most critical aspect to be considered in this regard is the "threat of harm" (potential violence) and/or "doing of harm" (actual violence). These elements were operationalized with a variable that measured whether or not an offender used intimidation on the victim. As such, it is not designed to differentiate the magnitude or degree of violence that occurs but only the fact that it does occur. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.11. Accordingly, it can be seen that addicts and non-addicts differ in the use of violence as defined through intimidation. Addicts are less likely to commit crimes where intimidation is present.

Table 4.11

Relationship of Addiction and the Use of Violence During the Commission of an Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Violence</th>
<th>Addict</th>
<th>Non-addict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation present</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34.7%)</td>
<td>(41.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No intimidation present</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65.3%)</td>
<td>(58.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 6.76 \quad df = 1 \quad p < .01 \]

Following the research format, a tau correlation was computed to evaluate the strength or importance of this relationship. The findings in this case are remarkably similar to the previously examined hypotheses. An extremely small increase in the reduction of errors is accomplished in this instance (\( t = .003 \)) than with the
violent/non-violent categorization. The percentage difference between groups was 7.2% in the occurrence of intimidation. The consistency of the results across all hypotheses lends credence to the differences found but reservations as to their predictive or practical utility in differentiating addicts and non-addicts.

Given the extremely small correlation found between the independent and dependent variables, an attempt was initiated to discover more salient differences between the groups in the use of violence. The nature of intimidation could vary in the study according to verbal threats or actions and threats or confrontations involving a weapon. It is clear that a crime involving a weapon is perceived to be more serious than offenses where a weapon is absent. This perception is supported by the sudden rise in weapon-related legislation for mandatory sentencing\(^1\) and the weight developed in the Sellin-Wolfgang scale (Sellin/Wolfgang 1964). As a result, a secondary observation between addicts and non-addicts can be made with regard to the form of intimidation used.

It was found that a much stronger relationship occurs in those cases where intimidation is of a verbal nature. Non-addicts are significantly more likely to use verbal threats or actions (12.3% vs. 7.8%). However, in those offenses where intimidation with a

\(^1\)Specific examples of such legislation may be found in Michigan House Bill No. 5073 and the Massachusetts' Bartley-Fox Act.
weapon is involved, a different finding emerges.

Table 4.12

Relationship of Addiction and Intimidation with a Weapon
During the Commission of an Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of a Weapon</th>
<th>Addict</th>
<th>Non-addict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation with weapon</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26.7%)</td>
<td>(29.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No intimidation with weapon</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(73.3%)</td>
<td>(70.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 1.31  df = 1  Not significant

As Table 4.12 shows, addicts and non-addicts do not differ significantly in the commission of those offenses where a weapon is used. While it may be reflective of the addict's involvement in robberies, it does help clarify the role intimidation occupies in violent offenses. The importance of these findings to traditionally held beliefs will be discussed in Chapter V.

Other Research Findings: Robbery

Because robbery is an offense which is not purely assaultive in nature, it has occupied a paramount role in the narcotic literature. As such, it deserves additional attention in this report. Robbery is one of the four crimes of most concern to the public (President's Commission 1967). More importantly, the increase in robberies over the years among narcotic addicts may be
associated with the subtle changes (i.e., race, age) occurring in
the addict population. Given that the data contained in this study
are representative of the late 1960's, the findings may be more
characteristic of the initial changes in this subgroup of criminals.

A reanalysis of the data in this respect indicates there were
no significant differences in the likelihood of addicts and non-addicts
committing the crime of robbery. This observation is supported
whether drug offenses are included or excluded from the analysis.
In fact, as Table 4.13 indicates, the tendency is for addicts to be
more likely to commit robbery than non-addicts.

Table 4.13

Comparison of Addict and Non-addict Involvement
in Robbery Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Addict</th>
<th>Non-addict</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24.9%)</td>
<td>(21.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-robbery</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75.1%)</td>
<td>(78.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 2.58$  \hspace{1cm} df = 1  \hspace{1cm} Not significant

The traditional belief that addicts avoid crimes of violence is
not supported in this study. Rather, the data indicate that addicts
avoid those crimes of violence not involving gain. Such an observa-
tion is consistent with more recent studies in the field (Prebles &
Control Variables

The data for the hypotheses indicate that in general addict offenders commit less person and violent offenses. Yet the measure of association and the observed percentage differences suggest the relationships are very weak. These observations contribute to the possibility that certain control variables may provide insight into the addiction/types of crime relationship. Because of the limited scope of this study, the possibility of certain intervening variables explaining the relationship between addiction and types of crime is undertaken in an exploratory sense. Data were collected on age, race, city size, and marital status. The earlier literature discussion indicated these variables may have theoretical or empirical importance. However, no specific hypotheses were stated in this respect.

A final aspect to be considered is the emphasis of this study on violent crime. Violent crime as defined in Hypothesis I b has a weak relationship to addiction (.002). Therefore, the application of controls will focus on this aspect of the addiction/types of crime relationship.

Age

The addition of age as a test variable clarifies the relationship
between narcotic addiction and violence. Although addicts over 22 commit significantly less violence than their non-addict counterparts, it is not true for younger addicts (22 and under). The relationship between addiction and types of crime disappears for this age group. Subsequently, there are no differences between young addicts and non-addicts as to the type of crime committed. The results are summarized in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>22 and under</th>
<th>Over 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-addict</td>
<td>Addict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = .02\]  
Not significant  
\[X^2 = 9.39\]  
\[df = 1\]  
\[p < .01\]

Comparatively Table 4.14 also shows an increase in the strength of the relationship that does exist (for older addicts). The observation that older addicts commit significantly less violent crime than older non-addicts, although no differences exist between their younger

\[1\]^The significance level chosen was 5% (.05). The format for discussion will follow that used in evaluating the hypotheses earlier.
counterparts, is noteworthy for several reasons. It has been shown that a substantial shift in the age composition of addict offenders has been occurring over the years. While past studies have documented these characteristic changes, they have neglected to control for its possible impact on the addiction/crime relationship. It is probably a reflection of the greater differences observed in the past between the addicts and non-addicts involvement in violent crime. Only recently has age been isolated as a major concern (Stephen & Ellis 1975; Greenberg & Adler 1974). However, one recent study cited by Chambers (1974) explored the impact of age on a group of addicts and the types of crime committed. His review noted that the younger addicts commit considerably more assaults than older addicts. Although the study was based on a small (n = 50) non-random sample of addicts only, it provides limited support for the importance of age.

Two related propositions may explain the critical role age plays in addiction. First, the older addict offender may be less likely to commit crimes involving risk. Winick (1974), in developing a career model for heroin users, speculated that the older addicts were able to "adapt their drug habits to the changing realities of income and availability of drugs" (p. 121). Of critical interest, Winick points out that "by recognizing the virtue of moderation, they had learned how to get drugs of reliable quality at minimum risk of
It would be consistent with this study's findings to speculate that risk and the ability to control personal need are related factors. Subsequently, older addicts are able to assimilate their drug habit into a more rational "life-style." For the most part, it substantiates the historical perspective of the criminal addict who was generally older and involved in property crimes. At the same time, it supports this study's position that changes in the age composition of the addict population influences the types of crime committed when compared to non-addicts.

Although the findings on older addicts tend to support current explanations in the field, a methodological consideration should be noted regarding theoretical interpretations based on officially recognized populations. The ability of older addicts to assimilate a heroin habit into a more rational life-style may also bias their selection in offender populations. The older addict may be more successful at evading detection than the younger addict. It is possible that as younger addicts grow older, they are able to accommodate a heroin habit into a more "rational" life-style. On the other hand, younger addicts could increase their ability to evade detection by official sources. These observations emphasize the difficulties encountered when examining hidden populations (i.e., addicts, alcoholics).

A second proposition that may explain the lack of differentiation
between the younger addict and non-addict offender is that because of the strong relationship between youth and violence, addiction is a weak determinant of crime involvement. Wolfgang (1969) concluded that regardless of reporting errors, youth involvement in the major violent crime groups is considerably higher than for older criminals. The UCR (1975) and Michigan State Police (1975) data continues to support this observation.

City Size

The addition of city size as a test variable also produces subgroup deviations. The relationship between addiction and types of crimes only holds for large urban areas. Those addicts from large metropolitan areas are less likely to commit a violent crime than non-addicts. However, addicts from smaller sized cities are just as likely as their non-addict counterparts to commit such an offense.

Table 4.15

Relationship between Addiction and Types of Crime Controlling for City Size

| Type of Offense | 500,000 & under | | Over 500,000 | |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
|                 | Non-addict | Addict | Non-addict | Addict |
| Violent         | 283        | 28     | 208         | 78      |
| Non-violent     | 678        | 103    | 237         | 172     |
| Total           | 961        | 131    | 445         | 250     |

\[ X^2 = 3.68 \]
Not significant

\[ X^2 = 15.96 \]
\[ df = 1 \]
\[ p < .001 \]
This finding is interesting in the sense that most violent crimes occur in large urban areas. Consequently an intuitive approach to the problem would seem to suggest that if no differences existed it would occur in this particular subgroup. On the contrary, the data show the opposite to occur with a much stronger relationship than that found when no controls are added. The differences between addict and non-addict criminals apparently emerge where violent crime is greatest.\(^1\)

The finding does not support previous assumptions of the impact of city size on addiction. It has been suggested that the perception of opiates and violence is actually a by-product of the relationship of violence to large urban areas (Blum 1969b). Along similar lines, it is believed that the relationship between addiction and types of crime may be characterized by violence in those situations where it is most likely to occur (Tinklenberg & Stillman 1969). On the contrary, the research data indicates it is in large urban areas where traditional beliefs regarding offender differences (i.e., addiction) and types of crime is supported. In small cities addicts and non-addicts are just as likely to commit violent crimes. The general relationship between addiction status and types of crime is

\(^1\)Although the subgroup totals indicate the majority of violent crime occurs in cities less than 500,000, it should be remembered that 500,000 and under is comprised of various cities' sizes collapsed into one category (refer to p. 3 for the breakdown of this demographic variable.
nonsignificant for smaller cities.

An explanation for such an occurrence could be related to the varied forms of social problems experienced in larger urban areas. Addiction may be one form of "normal" expression to urban stress. Conversely, for those offenders who are addicts in small cities, addiction may be an extension of other forms of anti-social behavior.

Race

Controlling for race also adds to the refinement of the basic addiction/types of crimes relationship. It can be seen that the overall relationship varies by subgroup according to the white/non-white dichotomy.

Table 4.16

Relationship between Addiction and Types of Crime Controlling for Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-addict</td>
<td>Addict</td>
<td>Non-addict</td>
<td>Addict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 34.13 \]
\[ df = 1 \]
\[ p < .001 \]

\[ X^2 = 3.82 \]
Not significant

An interesting finding emerges in this instance. While non-white addicts are less likely to indulge in violent crimes than non-
addicts, the relationship disappears for white offenders. White narcotic addicts show no significant differences to non-addicts in the type of crime committed. Additionally, the association between non-white offenders and types of crime increases tremendously over the basic addiction/violence relationship ($t b = .035$ vs. $.002$ respectively).

This finding has considerable impact because of its divergence from commonly held views. Although none of the studies reviewed in Chapter II controlled for race, it has received substantial discussion as a user characteristic and limited speculation as to its relationship to violence. Blum (1969a) noted the unsupported belief that certain addicts are responsible for violent crimes. Specifically, Blum's review (1969) of the literature suggested that "it is not always recognized that these (violent opiate) offenders are drawn from the larger pool of young urban males, primarily minority group members, who are involved in various street crimes, and who represent a disproportionate share of heroin addicts as well" (p. 668). Since many of the studies reviewed by Blum noted the increasing presence of minority members in the addict population, but failed to control for its impact on types of crime, such speculation is understandable. However, this study's finding that non-white addicts are less likely than their non-addict counterparts to commit violence does not support such a belief. On the contrary, addiction appears to play an important role in determining the type
of crime committed for non-white offenders. Of particular interest is that non-white addicts are more representative of the traditional beliefs regarding types of crime.

Blum (1969a) was correct in his observation that the minority addict is overrepresented in the addict population of offenders. Perhaps the most important contribution as a result of the racial finding may be the implication for social intervention and diversion programs. The non-white offender is also overrepresented in prison and correctional populations (MDC 1975). Discussion of program implications will follow in the next chapter.

The reverse finding of no difference among white offenders offers a limited basis for speculation on the nature of the addiction-crime relationship. Substantial documentation exists to indicate that the non-white addict is most often from disadvantaged urban areas characterized by social and personal stress (Blum 1969b).

It is plausible that addiction and subsequent criminal activity represent one alternative form of social adjustment (Lukoff 1974). For white offenders, particular types of criminal involvement do not appear to be associated with addiction. White addict offenders are just as likely as non-addict offenders to commit a violent crime. Obviously, more detailed information on ecological and socioeconomic variables would be needed before their impact on alternative modes of behavior could be supported.
An issue related to this finding is whether the impact of city size may explain these subgroup deviations. Although minorities are subject to varied forms of situational stress (Schur 1969), it is plausible that white offenders from large urban cities share these experiences. On the other hand, the majority of research in this area frequently focuses on urban minorities without speculation on the particular problems experienced by this subgroup in non-urban areas.

The impact of race and city size on the addiction-crime relationship may be seen in Table 4.17. Holding race and city size constant supports the racial differences observed earlier. City size does not appear to have an impact on addiction and violence. The relationship observed earlier between large urban areas and smaller sized cities disappears. Regardless of the size of the community, non-white addicts are significantly less likely than non-addicts to commit crimes of violence. For white offenders, the earlier observation that involvement in particular types of crime is not related to addiction is supported. Regardless of city size, white addict offenders are just as likely as non-addict offenders to commit a violent crime.

These findings fail to support the popular belief that non-white addicts from large urban areas are responsible for violent crimes. Given the widespread personal and social stress experienced by
Table 4.17

Relationship between Addiction and Types of Crime Controlling for Race and City-Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 500,000</td>
<td>Over 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under 500,000</td>
<td>Over 500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addict</td>
<td>Non-addict</td>
<td>Addict</td>
<td>Non-addict</td>
<td>Addict</td>
<td>Non-addict</td>
<td>Addict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.27$  \hspace{1cm} $X^2 = 0.15$  \hspace{1cm} $X^2 = 16.06$  \hspace{1cm} $X^2 = 23.65$

$df = 1$  \hspace{1cm} $df = 1$  \hspace{1cm} $df = 1$  \hspace{1cm} $df = 1$

Not significant  \hspace{1cm} Not significant  \hspace{1cm} $p < 0.001$  \hspace{1cm} $p < 0.000$
minorities, addiction and subsequent criminal activity may represent one alternative form of social adjustment regardless of city size.

In this sense, he represents the traditional view of the addict resorting to non-violent crimes to support or maintain a habit.

Another interesting issue regarding the impact of race on addiction concerns a traditionally overlooked area—the lack of differentiation between white addicts and non-addicts in the commission of violent crime. Addiction does not appear to influence or determine the type of crime committed by white offenders. This finding is supported whether they are from large or small communities.

Marital Status

When marital status is controlled, further subgroup differences emerge. There are no significant differences between single addicts and non-addicts and the occurrence of violent crimes. For married addicts, a weak relationship exists with types of crimes. They are significantly less likely to commit a violent offense.

As the measure of association indicates, the improvement over the basis addiction/types of crime relationship is negligible.

From the above findings, it is evident that the relationship between addiction and types of crimes does not hold true in all cases. Subgroup differences emerge on all control variables. Those addicts who are either single, white, or under 23 are not significantly different from their non-addict counterparts in the commission of violent
Table 4.18

Relationship between Addiction and Types of Crime
Controlling for Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>Single Non-addict</th>
<th>Addict</th>
<th>Non-single Non-addict</th>
<th>Addict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 0.002 \]
\[ df = 1 \]
\[ p = 0.01 \]

\[ X^2 = 6.92 \]
\[ df = 1 \]

Not significant

However, for those addicts who possess either of the following characteristics--non-single (married at least once), non-white, or over 22 years of age--a relationship does appear to exist. They are significantly less likely to commit a violent crime. It is also interesting to note that the racial differences persist regardless of the size of community an addict is from.

Consistent with the exploratory approach taken in this section, it would appear that the traditional relationships between addiction and violence may apply only to certain subgroups of addict offenders. Whereas further refinements would necessitate the development of a set of hypotheses utilizing multiple controls, it is beyond the scope of this study's purpose. In addition, a large sample of addicts would be required to prevent cell depletion.

Age, race and marital status have been shown to be important
explanatory variables for the addiction-crime relationship. Discrimin- 
inant function analysis was conducted to determine how important 
these variables are in the commission of violent crimes. Discrimin- 
ant function analysis indicates "the relative importance of the 
variables to discriminate between different groups" (Friday & 
Sonnad 1978).

Using violent and non-violent as the criterion groups, the vari- 
ables age, race, city size, marital status and addiction can be 
examined for their discriminatory power. Given the interest in the 
traditional belief that addicts are overwhelmingly property criminals, 
one would expect addiction to be the primary determinant of non- 
violent group membership.

For purposes of this study, the importance of these variables 
to violent and non-violent crime is examined under two conditions. 
The first concerns the relative importance of age, marital status, 
city size, race and addiction to violent and non-violent crimes when 
each variable is considered independently without controlling for the 
effects of any additional variables. The results are presented in 
Table 4.19.

The obtained F ratio provides an approximate guide to the 
importance of each variable. Race and city size appear to be the 
most important single determinants in the commission of a violent 
or nonviolent crime. Whether a person is an addict or not (Drug
Table 4.19

Significance and Relative Importance of Drug Problem, Race, Age, Marital Status and Community Size to Violent and Non-Violent Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significant at .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>1/1897</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>1/1897</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Problem</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1/1897</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1/1897</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1/1897</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problem) is third with a considerably smaller F value. Age and Marital Status were not significant.

The F values in combination with Wilks' Lambda provide the basis for multivariate discriminant function analysis. "The discriminant function program was designed to examine the discriminating variables one at a time and select the variable at each step which maximizes the overall F ratio. (The criterion for selection is the variable with the smallest Wilks' Lambda)." (Tippman, 1972) Consequently, the initial variable selected by the program may change the relative importance of the remaining variables entered. The results of this procedure are presented in Table 4.20.

It is clear that Race is the most important discriminator between the violent and non-violent groups. In fact, the F value and Raos V suggest the remaining variables offer considerably less discriminatory power. The order of the remaining variables are:
Table 4.20

Stepwise Discriminant Function Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Nos.</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Approximate F Value</th>
<th>df.</th>
<th>Significant at .05 level</th>
<th>Raos V</th>
<th>Significant Changes in Raos V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>1/897</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drug Problem</td>
<td>38.07</td>
<td>2/896</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>76.18</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community Size</td>
<td>30.71</td>
<td>3/895</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>92.23</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>23.39</td>
<td>4/894</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>5/893</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drug Problem, Community Size, Age and Marital Status. Consequently, when the effects of Race are adjusted or corrected for, Drug Problem emerges as the next most important discriminator. Raos V provides a basis for examining the contribution each variable is adding to the discriminant function. As Table 4.20 shows, Age and Marital Status add little discriminatory power. The approximate F value for Marital Status and Age suggest the discriminatory power of the function continues to be significant. At the same time, Raos V indicates that Age and Marital Status do not contribute individually to the discriminatory power.

In summary, addiction by itself is not a strong discriminant
between violent and nonviolent offenders. However, it does assume an important position when other offender characteristics such as race are considered.

A final observation regarding the discriminant analysis concerns the tentative nature of these findings. The control variables discussed in the chapter were examined in an exploratory context. The discriminant function analysis indicated the final function (consisting of the five discriminator variables) accounts for approximately 40% of the variable covariance. Consequently, the addition of different variables may refine or alter the role addiction plays in the commission of violent and non-violent crime.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

A traditionally held belief concerning addicts is that they commit significantly less crimes of a person, or violent nature, than non-addict offenders. Because of various deficiencies in past methodological and conceptual practices as well as changes in addict characteristics, a reassessment of the basic relationship between addiction and types of crime was recommended. The purpose of this research project has been to determine whether addicts and non-addicts differ in the commission of violent and/or person offenses. Three related hypotheses were proposed to examine whether a) addict and non-addict offenders differ in the commission of person offenses, b) addict and non-addict offenders differ in the commission of violent crimes, and c) whether addicts and non-addicts vary in the use of violence during the commission of an offense regardless of the legal classification. Although the principal interest of the study is the addict and non-addict's involvement in violence, the issue of person offenses was addressed to make the findings comparable to the traditional positions and studies in the area.

In addition to the hypotheses tested, this study explored the
impact of certain demographic and background characteristics on
the relationship of addiction to violent crimes. A secondary interest
confronted in this study concerned the implications of any findings
for social intervention programs.

To test the hypotheses, a 1971 random sample of paroled
offenders in Michigan was used. The sample was divided into two
groups according to the independent variable of addiction and com­
pared on several measures of criminal involvement (person offenses,
violent offenses, use of intimidation during the commission of an
offense). Because of recent changes in the addict population and
recent studies indicating an increase in violence among addicts, it
was postulated that no differences would emerge between addicts
and non-addicts in the types of crime committed or in the use of
violence. In addition to the application of control variables, further
analysis examined the impact of addiction on robbery and the nature
of intimidation. A synopsis of relevant findings will be presented
for each aspect investigated.

Hypothesis Ia

Addict and non-addict offenders differed significantly in the
types of crimes committed when categorized as person, property
and other. Addicts are less likely to commit crimes against the
person. The results support previous findings in this regard. At
the same time, the association between addiction and types of
crime is very weak ($t = .003$). The knowledge that a person is a
narcotic addict has a negligible effect on the ability to "guess" the
type of offense he would commit. These observations suggest that
although the finding supports the view of the addict as primarily a
property criminal, the degree to which addiction can be considered
a major or sole determinant of property crime is questionable. It
is also notable that the non-addict offender was primarily a property
criminal. Subsequently, the degree of difference between the groups
should be an important consideration.

Hypothesis I b

Categorizing types of crime into violent and non-violent as
opposed to person and property produced similar results. Addicts
committed significantly less violent crime than non-addicts. It
supports the view of the addict criminal as non-violent. In combina-
tion, the hypotheses evaluating the relationship of addiction to types
of crime depict addicts as non-violent, property criminals. Such
a conclusion would be consistent with past findings. However, as
in the case of person and property, the association between vari-
ables was extremely small ($t = .002$). In fact, it is slightly less
than the relationship to person and property crimes. The conclusion
therefore is consistent with Hypothesis I a: although addicts are
less violent than non-addicts, it has little substantive value.

Given other factors being equal, the knowledge that a person is an
addict does not increase the ability to "guess" what type of crime he would commit.

Hypothesis II

A behavioral analysis of the relationship between addicts and non-addicts with regard to the use of violence was almost identical with the preceding results. Ignoring categories of crime and concentrating on behavior, it was found that addicts use violence less than non-addicts in the commission of a crime. Again the observed relationship was considered very weak (t = .004).

The three hypotheses are remarkably consistent. On the one hand, they support real differences between addicts and non-addicts in criminal behavior. At the same time, they indicate that the relationship that exists is very weak. Further refinements help explain these results and lead to the conclusion that a general relationship between addiction and types of crime is not supported.

Control Variables and Other Research Considerations

The introduction of control variables in the basic addiction/violence relationship supports the need to qualify any statements regarding addiction and crime. In particular age, race and marital status significantly affect the ability to distinguish addicts and non-addicts with regard to violence.

Age indicated that addiction is related to violent crimes for older offenders. On the other hand, the overall relationship
disappeared for young offenders. As would be expected, the relationship for older addicts and the occurrence of violent crimes, when compared to older non-addicts, shows an increase in the strength of the relationship (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1
Comparison of Addiction to Violent Crimes With and Without Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No controls</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (≥22)</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (non-white)</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (non-single)</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since the results are based on 2 x 2 tables, the phi correlation is used for presentation purposes.

Race and city size offered more interesting results. It was found that a relationship between addiction and violence is supported for non-white offenders. In contrast, there were no differences in the likelihood of committing a violent crime for white addict and non-addict offenders. Likewise, differences between addicts and non-addicts existed for those from large, urban cities but not from smaller areas. However, when race and city size are both held constant, race is shown to be the critical variable. The effects of city size on addiction and crime disappear. The racial differences
noted above continue to be supported regardless of city size. The findings on race and city size contradict previous speculations and popular beliefs concerning the addict's involvement in violence. It should also be noted that the association between addiction and violent crime increases considerably when race is controlled (see Table 5.1).

Additional refinements can be made when robbery and intimidation are examined. There were no differences between addict and non-addict offenders in the occurrence of robbery. Because robbery is the only violent crime involving acquisition, it leads to the conclusion that addicts do not avoid crimes of violence but rather they avoid crimes not involving gain.

Similar findings emerged when the form of intimidation was examined. There were no significant differences between addicts and non-addicts in those crimes where a weapon was used. Addict offenders are just as likely to use the more serious forms of threat and confrontation as non-addict offenders.

**Conclusions and Implications**

The results of this study appear to support the following conclusions:

1. Addicts do not avoid crimes of violence but crimes not involving gain. This observation was originally forwarded by Preble and Casey (1969) on a theoretical level. The data in this
study supports their position in the sense that addicts and non-addicts did not differ significantly in the commission of robberies.

2. Addicts are just as likely as non-addict offenders to use a weapon in the commission of violence. For some addicts, the cowardly, retreative stereotype is not valid. In the most serious forms of violence where a victim is confronted with a weapon, addict and non-addict differences disappear.

3. Contrary to traditional beliefs, addiction by itself is not a strong indicator of whether an offender will commit certain types of crime. The hypotheses consistently show a weak association in this regard. The data in this study indicate that both groups of offenders, addict and non-addict, are primarily non-violent, property-oriented criminals. However, as a group addicts tend to commit proportionately more of these types of crime.

Additional support for this conclusion is derived from discriminant function analysis. The analysis indicated that among race, city size, marital status and age addiction was the second most important discriminator. Subsequently, addiction is important to a certain degree in determining violent and non-violent offenses but only in conjunction with other offender characteristics.

4. For those offenders who belong to minority groups (i.e., non-white), addiction is significantly related to types of crime. Among non-white offenders, addicts are less likely than non-addicts
to commit violent crimes. Although race has not been controlled in previous studies in this area, it has been speculated that differences between addicts and non-addicts would be less among minority members than white offenders. The data in this study does not support such a conclusion.

5. Minority addicts are less likely to commit crimes of violence than their non-addict counterparts regardless of the city size. On the other hand, white addicts and non-addicts do not differ in the commission of violent crimes. Such a conclusion is supported whether the subgroups are from large urban areas or smaller sized cities. Because the rate of violence is greatest for large, urban areas (UCR 1975; Blum 1969b), it could be speculated that subgroup differences would most likely occur between addicts from smaller cities. In addition, popular beliefs have focused on the role of violence among minority addicts from large urban areas. The present study does not support either position.

6. A relationship between addiction and violence is supported for older offenders but not younger offenders. The conclusion that addiction is not related to violent crime for younger offenders is consistent with data on violence and current trends in the literature. Extensive documentation exists to indicate youthful offenders are more likely to commit violent crimes (Wolfgang 1969; UCR 1975).

7. Single addicts are just as likely as single non-addicts to
commit a violent crime. Among those addict offenders who have been married, a relationship to non-violent crimes is supported. It would appear that the responsibilities associated with marriage may have an impact on the addiction career.

These findings and conclusions support the position that the relationship of addiction to certain types of crime, particularly those of a violent nature, is only applicable to certain groups of offenders. Although a number of implications have been suggested, two in particular deserve extensive attention.

The most important concerns the secondary interest of this study in the development and use of social intervention and diversionary programs. Specifically, the interest is focused on whether the widespread use of those programs based primarily on addiction status is justified. The findings in this study do not support such an approach. On the contrary, those addict offenders who are most likely to be excluded from such programs (i.e., minorities), should be the primary beneficiaries.

The analysis of addict characteristics indicated that most addicts are non-white and/or from large cities. At the same time, the introduction of these variables as controls in the overall addiction/crime relationship increased the strength of the relationship to non-violent crime. The overrepresentation of minorities in the addict category suggests certain behavior dependencies, in this
case narcotic addiction, may contribute to the ecology of crime.

In the area of social programming, especially in the use of legal and non-legal diversion efforts, the overrepresentation of minorities may be reduced to a certain extent. Efforts at increasing the interphase between drug treatment and the criminal justice system should be encouraged. In those instances where narcotic dependency is related to criminal involvement, the control of narcotic dependency may reduce the incidence of crime.

Within this context, the nature of social programming must be confronted in a realistic sense. A major shortcoming and imminent danger (in terms of funding and public support) is the overwhelming failure of most narcotic programs (National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse 1972). Many people believe little can be accomplished with the addict individual at this time (Rubington 1967). It is the position of this paper that programs are not meant for everybody. The shotgun approach to programming and diversion is based on the assumption that addiction is the primary cause of or main contributor to crime. Risk to society is viewed as a secondary consideration since non-violence is believed to be strongly related to addiction. The results of this study seriously question these assumptions. Both success in programming and public safety can be increased by developing criteria based on subgroups of addicts as opposed to a general application. The determination of certain
subgroups is beyond the scope of this study's purpose. However, the exploratory approach taken with regard to subgroup differences lends considerable support for further efforts.

Although this study combines speculation with implication in many of the statements made up to this point, more concrete evidence exists with regard to current research on subgroups of addicts. Recent studies indicate the existence of subgroups of addicts possessing different characteristics. Lukoff (1974) suggests the importance of these differences for treatment objectives. The impact of control variables on the basic addiction/crime relationship lends support to this approach. As Table 5.1 indicates, the strength of the relationship between addicts and types of crime increases when the controls are applied.

Discriminant function analysis also provides support for subgroup differences. By itself, addiction is not a strong discriminator between violent and non-violent offenders (see Table 4.19). However, in conjunction with other variables, it definitely possesses predictive value for types of crime.

On a more abstract level, an implication directed towards theory may help explain the impact of addiction on certain groups of offenders. Because narcotic dependency and crime are dual forms of deviance, the impact of one on the other has never evolved beyond speculation. This study was not designed to clarify the
causal nature. However, the etiology of narcotic dependency may be a key determinant in the development of subgroup offenders. To the extent that narcotic dependency represents the primary form of deviance to the individual or group, the greater influence it may have on subsequent behavior (i.e., criminal behavior). On the other hand, if addiction represents a form of secondary deviance, the more subordinate it may be to other forms of deviance (i.e., criminal behavior) and the less impact it will have in selecting the particular form of crime committed. Such an explanation would be consistent with the current findings of the impact of race and age. In both of these instances, an abnormal amount of social stress is experienced. Whether addiction is one alternative in adjusting to varied social problems may have an impact on the extent and nature of criminal involvement. In this sense, the literature describing criminal involvement as a means of sustaining a habit with minimal risk would be consistent. In those cases where addiction is not a form of adjustment and does not have peer group support, addiction may be an extension of criminal behavior as opposed to a determin- ant of it. Whether addiction contributes to or is an expression of criminal involvement is not a question that can be directly addressed in this study. Obviously a set of causal models with a sufficient data base for multiple controls would assist in verifying the exis- tence and nature of certain subgroups of offenders within the addict
Because the introduction of control variables was exploratory, the lack of causal models or hypotheses limits theoretical interpretation. At the same time, certain theoretical concepts of deviant behavior offer points of departure for explaining or describing the empirical results.

Sutherland's concept of differential association offers a possible point of synthesis for these varied forms of deviant behavior. While Sutherland himself points to the limitation of differential association as a cause of criminal behavior, the concept does involve a learning process whereby certain individuals learn different types of deviant behavior (1971). For certain addict offenders, criminal activity may involve a learning process quite distinct from the addict subculture. Addiction, in these cases, may be an extension of previous criminal involvement and have little influence on the particular type of crime committed.

Perhaps an additional feature of such an approach to varied forms of deviance is the concept's relationship with other deviant perspectives. Merton's anomie theory and Marshall Clinard's integration attempts share basic premises with differential association. Rubington and Weinberg have noted the conditions that contribute to the development of deviant behavior in these perspectives.

For a pattern of deviant behavior to evolve, restricted opportunities for the learning of so-called conventional
ways and increased opportunities for the learning of deviant ways, restricted opportunities to gain societal ends, a feeling of stress, and access to a mode of relief are all important background conditions (1971:126).

The characteristics of most addicts and criminal offenders in this sample reflect these conditions (i.e., conditions conducive to stress or deviant adaptation).

In addition to the structural conditions and learning situations, Lemert's labeling perspective provides further possibilities for the role addiction plays in types of crime committed. Lemert's discussion of primary and secondary deviance addresses the career of deviance. More importantly, Lemert's discussion of labeling theory does not exclude structural causes of deviance. Gibbons and Jones note that "Lemert . . . defines deviance in terms of rule violation rather than social reactions. Hence he regards the societal reaction as a variable to be studied, rather than a defining characteristic of deviance" (1975:132).

Primary and secondary deviance provide useful concepts for understanding subgroup differences in behavior. Gibbons and Jones continue that:

He claims that primary deviation is polygenetic, arising from a variety of social, psychological, cultural, and physiological sources; it represents that state of affairs in which an individual engages in norm-violating conduct which he regards as alien to his true self. Secondary deviation, on the other hand, develops when the actor reorganizes his social-psychological characteristics around the deviant role (1971:129).
The subgroup differences among addict offenders may reflect the career formation of deviance. Rubington (1967) observed that an addict's life follows an orderly career. Under these circumstances, criminal behavior may be one aspect of the career or secondary deviation of the addict role. Therefore, addiction determines or contributes to extended deviant behavior (i.e., criminal). Conversely, as the earlier discussion suggested, for certain addicts addiction may represent a secondary aspect of a criminal career.

In summary, the addict's relationship to crime may derive from similar conditions (structural stress, etc.) but the learning behavior or alternative modes of adjustment (i.e., addiction, criminal behavior) may depend on different circumstances. Once the primary form of deviance is initiated, subsequent deviance may reflect a career formation. It is the position of this paper that the extent to which addiction represents primary deviance, it may determine or contribute to subsequent types of further deviance (i.e., criminal involvement in property crimes). The focus of social intervention programs should be the identification of those addict subgroups where addiction represents the primary form of adaptation.

Of course, another alternative with regard to dual forms of defiance may reflect what Blum refers to as interactive mixes, producing a modified form of behavior.

Under certain conditions, the interaction of different forms of
deviance may produce a unique effect. The unique effect may not be dependent on temporal order (i.e., narcotic dependency plus criminal behavior).

Suggestions for Further Research

Additional research efforts should be directed at the identification and description of those subgroups or "clusters" of addicts associated with particular types of crime, primarily violent offenses. It is plausible that certain groups of addict offenders share characteristics with non-addict offenders under particular circumstances.

The most beneficial approach would be the development of hypotheses based on conceptual models. The exploratory nature of the controls used in this study restricts generalization.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akers, R. L.

Anslinger, H. J.

Ausubel, D. P.

Bailey, W. C.

Ball, J. C.

Berlin, A.

Blalock, H. M., Jr.

Blum, R. H.

Blum, R. H.

119
Blum, R. H.

Blum, R. H.

Boshka, S. C., Weisman, H. M. & Thor, D. H.

Brecher, E. M. and the Editors of Consumers Report

Chambers, C. D.


Cushman, P., Jr.

Dai, Bingham


DeFleur, L B., Bell, J. C. & Snarr, R. W.
Duvall, H. J., Locke, B. Z. & Brill, L.

Eckerman, W. C., Bates, J. D., Rachel, J. V. & Poole, W. K.

Eitzen, D. S.

Finestone, H.

Friday, P. C. & Sonnad, S. R.

Glaser, D.

Glaser, D.

Glaser, D., Inciardi, J. T. & Babst, D. V.

Gordon, A. M.

Gottfredson, D. M.
1965 Wisconsin base expectancies for reformatories and prisons. Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, California Medical Facility, Vacaville, California.
Gould, L. C.  

Gibbons, D. C. and Jones, J. F.  

Greenberg, S. and Adler, F.  

Inciardi, J. A.  

Inciardi, J. A. and Chambers, C. D. (Eds.)  

Inciardi, J. A. and Chambers, C. D.  

Irwin, S.  

James, I. P.  

Joint Committee of the ABA and the AMA on Narcotic Drugs Interim and Final Reports (ABA & AMA). Drug addiction: Crime or disease. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Josephson, E. and Carroll, E.  

King, R.  
Kolb, L. 1925 Drug addiction in its relation to crime. Mental Hygiene, 2, 74-89.


O'Conner, C., Wrmsen, L. and Brown, T. C.

O'Donnell, J.

O'Donnell, J. and Ball, J. C. (Eds.)

Pescor, M. J.

Plair, W. and Jackson, L.

Preble, E. and Casey, J. J., Jr.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice

Raab, E.

Resistance by drug arrestees

Reynolds, H. T.

Rubington, E.
Rubington, E. and Weinberg, M. S. (Eds.)

Schur, J.
1966 Patterns and profiles of addiction and drug abuse. 
Archives of General Psychiatry, 15, 539-551.

Schur, E. M.

Schur, E. M.

Sellin, T. and Wolfgang, M. E.

Simon, F.

Spencer, C.

Stephens, R. C. and Ellis, R. D.

Stephens, R. C. and Slatin, G. T.
1974 The street addict role: Toward the definition of a type. 
Drug Forum, 3 (4), 375-388.

Stimson, G. V.

Sutherland, E.

Swezey, R. W. and Chambers, A.
Tinklenberg, J.

Tippman, D.

Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) for the United States

U.S. National Criminal Justice Information and Statics Service

Vera Institute of Justice

Winick, C.

Winick, C.

Wolfgang, M. E.