

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9108170

**Bias in the processing of crime data: A comparison of police
and social scientist constructs of the drug/homicide nexus**

Ryan, Patrick Joseph, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1990

Copyright ©1990 by Ryan, Patrick Joseph. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

**BIAS IN THE PROCESSING OF CRIME DATA:
A COMPARISON OF POLICE AND SOCIAL SCIENTIST CONSTRUCTS
OF THE DRUG/HOMICIDE NEXUS.**

by

PATRICK JOSEPH RYAN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in
Criminal Justice in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York.

1990

© 1990

PATRICK JOSEPH RYAN

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty In Criminal Justice in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

19 July 1990

Date

Anthony T. Siper.

Chair of Examining Committee

19 July 1990

Date

Anthony T. Siper.

Executive Officer

Carl F. Wiedemann

Dorothy Bracey

Hans B. C. Spiegel

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ABSTRACT

BIAS IN THE PROCESSING OF CRIME DATA:
A COMPARISON OF POLICE AND SOCIAL SCIENTIST CONSTRUCTS
OF THE DRUG/HOMICIDE NEXUS.

by

PATRICK JOSEPH RYAN

Adviser: Professor Antony E. Simpson

The dissertation addresses the question: Are the police a valid source for criminologically useful data? It compares two sets of data describing the identical sample of criminal homicides in New York City, 1988. The findings demonstrate that research data collected by an agency whose raison d'être is not scientific inquiry and data collected by social scientists, will produce quite dissimilar constructs of "what happened" regards the crime studied.

The sociology of knowledge provides a theoretical basis upon which to posit that a tension between the tacit knowledge of persons in different fields will naturally and irreversibly lead to disagreement in how each interpret, first, the phenomenon observed and then, the verbiage used to systematically record it.

Recommendation is made that researchers who rely on public agencies for research data limit the idiom of their operational definitions to those most easily comprehended by the practitioner. The study also strongly suggests that if crime data is to be meaningful for the purposes of social scientists, collection methods should always include a follow-up interview in which mutual understanding of events and the variables used to record them can be elaborated and clarified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work owes much to Colm Patrick Ryan whose background assumptions put the entire effort in proper perspective when he asked: "Are you going to play with the computer all weekend?" and to his mother Maureen Ryan who has the wisdom to say little to a dissertation writer.

The work is dedicated to Maureen and Colm.

Only as the work neared completion was the support of the Dissertation Committee appreciated. As a sophomore perception that this work was entirely my own waned, my respect and gratitude for the contribution of the Committee grew. I am forever in the debt of my mentor Tony Simpson who mysteriously filled in gaps I did not know were there. Professor Carl Widemann who introduced me to Kappa and Professor Dorothy Bracey who oiled the waters of crisis so graciously, taught me the self-confidence necessary to move from student to academic.

I wish to thank Paul Goldstein of Narcotics and Drug Research, Inc. and Henry Brownstein of the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, the principal investigators of the research project that led to this work for allowing me the use of their material and providing the opportunity to learn and develop as a researcher.

The staff at N.D.R.I., Barry Spunt, Tom Miller, Paul Simon, Pat Bellucci, and Alice Rivera each in their own way contributed to this work. A special note of thanks to Bud Gropper of the National Institute of Justice, who, in a single meeting, so infected me with his enthusiasm for my work it was sustaining throughout.

FOREWORD

This dissertation makes secondary use of data collected under a research grant, Drug Related Crime Analysis, Homicide-2 (DRAH-2), funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) (87-IJ-CX-0048). The research was conducted jointly by Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc. (NDRI) and the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) with the full cooperation of the New York City Police Department (NYPD). The candidate was Project Director of this grant.

DRAH-2 is part of N.I.J. funded research designed to "develop a model for a nationwide data collection system that will allow for valid, reliable, and efficient documentation of the extent and nature of the relationship between drugs and violent crime." Within that context the specific goal of DRAH-2 is to "pilot that model through the documentation and study of the drugs and homicide nexus in New York State."

On a personal level, the experience of the "pilot" testing gave rise to questions of whether the information found in the national data bases on crime suffered problems of internal validity because of the unilateral nature of its source. This intuitive conjecture developed into an articulated concern that the police are not the best source from which to collect scientifically useful data for the simple reason that the police collect information for operational not scientific reasons. This notion then became the basis for the hypothesis underlying this study.

Opinions in this work do not represent the official position of the United States Government, the New York State Government, the New York City Police Department or Narcotics and Drug Research, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	vi
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION	
Introduction	1
Statement Of The Problem	9
The Research Question	16
Formal Hypothesis	16
Operational Definitions	
Police Data	17
Research Data	17
Summary	18
Footnotes to Chapter One	20
CHAPTER TWO - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
Reality Construct and the Sociology of Knowledge	21
The Social Nature of Knowledge	23
Tacit Knowledge and Group Think	27
The Prerogatives of Sociology	30
Criminological Theory and the Sociology of Knowledge	32
Relevance of Sociology of Knowledge to Dissertation	34
Police Handling Of Information	35
Expertise and the Function of Ignorance	37
Lying and Secrecy	40
Privileged Position and Knowledge	42
Detectives and Information Sharing	45
Social Organization of Detectives-A Few Observations	48
The Organizational Contribution to Deception	49
Information in Investigations	51
Social Scientific Bias	57
The Becker/Gouldner Debate	58
Role Conflicts In Other Disciplines	60
Research Neutrality	61
The Research Idiom - Data Sources	64
Dissertation Bias	66
The Nexus of Drugs and Homicide	
Estimating The Drugs/Crime Connection	69
Uniform Crime Reports and Supplemental Homicide Report ..	72
The National Crime Survey	79
Footnotes to Chapter Two.....	81
CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY	
Methodology	82
Organization of the New York City Police Department	83
Assignment of Cases	85
Assignment of Detectives	86
The Data Collection Process	88
Geographic Selection of Sample	88
Generalizability	89
NYPD Cooperation - Investigative Protocol	90
Selection of Subject Matter	91
Classification and Coding	92

CHAPTER THREE - METHODOLOGY (Continued)

Tripartite Conceptualization	93
Tripartite Dimensions	96
Dissertation Methodology	99
Statistical Methods	100
Footnotes to Chapter Three	104

CHAPTER FOUR - DATA ANALYSIS

Introductory Comments	105
Two Variables Examined	106
Differences Between The Data Sets	108
Internal Consistency	109
More Differences	116
Differential Assessment of Drugs Involved	119
Location, Means Used and Relationship	129
"Other" Categories	133
Agreement and Disagreement	135
kappa	136
Variable examined - Definitions	138
Interpretation of Kappa	142
Maximum Possible Agreement	143
Acceptable Levels Of Kappa - Event Variables	146
Acceptable Levels Of Kappa - Victim/Perpetrator	153
Acceptable Kappa Scores and Variable Definitions	156
Footnotes to Chapter Four	161

CHAPTER FIVE - CONCLUSION

Support of the Hypothesis	162
Validity	164
Contribution	165
Recommendations	166
Further Research	169
Appendix A - Data Collection Form	170
Appendix B - UCR Collection Form	176
Appendix C - Focus of Prior Research	179
Appendix D - Event Variables	194
Appendix E - Victim/Perpetrator Variables	195
Works Cited	196

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS, CHARTS, DIAGRAMS

Tables	Page
1. Selected Cases: "High or Irrational Due to Drugs or Alcohol ..	112
2. "Is This Case Drug Related"	117
2A. Frequency Change - Police to Researcher Data	118
3. Primary Drug Involved - Drug Related Events	122
4. Tripartite Conceptual Framework - Primary Classification	125
5. Selected Variables Combined: Frequency Differential	128
6. Events By Location Of Occurrence	129
7. Events By Weapons and Means Used	130
8. Events By Victim Perpetrator Relationship	131
9A. Event Variables - "Good" Kappa Scores	139
9B. Event Variables - "Fair" Kappa Scores.....	139
9C. Event Variables - "Poor" Kappa Scores.....	140
10. Victim Variables - Kappa Scores.....	141
11. Perpetrator Variables - Kappa Scores.....	141
12. Location = Bar or Tavern - Frequency Matrix.....	142
13. Other Motive - Frequency Matrix.....	142
14. Location = Bar or Tavern - Proportion Matrix.....	145
15. Other Motive - Proportion Matrix.....	145
16A. Event Variables - Kappa Score Acceptability = Good.....	148
16B. Event Variables - Kappa Score Acceptability = Fair.....	149
16C. Event Variables - Kappa Score Acceptability = Poor.....	151
17. Victim Variables - Kappa Score Acceptability.....	154
18. Perpetrator Variables - Kappa Score Acceptability.....	155
19. Acceptable levels of Kappa Scores by Variable Groupings.....	159
Illustrations	
1. Disagreement and Agreement.....	101
Formulae	
1. Kappa	101, 137
2. Maximum Possible Agreement	144

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The dissertation is primarily concerned with how police officers gather, record and retrieve information and with the way this information is used and interpreted by social scientists. In more succinct terms: Is there an inherent bias in data gathered from agencies whose primary reasons for collecting them are not compatible with the reasons social scientists collect data? Then, if there are different reconstructions of an identical set of criminal events because two different interpretations affect the data used, is the difference measurable? Lastly, if so, what is to be done about it?

There is about in the research community a perception that the police give short social scientists shrift (e.g., Van Maanen 1988, 84-87). A corollary of this perception is the social scientist's apparent lack of understanding of its origin and strength. Just how what appears to be summary and unsympathetic treatment might grow is exemplified in the remark a police lieutenant made regarding the term "psychopharmacological" in a data collection instrument used in a study of the relationship between drugs and homicide. To wit: If your term psychopharmacological means using, why don't you say using? - Then I wouldn't have to lose two hours looking for a word that I can't find in the dictionary.

The remark is paraphrased; if repeated here verbatim, its profane modifiers would offend. The attitude which the remark expresses is noteworthy not for its summary dismissal of the research idiom but for the obverse. Read another way, the police officer was giving

anything but "short shrift" to the research project. He was, in a sense, offering constructive criticism of the language of data collection. It is important to note how the possessive "your term" disavows any connection to the words used and explicitly ascribes ownership to the researcher.

The speaker, a commanding officer of one of the busiest detective squads in New York City, took time to search for a definition of a term that is readily understood and unexceptional in the scientific lexicon. For the police, it was a foreign term. When the lieutenant could reasonably bemoan the task of completing a research instrument whose purpose he probably did not fully understand. He instead tried honestly to grasp the nature of the inquiry, to respond to the research question as best he could. This exchange took place during the data collection phase of a research project that had sought out the New York City Police Department (NYPD) as its primary source of data. There were many confrontations involving this type of researcher-generated confusion during the process of "routinely" collecting data from the police.

The problems were not always semantical. The data for the research project of which this dissertation makes secondary use were collected in anticipation of fitting them to an analytical framework that includes the category "Economic Compulsive" ("Psychopharmacological" is the first category; The conceptualization is discussed below). Operationally defined, "Economic Compulsive" describes violent criminal events in which the offender feels compelled to commit crimes to finance a personal drug use habit (Goldstein 1985,

496-97). The police were asked to classify homicide cases using theoretically based categories such as this. The results were often methodologically flawed.

In common usage, "economic" means money. When classifying the homicide events, detectives participating in the study frequently saw in this label the connotation "dollars" and ignored the compulsive requirement in the research definition. They accordingly classified any killing that was even vaguely connected with monetary gain as an "Economic Compulsive" event. There were more than a few, often heated, discussions between researcher and detective over whether the killing of a sober drug dealer by another sober rival who disputed certain territorial boundaries was an economically motivated occurrence or strictly a "Systemic" event ("Systemic" is the third category in the model, see Goldstein 1985, 497-502 and pp 94-5 below). The detectives argued that a common motivation in disputes about a drug territory is control of the marketplace. The marketplace is a money place and "logically" crimes connected thereto are economically based.

This position was not simply a function of the police failing to read the operational definitions describing the various homicide event classifications the researcher had devised. When faced with the printed definition of "Economic Compulsive" requiring that a personal drug use habit drives someone to commit crime, several detectives adamantly insisted that if economics, in the broadest sense, played a part in the homicide, the event was compulsively economic.

"Psychopharmacological" not only caused problems for the detective supervisors. In large letters across the face of one

collection form is the notation that "THIS IS A CLEAR CASE OF PSYCHOPHARMACOLOGICAL BEHAVIOR". The circumstance of the homicide was a family dispute, not related to drugs. When questioned regarding the emphatic notation, the detective smiled and with a shrug of the shoulders said: "I thought all homicides were psychopharmacological."

Whether the reasons were semantical confusion, misunderstood definitions, or some hidden variable that is not so easily identified, it soon became obvious that when left to their own devices, the police would provide a description of events as they interpreted both the events and the mechanism used to report them. In light of prior experience, the researcher might have anticipated such a response as reasonable. To a greater or lesser degree, we all "Call them as we see them". But a "reasonable" response that does not address the research question also fails to address the needs of those who designed the study or, for that matter, those who regularly rely on information from practitioner agencies for all sundry purposes.

Research that cannot be modeled for future testing and replicative studies is of diminished value. As a researcher moved from one agency to the next, even the most scientifically rigorous methodology would suffer when faced with multifarious interpretations of its definitions. Interpretive bias raises questions about the ability to fit data into a model as objectively as possible (In this case, one designed to inform the connection between homicide and drug use₂) . Is the methodology, including its interpretive standards, changed by the respondents' differential interpretation of basic research questions?

Should the issue be ignored or should analyses be somehow weighted to control for the bias; by what amount; in which cases?

Beneath questions such as these is a supposition that data collected by different groups will produce different pictures of what happened. Based on the work presented here, the supposition rings true.

Formulation of the problem under study grew out of experiences with the police during a research effort to identify the connection between drugs and homicide. For this reason, proper elucidation of the larger issue, disagreement between data sets, requires reference to two subordinate themes: 1) the especial way the police handle information and 2) the inadequacies in the data bases most commonly used by criminologists. Both matters are discussed within a context of the drug relatedness of crime generally and homicide specifically.

However, the principal subject matter of this paper is not about drugs and crime or deficiencies in the existing data bases. It is about how the police record criminal events and how scientists use those records. Also, it is not a psychological assessment of police attitudes developed in the process of occupational socialization, although, to be sure, recognition of that process is a primary reason the research was undertaken. Rather, the work is about the inter-connected processes of evaluation and interpretation by which the police "create" official data and about the practical consequences of these processes - the implications of using the police to gather data for criminological uses.

The actual mechanisms used by police agencies for collecting data - the paper work - are of minor importance to this discussion.

Certain aspects of the process are presented to explain the methodology used or to provide background material necessary to an understanding of the analyses, but the process itself is not examined in detail.

The "Problem Statement", next following, provides a necessary insight to appreciate the "Summary" of the research. The third section of the dissertation reviews the literature. First, an overview of the sociology of knowledge provides a contextual referent for discussion of works concerned with the police handling of information in general, (with some specific relevancies to detective work) and the possibility that an equally consequential bias is present among scientists. Lastly, the literature review discusses deficiencies in the data bases most commonly used in criminological research and how the relationship between drugs and violence is described by scientists using these and other data sources. The review provides a background that informs an understanding of the data analysis chapter.

The chapter on methodology is presented in two parts; the first briefly describes the underlying research project (see Foreword) and the conceptual framework on which that work is based. Because this study makes secondary use of its data, a presentation of the theory that buttresses the original research gives meaning to the dissertation methodology presented in the second part of the methods chapter. A statistical analysis and discussion of findings follows and the paper concludes with recommendations for changing the way social scientists and particularly criminologists look at their data source, especially when that source is the police.

This research compares two sets of data that describe the same discrete sample of homicide events. The first data set consists of information supplied by the police alone - the type of information usually found in national data bases. The data were coded for analysis, "as is", without researcher/practitioner interaction, much the way the Uniform Crime Reporting system codes information. Most social scientists probably would consider these data flawed by inconsistent operational definitions, entry omissions and unstable response patterns, yet would also typically describe them as the best available data.

The second data set records the same homicide events using information gathered through joint researcher/practitioner participation. This is the type of data commonly used in criminological studies that rely on other than the national data bases for their information.

Throughout this discussion the first set is called "Police" data; the second, "Researcher" data. Comparisons are made without prejudice; this work looks not to fault either collection method nor to champion the construct of reality of either group. The research contrasts two sets of data and measures their agreement or lack of it for three reasons: First, to demonstrate that a "bias" exists (in quantifiable terms); next, by examining the way police handle information, to explore possible implications for the use of crime data generally; and lastly to argue that the police cannot be expected to provide sociologically useful data and therefore those involved in scientific inquiry who use "traditional" data sources should adjust

their theoretical interpretations by understanding the source from which their material arrives.

If it is to adequately inform perceptions of an abstract concept such as police attitudes towards information sharing, this discussion must rely on substantive, illustrative examples to supplement, explain or augment the quantitative findings. Still, the work should in no way be construed as an ethnography or what Van Maanen (1988) calls a "Confessional Tale" by a detective turned criminologist.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Are the police a valid source of information upon which to base scientific inquiry about crime?

This question is concerned with the way different people interpret the same bits of information and the possibility that any differential interpretation is structured relevant to their specific roles. If the reality of a criminal event is to be known, one would reasonably "Ask a cop", mainly because the other actors are most times absent or uncooperative. Yet, for good reasons, albeit reasons not always comprehended or appreciated by others, the police as an organization record, catalogue and return information in a manner unique to the occupation. When a detective reconstructs the scene of a crime, the purpose and manner for which the information is collected is a specific one, the clearance of the case. On the other hand, social scientists do not look to solve but to better understand criminal cases, and so, their purpose is often at odds with the purpose for which a detective collects information about an identical event.

When a detective sergeant was asked (as part of the actual data collection process), "What is the primary drug involved in this homicide?", he replied: "What's the address?" In his mind, apparently, drug use information was catalogued geographically. For him, if the homicide occurred south of X street, the primary drug involved was, perhaps, cocaine; if north of that street the drug involved was, perhaps, heroin. In either case, the datum of which drug was actually involved is lost in the "use specific" cataloguing of information by that individual officer. The officer can not be faulted for such

geographic typing of criminal events; to him, and for his purposes, the process is perfectly logical.

Solving crimes is the purpose around which detectives develop information gathering and analytical, investigative skills. They take a piece of information and embed it within a referent context which then leads the inquiry toward the next bit of data. In this example, "south of X street" tells the detective to seek out those connected to the cocaine distribution system for further information about the case. It makes sense that if the homicide occurred within the environs of a cocaine dealing/use milieu, the detective looks there for information. If the victim was intoxicated by alcohol or heroin or cocaine, or not connected at all with drugs, this fact would itself have little evidentiary value to the homicide detective. Once known, the detective would then move the inquiry into other quarters, but the shift would not be predicated by the drug use information as much as it would by the indication that more fertile forensic grounds are available outside the "south of X street" milieu.

Similarly, the fact that a victim or offender is described as a crack dealer does not tell the investigating officer that crack distribution is necessarily an important part of the reality of the event. It simply suggests that a series of known associates is available for questioning or that certain other information relating to the crack distribution and use systems should be examined (e.g., gang wars; murder contracts or hits; changes in the economic supply and demand curve). When the police apply the cognomen "crack dealer" or "heroin dealer" to someone, it is done more to describe a particular

string of prior known facts about the criminal environment in which drug dealers act than to describe the drug use habits of the individual referred to.

Lakoff and Johnson refer to this process as the use of "ontological metaphor", a way of viewing events, activities, emotions or ideas that gives them being. The metaphor designates as a substantive entity, perceptions that would otherwise be definitively sparse. The ontological metaphor is incorporated into the sub-culture's jargon and used in a manner that is not always understood by those unfamiliar with the analogy. Once prior experiences are identified in this way, "we can refer to them, categorize them, group them and quantify them", and by this means, reason about them and "perhaps" begin to believe that we understand what they are about (1980, 25-6). In the case of the police (or any sub-cultural group), this simply means that "experiences" are set within a framework of the group's construction, designed more to assist in a particular objective than to yield any broad understanding of reality. Thus the analogy of "crack dealer" to "crack distribution system" makes sense to the police. To a social scientist, the terms are hardly synonymous. Just as easily substituted for "crack dealer" and equally informative (for police purposes) is a geographic term that gives being to otherwise amorphous notions of "what's happening" in Harlem, El Barrio, the South Bronx, Jamaica or Brownsville. "The gang south of X street" says as much to a detective as does "crack dealer".

This metaphoric categorization however creates problems when researchers meet and must deal with it. When a term denoting singularity defines a collectivity, as the police use of metaphor, it

reflects a task-oriented interpretation of reality beyond the normal understanding of the social scientist. As social scientists are equally prone to using metaphors in the collective terms they use, situations often arise in which the same term has confusingly different interpretations. The example given in the introduction above regarding the mis-interpretation of the economic-compulsive classification of events emphasizes this point. A social scientist operationally defined that segment of the criminal world which is driven to criminality by a need for money to buy drugs. As applied by the police, the term took on such a broad meaning that almost any event in which finances were a part was included within the definition. This semantic difficulty is exacerbated because meanings are most often the product of "tacit knowledge . . . or what everyone 'knows' and what everyone uses to identify, interpret and testify about 'what happened'" (Cicourel 1968, 2). Meanings are deeply rooted in the personae of the users and frequently are hidden deep in the cloak of language.

Instead of nodding an understanding head in response to the "crack dealer" characterization of the police, the scientist would probably ask: Which drug; how much and how often was it used; what is the gram weight of a usual dosage; how is the user identified on the socioeconomic status continuum; what of his family; his friends; was he victim number one or two? The scientist would then store these data in a catalogue of referent variables to be retrieved when needed to create a descriptive composite of the event's reality. Just as the police cataloguing of knowledge is use specific, scientists collect information for a predetermined, directed and specific purpose.

It is not a question of the twain never meeting nor is it a requirement that they should. Rather a problem arises mainly because the police are not naturally interested in the methods or the nature of scientific inquiry while the scientists, particularly if they are criminologists, must all too often depend on the information gathering methods of the former. Added to this discrepancy is an almost universal desire among researchers to understand any and all enigmatic qualities in their subject while the police just as universally erect a wall of secrecy against the probing needles of questions about themselves. The research presented here indicates that, on both sides, data gathering methods are subject to value laden constructions. If social scientists are to understand the subject matter under investigation, and this observation is limited to those using police supplied information, it is not necessary for them to alter their personal interpretive schema. They should, however, adjust their theoretical approach to accommodate the fact that data supplied by practitioner agencies is not free of bias.

The suggestion is not without precedent. More than thirty years ago Hughes observed that professions delivery "esoteric services" that are determined by "esoteric knowledge" systemically constructed and applied to the problem of service delivery (1965, 1). Cicourel introduced his study of the social organization of juvenile justice with the observation: "The complication arises..." when we must address how the observer uses "tacit knowledge" (background information) in interpreting "what happened" (1968, 2). Gouldner wrote that "Social science is a part of the social world as well as a conception of it" (1970, 13). Humphries' (1981) work on the representation of the "agents

and institution of control" by the media, highlights a very specific interpretation of events by that occupation. Manning describes how the communication systems employed by an organization, itself, "create social realities in quite specific and differentiated fashion" (1982). Yet even though most criminologists are aware of the issue, many times no method can be designed to adequately compensate for the possible bias (Barker 1978, 264 citing Stoddard 1968).

Most criminologists use the "best available" sources of data for jurisdictionally specific and temporally static descriptive studies. The issue of "best available" data is discussed in the literature review below. For longitudinal studies, trend analysis and inter-jurisdictional research, criminologists generally use the national level data bases. Unless the data are collected first hand by the researcher, there is, without prejudice, a bias of significant proportions present in the data used to describe criminal events; if only because information gathered for operational purposes does not readily serve as data for research purposes. From the perspective of a social scientist, police collected data are often found to be less detailed and less specific than they would like them to be and often to mean something different from what they think the data mean (Brownstein et al., 1989).

It is not always possible to account for this bias consistently and across jurisdictions. Once discovered, yeoman efforts are spent adjusting the primary source data to the needs of the scientist, although such efforts may ultimately be unproductive. For example, in a situation like the one referred to earlier, it is possible

to identify as a pattern in the data sample that all drug related homicides south of X street are reported as being related to crack. At the same time, all homicides north of X street are said by the police to be heroin related. An astute researcher would discover the skewed nature of the data and adjust the theoretical analyses accordingly. More probably, a corresponding and opposite bias would be included in another part of the sample and the distortion would thereby be permanently hidden. In either case, each datum would be a product of its perceived context. The overall reporting of events would be far from the reality, far from a telling and rigorous description.

The material which helped identify the problem under study is derived from closely working with detectives to reconstruct the drugs/homicide nexus for analytical purposes. That research effort (DRCAH-2) is designed, in part, to address recognized deficiencies in the usually available data sources on crime and criminals. The mix of work-a-day empiricism, pragmatic necessity and what was at the outset an ill-defined indication that the way in which the police use descriptive data may effect the reality construction of criminal events, are each a structural part of the basis for testing the research question.

THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The primary question addressed by this research is: Are the police a valid source of criminologically useful data that can be used to describe the reality of crime? The inquiry proposes that the police gather crime information for reasons different from those for which a social scientist gathers information. Restated, the concern is that the police record, catalogue and retrieve information within an interpretive schema that is not always understood by others who use police supplied data. In order to test this observation, two separate data sets, both of which use identical variables to code the same set of discrete homicide events are compared. Using appropriate statistical methods, the comparison will determine the degree of agreement found in the data supplied by two different sources.

The research question implies the presence of some latent factor in the nature of policing that makes data supplied by this source different from data gathered by criminologists.

The formal hypothesis is:

The degree of disagreement between police data and research data is a function of the degree of bias present in the police data.

It should be apparent that the hypothesis assumes that any unique characteristics of the police data are to some measure driven by organizational or occupational factors. The question of comparable bias in the research data is not ignored. As in any research effort, the neutrality of the specific research variables used is relative to their ability to reflect association uncomplicated by other interests.

While the hypothesis testing identifies a bias in the police data, because it is a statistical comparison, the testing simultaneously identifies a bias in the researcher data. Throughout this discussion, "bias" bears no pejorative connotation. A researcher can say that the police data is biased because it is "different" and with equal validity, a police officer can say the same of the research data. So, as used here, "bias" refers to the particular way a group sees and interprets the things they observe.

Operationally defined:

"Police Data" are the product of having a police agency complete a survey instrument describing a discrete set of homicide events;

"Research Data" are the product of a joint police agency/researcher effort that allows the research questions to dictate the nature of the inquiry.

In other words, the efficacy of the respective sets of data to reconstruct the reality of criminal events is not at issue. The "best available" data might be found in either data set. In effect, the masked factors subjectively influencing both police and social scientist data sets are neutralized by the very process used to collect the data and both reconstructions are equally true.

The hypothesis and the testing of it names the police data as containing a bias but since the research compares that data with a like set produced by researchers and measures the differences between the two, each "occupation" (or group) share responsibility for the difference and hence both contain a "bias".

SUMMARY

When the same set of events are viewed by two different people (or groups) one can reasonably expect that the re-telling of the events will to some degree be different. This idea becomes compelling when the events are criminal homicide and the viewers are the police and social scientists. The former are closest to such events and could be expected to accurately reconstruct what happened. Society depends on the latter group to interpret the dynamics of criminal events such as homicide, to better understand what can be done about them.

During a research project that combined practitioner and researcher inter-actively, it became evident that the two differ more than agree about what happened. At first, the problem appeared to be a product of a police occupational bias that is unintentional, but real. In discussing this issue with a number of detectives participating in the research, a corollary but opposite possibility was suggested. Social scientists bring to the arena a set of interpretive schema that are equally self serving in that they are informed by an agenda that goes beyond a neutral understanding of the subject matter.

This study examines the opposing viewpoints by treating the police supplied data and the data collected by the social scientist as equally valid sources of information. Statistical comparison of the two was made. There is a measurable level of disagreement between what the police data say "happened" and what the research data say. This research makes no judgments regarding their relative value. It does however recommend that those who would do research with the police be aware of the occupational bias in police supplied data and that they

learn to adapt to it, for it is a "good" bias without which the police would be less effective.

The research found that the greatest disagreement appears in those variables that need most to be explained by the researcher. Variables that are created by the scientist to test a theoretical model, are based on personalized, tacit knowledge and are announced in a way that unconsciously assumes the definer's "knowledge" is shared by everyone else. This is not the case. When the variables studied here were grouped by "common definition", "mixed definitions" and "researcher defined", the first group showed the highest levels of acceptable scores of agreement and the latter group, the poorest.

Reliability, not validity, is the focal point of this work. It was found for the sample studied that, the consistency demanded by reliability standards is present to a greater measure in variables shorn of researcher invention; the variables defined exclusively to address theoretical questions showed the least ability to interate responses in the opposite data set. Overall the dissertation finds that when social scientists turn to practitioner agencies for their data, they should be aware that the most reliable answers are had when the questions are framed in language understood by the respondents.

Footnotes to Foreword; Chapter One.

1. This quotation is found in the original proposal made to N.I.J. The DRCAH-2 project is part of a series of research efforts addressing the relationship of drugs and violence. The other studies are: 1) Drug Related Crime Analysis - (DRCAH-1), NIJ 85-1J-CX0052; 2) Drug Related Involvement in Violent Episodes - (DRIVE), NIDA DA 03182; 3) Female Drug Related Involvement In Violent Episodes, (FEM-DRIVE), NIDA DA 04017 and 4) Drug Relationships In Murder - (DREIM), NIDA DA 04017-03-04.

2. These questions are primarily a concern of the DRCAH-2 research project. The inclusion in the DRCAH-2 methodology of a follow-up interview insured, as far as possible, that the data collected were in conformance with research objectives and responsive to the project's operational definitions. This dissertation is concerned with the fact that without the intervention of the research staff in that study, the police supplied data would be greatly different from the data that were actually used in the analyses.

3. "Use specific" or "investigative use specific" defines the primary ends for and particular ways in which detectives gather information. As a rule, they collect data for its value as the basis for an arrest, not for its epistemic value. The way in which detectives collect and return information is a very narrow application and use of knowledge (hence specific). Since information is seldom shared unless its owner perceives a justifiable necessity (usually a quid pro quo exchange), the processing of information can be said to have a very directed purpose. Simply put, detectives gather information for a personal and categorical use; the thought of sharing information with others, be they superior officers, other detectives, the press, the public, community activists or social scientists is anathematic.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

For purposes of clarity and insight, the review of the literature is presented in three parts: The problems associated with collecting definitive data on the relationship between drugs and violent crime generally and homicide specifically; the possibility of separate and distinct biases in both police and researcher supplied data; and an overview of the debate surrounding the sociology of knowledge. A discussion of the sociology of knowledge lays the theoretical underpinnings for discussion of the issue of bias, and indeed is what drives the entire dissertation.

Reality Construct and the Sociology of Knowledge

I live in the commonsense world of everyday life equipped with specific bodies of knowledge. What is more, I know that others share at least part of this knowledge and they know that I know this. My interaction with others in everyday life is, therefore, constantly affected by our common participation in the available social stock of knowledge. (Berger and Luckmann 1966, 39)

A reviewer of this dissertation's proposal saw the contribution of the work to be its seminal attempt to assess the measure of disagreement between the kind of data that feeds the usual crime statistics and data as they are usually collected and used by researchers. In this regard, the reviewer, good social scientist that he is, commented that the police, like all people, construct reality from their own experiences and in terms of their own values. When they describe an event they subjectively reconstruct that event; their description is actually an interpretation based on their common experiences and shared values.

His comments on the construct of reality by the police were uniformly echoed by all academics with whom the work was discussed. Most who were consulted about this work are social scientists and, to their credit, they went right to the core of a research project and identified the subject matter. To a person, the notion that a reporting bias might be found in the police supplied data was said to be a subject worthy of examination.

On its face, it is difficult to argue with an observation that individuals within a collectivity (Cohen A.K. 1986, 1980), socialized as a group, would bring a uniform interpretation to bear on a description of events. In this case, however, the identification of the subject matter as being the police and not the social scientist speaks to a bias within the research community that ignores the fact that their data may as well be tainted by personal but masked values. The dissertation proposal does not identify "the police data set" as the subject matter. Rather, it asks to examine the data provide by two groups, in effect as peers. That the police data was the appropriate (and perhaps logical) subject matter for study was inferred by those who were kind enough to review the proposal. It is fair to speculate that had the police done the review, might not the reverse be true?

The repetitiousness of this theme at first was troublesome, until its very uniformity yielded an approach to a discussion of how the police construct reality that would adequately inform the reader. The resultant approach is intended not to discuss the police as a separate entity, but to address the entire question of data construction and interpretation by relying on the contributions made by the sociology of

knowledge to making "sense of the various perspectives [in criminology] and the oftentimes contradictory conclusions derived from these perspectives" (Scimecca and Lee 1978, 46).

The Social Nature of Knowledge

"Reality is socially defined", or so say Berger and Luckmann (1966, 116). Different people might see different details or interpret the same details in different ways, so society's "stock of knowledge" is structured by what is relevant to specific roles (Berger and Luckmann 1966, 77). Cicourel discusses this as an issue of both theory and method: If two observers are from the same modern culture they might agree on the meaning of table or chair. Observers from an alien culture, the early Stone Age for example, might find it more difficult to achieve such consensus. In other words, as the subject matter gets more complicated, so too get the words needed to understand what we are talking about. As Cicourel puts it: "I am interested in how we assign unequivocal meaning to" the kinds of personal experiences and situational contexts not revealed in the "fixed-choice" categories provided [in survey instruments] (1968, 3). What Cicourel labels "tacit knowledge" in the individual is the same concept that Berger and Luckmann apply to groups. In any event, definitions are always embodied in specific contexts created by either individuals and groups of individuals who serve as definers of reality (1966, 116).

The question asked by Schutz:

How can I, in my attitude as a man among other men
or as a social scientist, find an approach to all
this if not by recourse to a stock of pre-
interpreted experiences built up by sedimentation
within my own conscious life . . .

(Wagner 1970, 56)

is central to the subject matter of the sociology of knowledge. The conceptual frameworks "so far developed" within the sociology of knowledge have not yet dealt adequately with the internal conflicts inherent in a belief that "human consciousness, knowledge and social factors are somehow integrally related" (Goff 1980, 1). More to the point, Scimecca and Lee say that "If one's background assumptions are in agreement with the assumptions of a theory, the theory will likely be accepted" (1978, 41). Scimecca and Lee refer to criminological theories in general, not the theoretical bases of the sociology of knowledge but their idea applies equally as well. (The general theories referred to are discussed below.)

Although Veblen is not usually identified with the sociology of knowledge, his observation that "habits of thought are an outcome of habits of life" (Coser 1977, 270) supports the criticism that the sociology of knowledge has a tendency to talk itself into a self-contradictory position since the scientist's own ideas about knowledge themselves derive their meaning from historical social circumstances (Goff 1980, 6-7).

Early in the development of a positivistic sociology of knowledge, Durkheim suggested that a way around this apparent contradiction could be found if the categories used for the objectification of thought could be demonstrably separated from the social context (Durkheim 1969, 483). Merton made an existential connection between knowledge and other elements in the society (1945). He contended that the term knowledge was so broadly defined that it refers to every "mode of thought" and since thought is generally held to be existentially conditioned (1945, 379-80), the task of those who study

the organization of knowledge must be the conceptualization of knowledge, the "existential" factors which influence knowledge and the relationship between the two. The apparent circularity of the study of "knowledge" to increase knowledge is more understandable if the object of the social scientist's thinking is to clarify the nature of problems, without necessarily being able to resolve them.

Contemporaneously with Merton's writing, Moore and Tumin, in their discussion of the functionality of ignorance, observed that there was (in 1945) a reversal of the trend to increased knowledge as being a panacea for all ills. They emphasize the fact that empirical knowledge and ignorance do not together exhaust the significant orientations of the individual to his environment. "Super empirical values exist beyond" them both. Moore and Tumin do not mean to de-emphasize the value of knowledge that is only empirical but rather point out that values in the society must be a consideration in any attempt at understanding knowledge, that to know how knowledge is organized requires consideration of "non-rational beliefs and values" which characterize societies (1949, 787-88 citing Malinowski (1938) regarding the role of magic and regarding societal values, Pareto (1935) and Parsons (1937)).

Taylor also sees values as intrinsically and inseparably a part of the human condition. "No society has been able to demonstrate with certainty that values have any objective existence or validity other than as ideas in the mind." (1956, 45). It seems that the sociology of knowledge meets its biggest hurdles at this point. If, as Taylor suggests, a value system is embodied in our institutions but the

values are "in the mind" of each individual, how then is the researcher to properly extricate meaning from ideas without imposing his own interpretations upon the information derived? In other words, when the sociologists of knowledge say that the intellect is influenced by "existential" factors and proceed to explain the observed knowledge, then all statements of "fact" they present must be relative to the sociologists' social biography, location and interests operating at that point in time. But should the sociology of knowledge be abandoned on such infirm grounds; the infirmity apparent in the fact that the influence of the social biographies of those who reject the work are also at play?

Goff's (1980, 1-21) presentation of the critique of the sociology of knowledge finds that its largest hurdle is not the circular reasoning referred to above but the fact that, given the basic "insight" that human consciousness, knowledge and social factors are somehow integrally related, proponents of the sociology of knowledge allow themselves to be manipulated into self-defeating efforts simply because they have never totally and consistently rejected their critics.

According to Goff, it seems an often repeated error that those critics who cry for non-subjectivity are never challenged as to their own objectivity, their assertions that their evidence is self-evident. A second error Goff locates in the common methodologies of critics and their targets that use a positivistic conception of objectivity which, by its very use, forces the proponents of the sociology of knowledge to attempt to theoretically conform to the same

parameters their critics use to defeat their efforts (see also, Lavine 1953). This does not have to be the case.

A review of one study which uses the methods of the sociology of knowledge to study the temporal shifts in criminological perspectives is a case in point. Scimecca and Lee (1978) base their argument on the concept of "paradigm" first formulated by Kuhn (1973). A paradigm, according to Kuhn, is a group of theories representing an integrated series of common assumptions about the nature of social inquiry and levels of acceptable proof. The structure of the dominant paradigm "must seem better than its competitors, but it need not, and in fact never does, explain all the facts with which it can be confronted" (Kuhn 1973: 17-18). Kuhn's paradigm determines levels of proof and the questions to be asked and in this sense reinforces itself or is then replaced by another paradigm. In his own words, a theoretical model is neither universal nor eternal and subject to change as an "awareness of anomaly" develops (Kuhn 1973, 52). Scimecca and Lee then add to this concept (and here return this discussion to the question of "tacit knowledge") their own notion that change occurs not because of anomalies discovered as a theory is put to the test, but because of "background assumptions" that are so deeply intrinsic "that we may not even be consciously aware of them" (1978, 41).

Tacit Knowledge and Group Think

Scimecca and Lee may be dismissing the anomaly discovery question for the wrong reason. Cell, a psychologist, calls attention to a "cogent schema for the process of scientific discovery" which proposes that "novelty [anomaly] emerges only with difficulty, manifested by

resistance, [and] against a background provided by expectation" (1984, 83; Wickelgren 1979, 13 - arrives at a similar conclusion). Until such time that we change our learning habits, the human tendency is to experience the usual and anticipated, even when confronted with anomalous conditions, say Cell and Wickelgren.

On an institutional level this individualistic phenomena is complemented by a suggestion that people in groups solve problems using "quasi-theories" which, structurally, first solve the problem, then define it and finally adopt a cause-and effect sequence (a theory) that justifies the solution (Hewitt and Hall 1973). The background assumptions and tacit knowledge of the individual are subordinated to the demands of the group at the same time they both help form the group consensus. The process is conveniently labeled "group think" and results from either the acceptance of a member of the correctness of the group ethos and/or a compliance in which private doubts about the decision are suppressed (Mc Cauley 1989, 250).

The notion of group suppression of contradictory states of affairs appears universal. When we learn that "doing what [comes] naturally" creates problems, we go along with the demands of the institution by rejecting our own perspectives and internalizing the norms and expectations of the system (Culbert 1977). Speaking of defenses against the conflict between personal experience and organizational expectations, Culbert relates the following:

For many of my colleagues in academia, this means publishing two or three articles a year without much personal concern for their actual relevance. The consequences of . . . these defenses is the same: we subordinate our pictures of reality to those of the system . . . (1977, 11)

It is not difficult or contentious to suppose that the suppression of individual values, at whatever level of consciousness this takes place, is subsumed by and is actually part and parcel of the process by which "background assumptions" and "tacit knowledge" are formed. "I apprehend the reality of everyday life", say Berger and Luckmann, "as an ordered reality [whose] phenomena are prearranged in patterns that seem to be independent of my apprehension of them and that impose themselves upon the latter" (1966, 21). "The social scientist's gestalt is thus a function of the ethos of the broader society" (Scimecca and Lee 1978, 41) or as Gouldner put it "Social science is a part of the social world as well as a conception of it" (1970, 13).

If social science and society are configured, physically, psychologically or symbolically, as an inseparable organism, sui generis, how then does the first learn about the other? Who would define the criteria for observation? How did Scimecca and Lee decide to study paradigmatic change in criminological perspectives when they themselves are criminologists operating within a particular paradigm? Does not their theory become tainted by the "genetic fallacy" (Goff 1980, 4), of connecting validity with origin. Child says that any attempt to explain the development of ideas, especially in respect to their validity or objectivity, in terms of extrinsic or existential factors, is guilty of the genetic fallacy and is therefore conceptually flawed (1941, 405) primarily because the validity of the explanation is unconsciously originates in one's background assumptions.

Starbuck provides a "useful lesson" in this regard: A group of 13th century Parisian professors got interested in whether oil would

congeal if it were left outdoors on a cold night and launched a research project to find out. After much work, they concluded that the question was unanswerable. The professors had carefully searched all of Aristotle's works, and nothing he had written answered this question. "The lesson is, of course, that the Parisian professors were absolutely right: the question was unanswerable in their ideological frame of reference." (1982, 24-25).

The Prerogatives of Sociology

Questions as to the nature of the sociological inquiry are informed to a large extent by Scimecca and Lee's work, discussed below, and by this short detour into what are generally viewed as the basic assumptions of sociology. The guiding assumption underlying the discipline is that persons are fundamentally social in nature (Goff 1998, 1) and that the reality of everyday life is shared with others (Berger and Luckmann 1966, 28). A belief in the legitimacy of sociological endeavor, in its ability to progressively contribute to and improve a theoretically fruitful and pragmatically useful body of knowledge, can be said to rest on the basic assumptions that sociology "owns" a valid subject matter, that it can be described and measured and that the subject matter involves recurrent events between which a describable relationship exists (Lachenmeyer 1971, 2-3).

In an etymological discussion of new terms appearing in the language, Rheingold calls attention to a construction of reality, in the French, labeled déformation professionnelle. In English it translates as "professional idiosyncrasy; vocational bias" or a view of reality biased by one's profession. Following the adage of the blind men guessing the shape of the elephant, he provides as example of the term at work:

Four people gaze at a steeple. A minister sees a religious monument. A mechanical engineer sees a balance of forces and materials. A psychoanalyst sees a Freudian symbol. The person who has to climb 70 steps to clean the belfry sees something else. The same object, but each observer has a different take, depending on his or her déformation professionnelle.

The steeple in this example is not a quadripartite subject matter for it remains unitary in nature; its nature changes not at all by having been subjected to scrutiny. However, the steeple has been legitimized from four different perspectives as a subject for study that can be measured and described. Upon a second observation each observer's relationship to it can be articulated in much the same terms that were used at the first. (The methodological considerations this example brings to the discussion requires the supposition that each observer is a member of a scientific "discipline".)

The crucial issue, the problem, is how each observer objectifies the material he observes so that others can arrive at similar inferences (Cicourel 1968, 4). That they have a justifiable prerogative in attempting the objectification should not be part of the debate, as it is in that surrounding the legitimacy of the sociology of knowledge.

In a broader sense, Goff concludes his digest of the critique of the sociology of knowledge with the observation that the critics are subject to the "self-same criticisms" that they level at the sociology of knowledge; therefore it "becomes quite unclear as to why positivism should be considered free of social penetration or why the insight [the relativism of knowledge and social factors] should be rejected out of hand" (1980, 20).

Goff makes some positive recommendations for the future of the sociology of knowledge, mainly that the study must be pursued within "an entirely different epistemological framework" (1980, 21), yet he is equivocal regarding the present state of the inquiry. He takes to task the critics; "the classical theory of knowledge does not constitute a self-validating logic" (1980, 20) and a number of its major proponents alike. Berger and Luckmann, he says, are guilty of the same circular reasoning as were Durkheim and Mannheim: If knowledge is socially determined and therefore relative in time and space, then the claim to truth presented by these sociologists "cannot itself be accepted. It, too, must be a 'truth' relative to the social space and interests of these writers." (1980, 9). The debate is not ended.

Criminological Theory and the Sociology of Knowledge

Scimecca and Lee ignore this debate to examine the changes over time in criminological paradigms from a sociology of knowledge perspective. They demonstrate, for example, that the functionalism of the 1940's and 1950's gave way to interactionism not for any fault in the former's theoretical foundation but because the black, student and women's movements "cried out for analysis" and the functionalist model

was found wanting (1978, 43; 42-44). In turn, interactionism is being challenged by conflict theorists not because it suffers a lack of empirical attention nor that the theory could not answer Gibbs' four questions, which any theory of deviant behavior needs to be able to answer to warrant serious consideration, but because shifts in "domain assumptions" are forcing the change (1978, 44-5). ("Domain assumptions" typify Gouldner's conception of "an aspect of the larger culture that is most intimately related to the postulations of theory." 1970, 31). In other words, they are the perspective that links the theorist and the larger society.) Scimecca and Lee ascribe the success of the conflict perspective to a movement within in the "societal ethos" away from a desire to understand and explain individual and group problems, in the late 1960's and 1970's toward a desire to understand the political and economic order of society (1978, 45-46).

Having traced change in theory over time, Scimecca and Lee describe their postulation as "an extreme relativistic position" that shifts the focus to the level of the sociology of knowledge, "a perspective which has been conspicuously absent from criminological theory". In sum, they maintain that there is a relationship between theory, the theorist, and the world in which "he lives and studies" (1978, 46).

Whether or not they are correct in their analysis is not at issue here nor would any pertinent purpose be served in candling their methods on the lamp of scientific "rigor". The critical point, and the reason this synopsis spends so much time with this area, is that the review of criminological theory by Scimecca and Lee has a heuristic

value and, any quarrel with the methods employed notwithstanding, it makes a contribution to the body of knowledge. If their criterion for analysis is subjective or inductive, so be it. As is typical of most research, the context surrounding the proffered thesis provides adequate explanatory framework from which the reader can educe a sense of agreement or argument based on his or her own background assumptions.

Relevance of the Sociology of Knowledge to the Present Study

Following the above, there is nothing inappropriate about the principal investigator of study B accepting, wholly or in part, the theoretical orientation of study A. The same holds for study B creating a priori a series of original definitions to drive the work. The foregoing discussion adverts to the force of different realities and the tacit knowledge upon which sociological research must rely. As Starbuck puts it: "Social scientists cannot all study the same reality because the social universe is comprised of multitudinous realities." (1982, 7). The theme of this discussion so far is that no one reality exists in the social sciences but more importantly, it suggests that, provided both are applied uniformly and consistently, one method of constructing reality cannot be valued more than another. To be sure, disagreement is allowed and, as Scimecca and Lee suggest, is in fact the life's blood of progress and change.

For purposes of this discussion, the significance of the issues raised in the sociology of knowledge is not the impossibly circular nature of its subject matter. That is a dilemma to which this paper will not recommend a solution, for the problems seem to be fundamentally irresolvable. Rather, the critical inference to be drawn

from the foregoing is the fact that data are affected by perceptions in very much the same way as are other social phenomena. The problem addressed here is that we may have come to ignore this inconvenient fact. In Cicourel's terms, often what we think of as tables are really chairs. More to the point, crime statisticians may be looking at chairs thinking they are tables.

This review of the literature continues with a description of how the police and social scientists each use information for their specific purposes. This "qualitative" material informs an understanding of the core of this dissertation, its documentation of immediate, important and quantifiable consequences when two different groups, separately examining the same set of events, create dissimilar research data.

POLICE HANDLING OF INFORMATION

The focus of the ensuing discussion might give the impression that this study is more concerned with the possibility that an occupational bias exists in police supplied crime data than with the possibility that an equally serious bias exists among researchers. This is not the case. Both are serious concerns. In fact, the term "occupational" bias as used in this dissertation is more a convention of convenience without the structure that a study in organizational analysis might connote by "occupational". The term, here, simply describes those masked variables that are brought to bear on the way a particular group collects and records information - since the police "occupation" and the research community are the focal points for the discussion about how data is obtained, they are referred to as

occupations, rather than "groups", "segments", "collectivities" or the like. The "bias" describes the different assessments of the same events found in the respective data sets.

For purposes of this discussion then, "occupational bias" is not fixed in time, is not purposefully prejudiced and is neither integrated officially nor systemically immobile. It is a personal thing, a "mind set" that affects perceptions and is a bias only because its product is an "uninformed or unintentional inclination" that may "operate either for or against someone or something" (American Heritage 1985, 175) that in this case created a measurably different accounting of what happened when two different "occupations" examined the same occurrences.

Also, the reader might discern an over-emphasis of the point that the motivation for detectives' construction of reality is more personal, a concern with the prestige of knowledge, compared to the social scientist's supposedly objective search for knowledge. This too is not the case.

Simply put, the body of literature regarding the handling of information generally, is more heavily weighted with studies of police organizations than with a like treatment of social scientists as a collectivity. Although it is not pursued here in depth, the possibility that social scientists may be moved by motives both personal and self-protective should be noted. Paul de Man (the founder of the deconstructionist school of literary theory in the United States) who some allege spent much of his professional career "trying to explain away" the anti-Semitic writings of his youth, (Donoghue 1989) is a case

in point, as is the classic debate between Gouldner (1968) and Becker (1967) regarding scientific objectivity discussed below.

This paper attempts no judgement nor assigns any weight or value to either the police or research perspectives. An inquiry into the different measures of the same events each produce is the primary concern. Accordingly, a presentation of the way police generally process information precedes a suggestion that an equally compelling bias is present in the scientist.

Expertise and the Function of Ignorance

One of the most influential social theorists of recent years, M. Foucault, has focused his attention on the relationship between modernization and the growth of bureaucratic power. He has in a variety of works specifically addressed the intimate relationship between knowledge assumed by the state and the ability of its agencies to expand its power of intrusion within civil society.

In his Discipline and Punish (1979) for example, Foucault applies his schema to the development of the modern prison as an institution per se and as metaphor for the whole of modern society. He says that the prison's power to influence the behavior of all it constitutes - its social spirit as well as employees and inmates - lies in its monopoly of a body of knowledge that is of a deep but generally unknown extent. Foucault's perspective depends on the development of an "expertise"; that is, an organizationally controlled body of knowledge whose scope is considerable and the more intimidating because its precise extent is unknown. In Foucault's framework, secrecy, power and intrusiveness are three characteristics of the operation of the

bureaucracy in the modern world. The framework equally well elucidates the use of information in police organizations.

Police organizations are arranged hierarchically and the flow of information, in the form of memoranda, directives, general orders and the like, is from the top downward. At the operational level, dicta require police officers to record information much as the telephone company lists names and addresses - individually, to be filed alphabetically or by date of occurrence to be retrieved only when somebody needs to "look something up." (Wilson 1968, 62-3). Information about crimes is gathered in standardized, "characteristic" documents and files and little effort is made to evaluate the information for predictive or preventive purposes (Manning 1977, 266). More often the data are used to measure efficiency and accomplishments and generally present the department to the public in a favorable light (Griffin 1958, 31).

Upward communication is minimal, mainly because, as Manning sees it, much of the information available "is retained by lower [ranking] participants primarily as a means of self-protection." (1977, 267). The self-protectionism identifiable in the lower ranks is tacit but apparent in the more general organizational posture and the latter most probably facilitates the former.

In one way, a very compelling way, the overall process can be viewed as a function of ignorance, or, more positively, the process reveals an appreciation of the power personally owned knowledge affords. This concept is important to an understanding of the handling of information by the police, especially detectives.

Moore and Tumin opine that "as a general principle" ignorance in others tends to nurture one's own sense of security (or that of an entire social system) "wherever knowledge would aid an actual or potential enemy" (1949, 790). For police officers, the functional aspect of ignorance means that the more we (the police) know about the enemy, the weaker the enemy becomes be it the criminal, or the public, the researcher or the media. For tenable reasons the police think that the more they know about an "alleged" offender, the easier an apprehension can be made. Detectives, in particular, are motivated from the outset of any investigation to secure as much information about the participants in the event as possible. The jurisprudential prohibition against presenting evidence of a citizen's criminal history does not apply to using that history as the corner stone of a dossier. The personification of the Federal Bureau of Investigation developed the process to a fine art (Powers 1983; Cook, F.J. 1984) and its power was not lost on at least one of our Presidents (Congressional Quarterly 1975; Muzzio 1982).

The corollary of the notion that knowledge is power, is that the more the enemy knows about you, the weaker you become. In this sense the ownership of knowledge is viewed as a bipartite struggle for power in which the relationship between weakness and knowledge is linear: The more "I" know about "you", the weaker "you" become, and the converse. This perception serves to engender a posture of self-protectiveness in police organizations on several levels, two of which are pertinent to this discussion. First, in the way detectives deal with criminals and second, in the way they deal with each other.

In both cases, the "habitualization" of behavior leads to a typification by the institution (including the environment in which detectives operate) of what expected behavior should be (Berger and Luckmann 1966, 53-54). Within policing, one of the hallmarks of a "good" detective is the way in which information is used to protect one's self, not only from criminals but from most other outsiders as well. There is a fluid and facile transition from treating one societal segment (criminals) in a particular fashion to treating most other segments equally. In the work place, most detectives treat criminals, the public and their fellow officers much the same, at least when it comes to sharing information. The argument that police officers are a unitary collectivity of mutual admirers, or a group that goes out of its way to defend and protect individual members of the group, is discounted below.

Lying and Secrecy

Parenthetically, functional ignorance as defined above has common etiological roots with the lying and secrecy that is so prevalent a part of day-to-day policing. Manning describes the effects of the process at three levels; the court house, the public and the criminal (1978) while Skolnick's typology of police deception concentrates on the investigative, interrogation and testimony phases of police work (1982).

First, at the court house, where, by using a stylized and indefinite idiom ("alleged defendant", "it can be assumed that", "proceeded on information received") the police withdraw commitment to a "paper reality" that carries over into their dealings with "outsiders

(sociological investigators, journalists, lawyers. . .)" (Manning 1978, 242).

A typical device used to counter the dilution of a position of power and privilege is the creation of a specialized, even esoteric, vocabulary or the invocation of a technology shrouded in mystique (Moore and Tumin 1949, 789). Jargon can always be used to impede as well as facilitate communication, even between members of the same sub-cultural or occupational group. Exclusive knowledge works to maintain a separation between detective and outsider and detective and other detectives. In a structurally similar, though more subtle, way lying and secrecy allow a police "bible", or anyone who is looked to as an information source, to fend off a potential consumer since it establishes privilege in intra- as well as intergroup relations.

Second, there is the assumption on the part of the police that if enforcement information (deployment of personnel, differential attention to certain criminal activities, patterns of police operations) were communicated to the "respectable" public, conceivably, the public might withdraw support from the department. Lastly, in dealings with the criminal and the public alike, law enforcement "requires preserving a degree of ignorance" (Manning 1978, 242-3). Manning, and others (e.g., Van Maanen 1978;) say that the police suspect large segments of their clientele are "ingrates" and thus, cynically, the police officer uses "[among other things] incongruity . . . in a sharpened way" that consciously suspends a "principal feature of everyday life - the principle of trust" (Manning 1978, 243; also, Buckner 1967; Ryan 1986;

Sacks 1972;). Contrary to popular perceptions, detectives do not place abiding confidence in their fellows.

Privileged Position and Knowledge

Here, the discussion is limited to secrecy in dealing with the criminal, the public and other police officers, since this aspect of police behavior most influences the way information is controlled. The first, and most obvious functional consideration, is the element of planned "surprise" that is endemic to law enforcement operations. In both the public perception and in fact, the success of law enforcement operations and the security of the officers involved may depend upon keeping the operation secret (Moore and Tumin 1949, 790); upon guarding against the risk that prior knowledge by the criminal target will weaken their upper-hand position. "It is assumed" that if the suspect, in particular, and to some degree if the general public, are informed of an intended police action, they might change their behavior patterns to avoid arrest or surveillance (Manning 1978, 242).

For most police officers, this is an indisputable fact; operationally, it is a basic tenet: Let the bad guy know you are coming, and when you get there, he won't be there. Consequently, detectives, in particular, operate in an atmosphere guarded by tacit but no less real threats. Skolnick's "symbolic assailant" for the uniformed officer threatens physical well being. A detective's information is equally threatened by sharing, symbolically if not in fact. The role of detective institutionalizes suspiciousness and distrust (Banton 1964, 168-175) and although perhaps not indigenous to the role, a developed

attitude of cynical skepticism is certainly an ingrained and large part of a detective's persona.

In the conceptual scheme of Moore and Tumin this kind of secrecy is of obvious benefit, "particularly to the cynical", in maintaining social differentials between the specialist and the consumer; in this case between detective and criminal or other outsiders (1949, 788).

When used against criminals, this level of the function of ignorance is legitimized, if only through general acceptance by the occupation. Along with the expertise, a Moore and Tumin point out, comes the creation of a specialized jargon for those "in the know". And jargon too can be used as a mechanism for coping with frustration. In a classic article (1978), Van Maanen provides example (and cogent argument) that the police use the term "asshole" universally, without regard to status, race, or class when faced with frustration. All those who present the police with a seeming irresolvable problem, be they hoi polloi or the richest 400, are described as "asshole".

There is a similar facet of the withholding of information that is not as widely recognized. It is applied with equal force in the interaction of one detective with another. The attitude toward information sharing the police show toward outsiders, is reinforced and fine tuned in their dealing with other police officers. The skills developed on the one hand to deal with criminals are duplicated in the workaday inter-actions between individual officers and their peers. It is not surprising that the skills developed to secure personal control of information are generally applied in all professional encounters.

Concerning their treatment of peers, it is important to know that there is a tremendous rivalry among detectives for promotion, peer recognition, choice assignments and privileged position that is predicated, for the most part, on successful clearance of cases. In the detective squad rooms, one who clears a high percentage of assigned cases is a "good" detective and succinctly, a "good" detective is only as "good" as his information. Detectives who have, or can give the appearance of having, "good information" (knowledge) are therefore en route to the status of superiority. Peers are beholden to them for the information they do share and supervising officers who benefit from the largesse of shared information, afford them an enviable deference. At the base of it all is an unspoken and bilateral acceptance that the store of knowledge is finite, that too much shared will diminish superior status and that to force information from such a source would be to shut it off completely.

The reluctance of detectives to share their knowledge with their colleagues is more evident when other than detectives ask for information. A detective's dealings with outsiders are more so colored by the corollary of functional ignorance: "Knowledge is power". The posture of most police officers in their inter-actions with researchers, the press, community leaders and such others who inquire into the workings of the department, is therefore one of giving only enough information to forestall further inquiry. Gratuitously proffered information is seen as a harmful boomerang that, in the idiom of the police, "will only come back to haunt you". Control of information at both levels, in dealings with other detectives and with the general public functions to secure the controller's superior position.

Given the idea that privileged position accrues to the dispenser of an exclusive knowledge, it follows that privilege tends to diminish as the information becomes common knowledge

Detectives and Information Sharing

The second point regarding the self-protectiveness found in police organizations, that police officers generally and detectives specifically, do not treat each other much differently than they do outsiders when information sharing is concerned begs for further study. In the case of detectives, research reporting that about 80 percent of a police officer's time is spent in order maintenance, as opposed to law enforcement tasks, are misleading. For the most part, detectives investigate crimes known to the police, Detective work is "service" only in the way it satisfies a clientele already victimized by criminals. Since the bulk of their workload is law enforcement after the fact, detectives seldom solve service oriented problems the way patrol officers might. Because little research has focused upon the investigators themselves (Black 1980, 14; but see Leinen 1984; Cohen and Chaiken 1987; Sanders 1977; Manning 1980; Wilson 1978) documentation of this point relies heavily on those few parts of the general police literature which describe the detective experience accurately.

Skolnick warns that all police behaviors are not alike, yet his point that "there are distinctive cognitive tendencies" in policing that "tend to develop" a unique way of looking at the world (Skolnick 1986, 42) has particular relevancy where detectives are concerned. By its very nature the world of the police [detective] is permeated by a sardonic lack of trust (Punch 1984) and, as de Tocqueville observed

about politicians in general, "by the cares of self-defense" (1945, 140). The guarded treatment of others in other parts of the criminal justice system, the public and in general "outsiders", creates a "working personality" (Skolnick 1986, 42) of detectives that disposes them to trust but a few close colleagues, or perhaps none at all.

Ethnographic studies of police have identified "colossally complicated networks" of information denial, unshared secrets and rivalry (Bittner 1970, 64). Albeit Bittner's work was with uniformed police officers, his observation is equally apropos the communication system of detectives. Punch argues that the "blue wall" (in this case, the sports jacket and polyester pants wall) is really less secure than a picket fence and the "solidarity" of the occupation is, in fact, actually characterized by "cut-throat" competition among individuals opposed to team work, the hoarding and protectiveness of information, and an aura of secrecy surrounding the "highly personal" control of information. Self-protection and personal control of information are key elements considered here for they seem to be characteristics unique to detectives that directly affect the quality of available data about crime. (Information generated by detective work is a chief source of much of the UCR data.)

At the organizational level, functional ignorance and a predisposition to retain information to protect one's self create a flow of information within the organization that is entirely one direction, downward. Dunning and Hochstedler, applying strictly organizational concepts, postulated that two-way, horizontal communication within any organization is a functional necessity. However, within police

organizations they found this to be untrue (1982, 152). In light of the ethnographic studies by Manning (1978), Bittner (1974) and Rubinstein (1973), Dunning and Hochstedler allowed that the "dysfunctional or distorted" communications systems (which are the norm in policing) do not seem to adversely affect the enforcement of the law. They concluded that, in this setting, horizontal communication appears to be nearly free of association with job satisfaction; that horizontal communications indicators and job satisfaction indicators are not associated (statistically) to a degree or consistency necessary for drawing conclusions. Rather, the authors suggest that the police, as has been claimed in the literature (for example, Muir 1977), are satisfied with recognition by their peers (1982, 144, 152). The discussion by Dunning and Hochstedler of this observation, that police organizations do function effectively in contradiction of accepted organizational theories that model communication systems as open, reciprocal arrangements, falls short of the real content of the issue.

Dunning and Hochstedler should have made part of their survey instrument, questions that address the peer recognition earned by a police officer who is perceived to hold a huge store of knowledge and only doles it out grudgingly. They are concerned with communication networks yet their survey instrument only focuses on recognition for work performed, for praise received from superiors as a satisfier or the dissatisfier of having work go unnoticed. These questions ignore a critical element.

There is probably no higher praise given a police officer than the appellation of being the "bible" on a particular issue. The

kudos of one's peers, is an extremely strong "satisfier". For example, the detective who knows the drug scene "inside and out", the expert on jewelry identification or valuation, the interviewer who routinely "gets the story" from child victims of sex abuse when colleagues cannot, each enjoys high respect from other detectives. Regrettably for researchers, in practice such "bibles" are opened only when the owner allows it. A police officer's information is his "private stock" which no one else may presume to use "unless invited to share" (Rubinstein 1973, 438). In the case of detectives, such expertise is more modestly described as a "good working knowledge" of the street or the investigative process. The possessive attitudes are tacit reminders of what Moore and Tumin (1949) and Manning (1978) have, respectively, identified for the scientific community as functional ignorance and lying and secrecy.

Social Organization of Detectives - A Few Observations

The reluctance of detectives to share information goes beyond having a particular expertise. It includes a reluctance to share all exclusive information. Again, although Bittner was concerned with uniformed officers, his observation that "the overriding rule is that no one tells anybody else more than he absolutely has to" (1970, 64) is no less compelling when applied to detectives. Manning makes a major contribution to the overall understanding of how detectives handle information with the point that "The police as an organization do not possess a 'common culture' when viewed from the inside. Instead, there is an elaborate hierarchical rank structure which replicates the social distribution of secret knowledge" (1978, 244 emphasis in the original). To bolster his argument that secret sharing patterns the structure and

functioning of "secret organizations" like the police, Manning cites Simmel 1964, 345):

As soon as a whole group uses secrecy as its form of existence, the significance becomes internal; the secret determines the reciprocal relations among those who share it in common...[therefore] the sociology of the secret society is confronted with the complicated problem of ascertaining how intra-group life is determined by the group's secretive behavior toward the outside.

Skolnick's study of the amount of deception found acceptable at various levels of the criminal justice system describes an inverse relationship. Deception, mainly purposeful lying, is most accepted by those segments of the criminal justice systems who serve as controllers of police conduct at the investigation stage and least acceptable in the courtroom (1982, 122). If Skolnick's observation is true, detectives then, are cued that police superiors, prosecutors, judges, indeed, the entire environment in which they operate, expect and tacitly endorse perfidy. Klockers identified this dilemma as "The Dirty Harry Problem" that describes a bad means/good ends discrepancy (1985). Extrapolated to detectives, the stereotypical role says they must somehow secure a clearance of the case without resorting to deceptive practices while the pragmatic say this is impossible.

The Organizational Contribution to Deception

The organization itself is not without culpability in creating a climate of secrecy and deception. When general procedural rules are laid down by any bureaucracy, its members develop and use theories and shortcuts of their own creation which are "tacitly or explicitly acceptable" to those members who act as the organization's mechanism to control behavior (Cicourel 1973, 1). This general

observation describes the police milieu, as did Skolnick, as "normatively contradictory", almost schizophrenic (1982, 121). Hidden in this anomic conflict, is an anxiety producing function, again, of ignorance. Rules are ordinarily thought of as lending predictability to the organizational climate, and therefore reassurance to those who work within it. In practice however, they are constructed and applied partially and selectively and more often lead to insecurity among those in the lower strata (Moore and Tumin 1949, 793-95).

For direction, members of the organization turn to each other to develop a normative system of behavior or what Cell describes as "a sense of self" (1984, 76-7). It seems as if the lack of direction from the organization regarding behavior on the personal level (prescriptive exemplars and not the proscriptive rule book which is voluminous), results in the lower echelon personnel driving the organization. Davis observes that the astounding thing about police department policy is that much of it is made at the lowest levels (1974, 622-3; also Sykes 1985, 58; Brown 1981, 89). If an "ordered reality" in which objectification appears pre-ordained (Berger and Luckmann 1966, 21-22) exists for detectives, it evidently is more a product of background expectancies of their own making (Cicourel 1973, 7) than it is a product of the organization they work for. The police organization is qualitatively no different from others in the way it creates conflict between behavior dictated by policy and behavior necessary for the proper functioning of the organization as an entity. However, the stifling effect on information sharing in the police bureaucracy is heightened, mainly because the raw material of police work is information.

An illustration of this dynamic is the not uncommon occurrence in which a high ranking police chief directs a favorite detective, sub rosa, to gather information about a crime from a criminal source - the type of contact that is prohibited by department rules. At one time, "Consorting with known gamblers" was a favorite chastisement of police officers in the NYPD. No police officer could associate with persons who had been arrested for a gambling offense without fear of formal disciplinary action. Yet, it was the known gamblers who had much information about other criminality and it was this very source that detectives would be directed to when deemed necessary to solving a "big" case. A supervisor would direct the detective to "contact his sources", knowing full well that such conduct contradicted department policy. When a detective who successfully completed such a task would be asked by another how he or she arrived at the information, the source, of course, would remain anonymous.

Information in Investigations

This is not to be construed as saying detectives never share information. They do, but usually the recipient is a trusted colleague, a fellow sufferer trying to meet unclear organizational objectives within equally ambiguous procedural guidelines. In almost all cases, it is only another "team" member, another detective with whom the giver of information has a working relationship of some duration and communal identification, who benefits from another's store of knowledge. Even then, information is shared only for clearly articulated purposes, such as solving a crime.

The primary purpose of detectives' information gathering activities is to develop data that has good forensic value. To the list of "qualities" a good investigator must have, in which Cohen and Chaiken put "Gathering Information" as the first (1987, 14), Skolnick adds his observation that the facts must be obtained in a way as to allow them to be used in evidence (1986, 183). More pragmatically, Reiss observes that quite often fact finding involves more the locating than the identification of an offender (1971, 109). In most cases closed by arrest, the detective knows from the outset who the target criminal is or identifies the target quite quickly, so locating, not naming, the crime doer is the major investigative hurdle. It is a utilitarian prerogative in investigative work therefore to gather information that locates rather than identifies.

Detectives are concerned more with where the "who did it" can be found than with the criminal's SES status, parentage, mental condition, demographics and, of concern to this study, drug use habits. If any of these kinds of facts provide information as to the target's present location, certainly, the information is not ignored. In addition to locating the suspect, such information may determine the way a particular case will be handled; how much time and importance a case will receive (Black 1980, 14-17). (It is a truism in police work that a "newsworthy" case will receive more attention than an "ordinary" crime but the standards used to determine such allocation of time are amorphous - detectives usually being informed that a case is "a heavy" one, only informally.) In practice, detectives generally discount the kinds of information that a social scientist might find of value. The

detective considers them as less than knowledge; more as a nuisance to be dealt with and disposed of quietly as possible.

This fundamental contradiction between the way a detective and a researcher value information is at the core of the disagreement the respective perspectives bring to data collection. In all honesty, practitioners deny any "knowledge" of a fact that a research considers vital and more importantly, a fact that the researcher expects the practitioners to "know" if only because they are closer to the event. Such denial is defensible and legitimate to a police officer yet to a scientist it is oft times incredible. That a detective reports a dispute as the precipitating factor in a homicide but is unable to say in any detail what the dispute was about, leads researchers to suspect disingenuousness, the short shrift mentioned above. Most scientists are by nature curious and by training probative - they need to test elements for their contribution to the result. Most research designs would inquire into the dispute - is it a family matter; a continuing or spontaneous exchange; is physical or psychological abuse contributory; are the participants' biographies telling, and so on.

On the other hand, most detectives see the "need to know" satisfied by the simple fact that a dispute occurred. That Mary and John argued satisfies the forensic inquiry - that the homicide was the cumulation of many years of spousal friction is considered by detectives as incidental information, nice to know but directly, of little relevance. Further, the fact that Mary and John were both high on drugs at the time of the homicide is similarly devalued. "High" suffices as to why the homicide occurred. The particular drug that one was high on

is of less interest to detectives. In general the police view drug use as possibly exculpating and therefore dangerous to successful prosecution of the case.

An actual case serves to demonstrate this observation. A teenager attempted to crash a house party and was stabbed to death by another teenager who resisted the first's entry to the affair. The investigating detective reports that approximately 30 teens attended the party by invitation and another 10 or 12 attempted entry. The case was reported as "Not Drug Related" and all drug related question on the survey instrument were answered "No". In the interview, the detective was asked if he, having been present at the scene, noticed any evidence of alcohol or drug consumption and emphatically the response was negative. Scientific rigor demands the case be classified as reported yet the report raises more questions than it answers. Based on a personal knowledge of the neighborhood (and its people) where the homicide happened, this researcher finds it unbelievable that in 1988, in inner-city New York, a group of teenagers would party sans liquor and, at least, some "soft" drugs. The picture provided by the detective of kids in that neighborhood using only soft drinks runs counter to personal experience and must be doubted.

The doubt cannot force the issue of drug relatedness but it does draw attention to the way detectives report criminal events to outsiders. Had the researcher here not been familiar with the environment and versed in the ways of its people, the "Not Drug Related" categorization might well have gone unnoticed. The detective's report that someone was killed during a dispute whose origins are described

only as "gate crashing" would have to suffice. It satisfies the practitioner's purposes and little more information can be expected from that quarter.

Handling information in this way allows detectives to use bits of information just the way the example above of the sergeant asking "what's the address?" in response to a specific question about drug involvement, describes. The geographic classification of drug use habits and distribution systems or the "crack dealer" designation being used to generally describe what most others perceive as specific characteristics are common practice. The process is akin to a classification system in which the arrangement of entities into groups is according to some system, some set of principles or preordained rules (Gottfredson 1987, 1). The characteristics which identify a group are subject to varied interpretation, misunderstanding and reliability. For an innocent to be "with" a criminal, is often to be classed as one, regardless of the reality that the only guilt is by association (Goffman 1963, 46-48). It is seldom with malicious intent that the police make use of such information. They would not for example invoke the formal criminal process based on association. Generally, the use is functional and purposeful in that "association" spells out information - if someone is associated with a criminal, that someone should have information of the former's whereabouts.

The concept of functional fixedness (Duncker 1945, 85; see note 3, p. 20 regarding "use specific") that was to have considerable influence in problem-solving research, describes the tendency to perceive things in terms of their familiar uses and although, we

commonly associate the term "set" with a state of mind that is fixed, a broader definition of the term includes the cognitive activity that precedes thinking (Solso 1979, 396). When we think about solving a problem, we necessarily rely on a stock of knowledge and organize it in a way which logically addresses the problem at hand. From this flows the concept that perception is "always" part of a larger "adaptive" act (Klien 1970, 215). Klien call the process "motivated selection" (1970, 215) and a sociologist calls the cognitive base "tacit knowledge" (Cicourel 1968, 2). It would seem then, that Skolnick's (1986) "working personality" is a product of a mind set rooted in the selectively and uniquely acquired "tacit knowledge" within which detectives frame their problems to be solved and develop with a fair degree of ease (and success) the ontological metaphor to give understandable human qualities to things that are not human (Lakoff and Johnson 1989, 25-26).

For example: To detectives, all criminality is bad, a harm to society. Yet, some criminals are seen as worse than others. A child molester does not earn a detective's contempt in equal measure as would a bank robber. An informant who violates the unspoken rules of the relationship merits condemnation to the degree the damage his transgression caused. Some people whom detectives deal with earn severe disapprobation; they are viewed with repulsion, as appalling and vile sub-human characters whose only possible contribution to society is to leave it. In the jargon of detectives, the metaphor "scumbag" collectively describes persons with all of the latter characteristics. With parsimonious verbiage the inanimate object takes on the human (or sub-human) qualities. The characteristics of a class of people who are faceless are thus "known" to those who understand the metaphor. When

directed to an individual, it allows the detective to think about how to deal with such persons. In contrast, "She is a gem." serves a wider audience since it is more universally understood. The prophylactic as metaphor says different things outside the use specific idiom of the police.

This then is the organizational culture facing researchers who must go to the police for data: An occupational socialization that breeds self-protective control of information, and a use specific purpose in the police processing of information that creates, by its very nature, a system that poses problems of validity when used to describe crime. What could easily be mistaken for a straightforward descriptive process is actually a combination of value laden objectification (Goff 1980, 19), analysis and interpretation of the reality of crime and its participants.

Social Scientific Bias

The suggestion that by recording and reporting on crime the police indeed reconstruct reality is not made presumptuously. Neither is the suggestion blind to the fact that those who rely on the police for information, themselves bring to the table a cognitive mind set, in all probability that is equally influential in creating a different reality. At the very least, they construct the reality by which the scientific community, the public, and the policy makers are informed, and we learn to adjust to and live with the shortcomings inherent in the products of this process of inquiry.

As in all social scientific research, the neutrality of the specific variables used is a function of their ability to reflect

association uncomplicated by other interests. If the variables below were examined in the customary descriptive modality, their measure of objectivity would be implicit in the described methodology, or would at least make their subjectivity understandable in terms of the operational definitions provided - or so we might hope.

Becker Gouldner Debate

Becker (1967) asked "Whose Side Are We On?" and paraphrased the Bard of Avon (as this does Becker): To be biased or not to be biased; that is the unremitting question. The dilemma for scientists posed by the question is dismissed by Becker as not existent. One of its horns is imaginary and requires the assumption "that it is indeed possible to do research that is uncontaminated by personal and political sympathies." (1967 239). Among others, Becker says that for private reasons, for neglecting to ask certain kinds of questions and for having to address the definition of reality proposed by the established "status order", the question "is not whether we [scientists] should take sides, since we inevitably will, but whose side are we on." (1967 239-41)

In a rejoinder, Gouldner (1968) takes issue with Becker's charge that other scientists choose sides, by himself charging that "sociologists must give their most basic commitment" to values, "not to factions". It is interesting that in the exchange, neither Gouldner nor Becker argue that scientific objectivity is possible although Gouldner sees its fate linked to "hopes for a peace-bringing human unity." (1968, 116).

Gouldner points out that the pursuit of objectivity rests on "moral character"; that personal commitment to values get lost in the

transformation of sociology into a profession - professions tend to accept the larger culture's values as "givens" (also, Stammer 1971, 205-06); and that the "operational definition" of objectivity in American sociology does not tell very much "about what objectivity means conceptually and connotatively" (1968, 114). Becker characterizes the external subjectivity (a factor he cites as requiring the choice of sides) of the critics of scientific bias much as the foregoing describes the "circularity" of the sociology of knowledge: When critics accuse the sociologist of not getting all the data relevant to the problem, they accuse him of seeing things from one side, but the accusers themselves are not disinterested parties. Both the critics and the defenders must rely on discrete value systems to champion their causes.

Neither side is objective. The conflict between subjective representations of "objective reality" is a problem for the sociologist not because normative theories contain values but that these values may go unnoticed (Horton 1966, 701) and the degree and kinds of influence go largely unrecognized (Miller 1973, 142). Values are fixed in background assumptions and (of particular relevance to this discussion) do get translated into the verbiage of research questions. The problem arises when the researcher is unaware that this has occurred. As Horton puts it: "Seeing the lower-class negro within a white liberal vocabulary may be very realistic politics, but it is not very accurate sociology." (1966, 713).

Role Conflicts In Other Disciplines

Sociology is not the only discipline experiencing this conflict. Becker is identified with the underdog (e.g., 1963). Gouldner says that such an identification is the urban sociologist's equivalent of "the anthropologist's (onetime) romantic appreciation of the noble savage." (1968, 106). The analogy is poignant. When "sides" are chosen, the perspective may inadvertently but effectively invent culture and traditions for others "and then treat them as if their inventions were the actual state of affairs." (Hanson 1989, 890). Hanson is concerned with the invention of a culture by anthropologists motivated by political ends and, more importantly, by a "predisposition" to analyze institutions in pre-defined terms (1989, 897), (such as "noble savage").

Parenthetically, the false reality created by scientists could impose itself upon the people studied, as it did in the case of the Maoris who today are "so proud of [the culture]" invented by researchers about them, the Maoris believe the invention to be historical fact (Wilford 1990, C1). Hanson notes that "realities" have been similarly constructed in Fiji (France 1969; Legge 1958), in the New Hebrides (Larcom 1982, 234), in Canada regarding Quebec nationalism (Handler 1984), in Hawaii (Linnekin 1983) and in Greece (Herzfeld 1982). Many police officers thought themselves protected by the "blue wall of silence" until Punch (1984) put in sociological terms a dynamic that the Knapp Commission had used ten years earlier - put police officers in jail on the testimony of other police officers. Because of the many references in academic and popular literature and indeed because of the

many references in the socialization process police went through, about the "wall", the police officers arrested so strongly perceived theirs to be a insular community they were shocked and horrified to discover it merely an invention, a hollow thing so easily penetrated that it was retrospectively a wall that did not exist. In fact, many were convicted of wrongdoing largely on the testimony of others behind the wall.

Just as the discussions of Becker (1967) and Gouldner (1968) lead to more questions, Hanson concludes his charge that the values and preordained perspectives that researchers bring to their study can alter (invent) the reality of what is studied with a question that his article might itself be an "invention". He, like much of what is said here, concludes that resolution of the question depends on the observer. The distinction between individual and aggregate contributions to knowledge meld in what Clifford describes as "a state of being in culture while looking at culture, a form of personal and collective self-fashioning" (1989, 9).

Research Neutrality

The conventional presentation of research findings are not to be argued against here. In spite of an awareness that the practice of social science is not free of role conflicts (Rabow 1980), neutrality is a convention accepted for the sake of convenience in the evaluation of social science research in the hope that "mutual inspection" within the profession will suffice to keep social scientists honest (Gouldner 1968, 115).

Hagen recommends that a decision must be made before the research begins regarding the level of commitment the analyst brings to

the task of negotiating the likely role conflicts which may occur when scientists work in close contact with practitioners (1982, 276). The point is not that the social scientist's perceptions are pure and those of the police are not. Each is geared to its own agenda and therefore each is "impure". The point is that their realities are different.

In doing this research, role conflict on a personal level was a serious consideration (and a disconcerting source of conflict) throughout the analysis. This was true especially in the data analysis stage when the comparison of differences in the data sets begged for judgement. Which data told "what happened" more validly? Informed by the debate surrounding the sociology of knowledge and that between Becker and Gouldner, the issue of objectivity takes on a gossamer quality and more so when one of the observer's feet is planted in 20 years of experience as practitioner and the other in the scientific perspective.

For example, the data analysis discussion (p. 135) makes reference to the support in the police data for the "myth" of a dope fiend preying of the weak to support a drug habit and then points out several "errors" in the police processing of information that tend to discredit this support. Implicitly, the commentary values the researcher data on this issue higher than the police data. In striving to present the findings as objectively as possible the discussion at page 135 uses qualifiers - e.g. "undesirable" results, "for the researcher" where appropriate and by presenting the findings as comparative, by presenting two results, seeks to allow the readers' background assumptions (rather than the author's) to determine which

depiction is the more valid. The conclusions drawn from this study offer opinions about the respective ways data are collected by police and researchers. The opinions offered here however are intended for the scientific community and accordingly should be read with the understanding that unknowingly, and to some unknowable degree, a researcher has unavoidably imputed in the discussion a personal set of value judgements.

The type of role conflict Hagen and Rabow are concerned with refers mainly to an alteration of the methodological design that mixes theoretical with operational purposes yet, the possibility of researcher bias is not limited to design problems. In settings such as the drug/violence nexus, where quantification is vital for assessing the extent of the problem, it is essential that the social scientist appreciate the practitioner's interpretation of reality. Understanding of the police interpretation of events (and the research question as well) and how this differs from that of the academic has obvious conceptual implications for criminological research.

This is not to say that the police must understand the research question from a theoretical viewpoint. Indeed, some research might require that the respondent be unaware of the purpose for which the research question is asked. Experimental blinds are commonplace. When dealing with social service agencies (such as the police), full disclosure is more a philosophical or ethical issue than an epistemological or methodological one, however it is critical that the respondent understand the question as it is posed regardless of the theoretical basis for which it is asked.

The Research Idiom - Data Sources

As the foregoing suggests, such appreciation must be worked for. In this case, by looking beyond raw statistics to a reconstruction of the event by those as close to the source as one can now get. The formalities of an occupation must be seen as constituting "the basic conceptual equipment with which [practitioners] organize their everyday activities" (Sudnow 1964, 255).

This is a two way exchange although little hope is held that the police will ever embrace the idiom and the ideology of the researcher. Nevertheless, just as the police have a "use specific" reason for gathering data, researchers justify their selection of one variable over another, or their operational definition of particular variables, in terms most easily understood by other sociologists.

For example, the need for Wolfgang (1958, 187, 195) to separate his sample into "violent" and "non-violent" homicides makes perfect sense to a social scientist. A person who would stab a victim one single time in a fit of passion requires, for analytical purposes, differentiation from the person who would repeatedly stab and brutalize a victim. The distinction is not so clear to citizen or police officer who might ask: "What is a non-violent stabbing?" Be that as it may, the issue of whether or not the researcher can find out how many times the victim was stabbed, remains at issue.

Luckenbill (1977), separately supported by Block (1985) and Cheatwood (1988), would have the reader understand that the person who survives a homicidal assault can actually be the victim while the offending party lies in the morgue. This is a perfectly understandable

distinction to all but those who have not studied the interactionist perspective and who might similarly (to Wolfgang' doubters) ask: "Why did the victim survive and the aggressor get killed?"

Apart from such important differences in the interpretation of the meaning of events found in different perceptions of reality, practical concerns must prompt questioning of the general value of many of the findings of criminological research.

Fifteen years ago Shellow observed that many criminological studies "more often than not" limited the sample to a population's particular subgroup, a single jurisdiction, were methodologically flawed or weak and could "in no way" be compared with other studies (1976, 133). The review of the literature on drugs and homicide which follows demonstrates that the reasons for Shellow's concern are still with us.

The following four citations are presented without prejudice. They are intended to demonstrate a not uncommon reliance on data and collection methods that force an inclusion in the findings of a disclaimer regarding the basis of the study. The ethics of skepticism which scientists are expected to share about data probably give rise to the caveats and to their credit, the researchers warn against taking the findings without question. A presentation of studies which do not contain such a warning, when one is necessary, would serve only to point an accusatory finger. They are intentionally omitted.

The works cited next are used to ask: When a social scientist says "When the data permitted, an effort was made to..." (Rizzo 1982, 37) and another study says that medical examiner data "are not adequate" for assessment of drug abuse deaths (Gottschalk et al.

1972, 2) and then proceeds to use it or others explain the use of the "snowball" sampling technique as restricting generalizability (Faupe1 1988, 468; Miller 1986, 28-9), must we unquestionably accept the findings as a depiction of reality? Obviously, not. The pertinent point is the need to disclaim. The need results from using available data and these four works are examples the uphold the contention that all data must be judiciously questioned. Certainly the studies inform us regarding their subject matter and without studies of this type the scientific world would be dumb, figuratively and substantively.

Dissertation Bias

Findings that can be generalized must obviously be based on research that is methodologically sound, and has been subject to capable and objective analysis. The major thrust of this study is to demonstrate that the raw data of the analysis can never, at least in the kind of context addressed here, be taken for granted. Data are, as has been shown, the product of particular organizational perspectives as well as criminal settings (more regarding the latter is presented below). Correct methodology requires examination of how official data are constructed, as well as appropriate manipulation and interpretation of the data themselves (i.e. Hopkins et al. 1989; Loftin 1986).

The object here is not so much to delineate the factors influencing the social scientist's perceptions of reality, as to demonstrate that due to the particular objectives of police gatherers of crime data, there are likely to be important differences between the relative depictions of "what happened".

The "Police Handling of Information" section above talks about individuals within a definable organization. The luxury of organizational identification is not available to those who study the possibility that social scientists, as a group, bring particular to the research effort. Surely, departments of sociology in the academy are a bureaucratic force, as are the several professional organizations such as the American Sociological Association, the American Society of Criminology and the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. As such, these entities might take on the specter of a "definable organization" but in toto they function more as Gouldner suggests, as an ombudsman charged with combating the complacency that sociologists "should have good reason to know makes liars of them." (1968, 112). Individual scholastic departments and the professional organizations may function as a police bureaucracy in influencing their membership yet it seems that most sociologists identify more with the broader based discipline than their individual work places as far as ideological perspectives are concerned.

In more general terms, the review of the sociology of knowledge suggests that, life being what it is, complete objectivity is not possible, regardless of the subject matter. The scientific perspective underlying a particular piece of research can be identified and from that, a priori, assumptions about the "tacit knowledge" and "mind set" of the research can be drawn. But the interactionist perspective, as example, is hardly an organized force which "socializes" its adherents in bureaucratic fashion as does the police institution its members.

However, it should be clear from the foregoing that the police perception of criminal events and the social scientist's perception both contain a potential bias effect and neither can be said to truly depict an objective reality. (As has been shown, the existence of an objective social reality is questionable.) The fundamental issue of how the perception of reality that is inherent in police reported crime data differs from the perception of the same set of events by social scientists, is the focus of this study. However, the concentration is not on how bias originates, although that process speaks to the need for the statistical analysis which follows; nor is the focus on one group or the other. The biases of each group must be weighed equally and although the respective treatments thus far is, by dint of number of words, seemingly weighted toward the police, this is only reflective of the literature in general. Sociologists tend to study the police more than they study themselves.

So far, the discussion has addressed several theories associated with the sociology of knowledge which assist in understanding the problem at issue and, from an overview of the way police handle information and scientists' use data in their interpretive schema, it has suggested that an "occupational" bias in police supplied data might be mirrored in the theoretical conceptualizations used by social scientists in interpreting it. Primarily to provide a context for the discussion of methodology and findings which follow it, this review now turns to a general discussion of the deficiencies in the usual data collection methods and provides some background material regarding the relationship between drugs and violence. Further, the discussion following expands on the theoretical basis underlying this work. Where

appropriate, practical examples of prior research are referenced to a major concern of the dissertation: That the purpose for which data are collected affect its ability to tell what happened.

The Nexus of Drugs and Homicide

Estimating The Drugs/Crime Connection

For at least the last fifteen years research findings have demonstrated that drugs and homicide are somehow related (Zahn and Bencivengo 1974; Monforte and Spitz 1975; Stephens and Ellis 1975; Preble and Miller 1980; Mc Bride 1981; Ball et al. 1983; Felson and Steadman 1983; Block 1985; Goodman et al. 1986; Graham 1987; Johnson 1989). The literature is huge. Gandossey et al. (1980) cite over 450 pieces, books, articles and reports that deal directly or indirectly with the relationship between crime and a single drug, heroin. The relationship is supported in the popular press (Molotsky 1988; Martz et al. 1989; Wolff 1988; Gordon 1989).

A 1986 prison survey found that 28.3% of incarcerated murderers were under the influence of a drug (other than alcohol) at the time they killed (Innes 1988, 3). In Washington, D.C. "officials" reported that 60% of that city's homicides in 1987 were drug related (Harriston 1988, A1). Likewise the Deputy Chief commanding Queens, New York City detectives said 60% of homicides occurring in southeast Queens in 1988 were drug related. The same newspaper article says that for the city as a whole the police estimate "more than" 38 percent of homicides are connected to drugs (James 1988, A1+).

A more conservative estimate from the scientific community suggests that 10% of the nation's homicides resulted from the use of drugs (Harwood et al. 1984) was translated into a loss of about 70,000 life-years for the average 2,000 drug related homicides that occur each year (Goldstein and Hunt 1984). One national daily says the F.B.I. surveyed 1,161 law enforcement chiefs who "think" drugs are involved in 21% of all killings and in cities with over 100,000 people, those surveyed say drugs play a part in "40% or even 95%" of homicide events (BJA 1988), emphasis added). The operative term "think" and the guesstimate "or even" typify frequently aired depictions of the role drugs play in crime.

The only consistency in reports such as these is the lack of it. Inconsistencies are found, first, in the definitions of what constitutes a "drug related" homicide and second, in the methodologies used in collecting data on which estimates of the scope of the relationship are based. One reason it is difficult to obtain precise data is because, in New York City at least, no single formal mechanism presently exists by which drug related data is systematically collected (Williams and Flewelling 1987, 544; Inciardi and Chambers 1972, 57) and funnelled to the national level data bases. (Note that all data are "precise". The difficulty noted in obtaining them becomes apparent only when other, disagreeable data are used for comparisons.)

As example: The data used in this dissertation were secured from the New York City Detective Bureau using a collection instrument that, although of greater detail, is structurally and substantively akin to a data collection form routinely used by the Detective Bureau to

record homicides for statistical purposes. Both forms ask if the homicide is drug related and what type of drug is involved, so the Department has available information about homicides at nearly the same definitive level as is found in the research data (at least for these two datum). Nevertheless, somewhere in the process of reporting information to the State agency, DCJS, the detail of the information regarding drug use is lost. The Chief of Detectives apparently knows more about the homicides occurring in the City than does the statistical bureau that reports crime data to the State. The former is not responsible for this administrative task and, for what are only speculative reasons, the Department does not have in place a routine process of passing on the data to that unit within the bureaucracy which is so charged. Consequently, while spokespersons for the NYPD report for public consumption that 38 or 60 percent of the City's homicides are related to drugs in 1988, the official report to DCJS, and ultimately to the national level data bases, ascribes an astounding 7% in this category for the same year.³ This is partly a function of different definitions and the time constraints imposed by DCJS but more importantly, the difference is no more complex than the City agency's not reporting a classification of homicides as drug related or not. A simple matter, indeed, is the reporting difference but it is at the same time due to a complex mix of organization perceptions, culture, socialization and bias (as that term is used here).

The proliferation of studies about drugs and homicide (or violence, generally) notwithstanding, our understanding of the role drugs play in homicide is limited. The New York State/City discrepancy, broad ranging and indefinite estimates reported in the popular press and

the comparatively low estimates of drug related homicide often found in the scientific literature are so for good reason: The existing national data bases are precluded by their collection methods from routinely and systematically gathering data elaborating the drug/violence nexus.

Details by which any given homicide could be labeled "drug related" are thereby unavailable. There is a widely recognized, critical need for data that would "help provide sound informational bases for the guidance of public policies directed toward the prevention and control of drug related crime" (Gropper 1985, and below).

Uniform Crime Reports and the Supplemental Homicide Report

The major sources of national level crime data in the United States today are the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), its subset, the Supplemental Homicide Report (SHR) and the National Crime Survey (NCS). None is very useful for amplifying the drugs/violence nexus (Williams and Flewelling 1987, 42; Loftin 1986, 191; Goldstein and Brownstein 1987). The statistics generated by these surveys simply do not link acts of criminal violence and resultant injuries or death to the antecedent drug activity of victims or perpetrators (Wiesmann 1982, 47).

The (UCR) system has remained virtually unchanged since its establishment in the early 1930's. At the urging of the International Association of Chiefs of Police a joint Federal Bureau of Investigation and Bureau of Justice Statistics Task Force was created to review the entire UCR program for purposes of redesign (Woodworth 1985, 4; see also, Gropper 1985; Schlesinger 1985). The final report of the task force was completed in 1985 (Poggio, et al. 1988) and testing of the guidelines and procedures are presently underway.

One of the innovations emerging from the review of present procedures is the development of an operational Incident-Based Reporting (IBR) system for UCR data collection. It offers the potential for a national data base that would include detailed and specific information about drug involvement in criminal events. Drug-relatedness information will be available at a level of detail heretofore unavailable (Brownstein et al. 1990; Schlesinger 1985). Loftin's work in Baltimore (1986) and elsewhere (Loftin et al. 1987), the original research referred to here (Goldstein and Brownstein 1987) and the Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Law and Justice Statistics (Woodworth 1985), are examples of the attention the scientific community currently pays to the issue.

Efforts to improve data collection methods are not limited to crime statistics. As noted above, raw homicide statistics, long regarded as the most reliable of statistics (Brownstein et al. 1990) are themselves not immune to criticism. Cause of death statistics are even less reliable but both are amenable to corrective measures. For example, regarding the collection of death statistics at the national level by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), Hopkins et al. (1989) compared the reported incidence of cirrhosis of the liver attributed to alcohol as the cause-of-death in Oregon, a state that employs a follow-up "querying" procedure, with those states that do not query. Even though the per capita consumption of alcohol in Oregon mirrors that of the nation, the incidence of liver disease attributed to this drug as a cause of death was reported to be about twice that of the rest of the nation.

The differential in the Oregon cause of death statistics is explained as mainly the product of the collection system used, and the inclusion in the methodology of a follow-up query interview. The query has a twofold effect. First, it educates practitioners on how to properly record the requested information and based on the responses received, the query can be "fine tuned" to adjust for changes in the environment being scrutinized.

"As a consequence of the data generated by the query program", nosologists added a question on tobacco use as cause of death to the program in 1989 (Hopkins et al. 1989, 572). The nosology data for Oregon were dramatically different as a result of the follow-up procedure. Six of the 20 leading causes of death in Oregon had rates which were ten or more percent higher or lower after querying (Hopkins et al. 1989, 572). The maternal death rate reported in Oregon was 126.7 percent higher than was the national rate (Hopkins et al. 1989, 573) and this appears to be attributable to a superior method of data collection and not to any real change in the causes of maternal deaths. If a similar query program were in place in the UCR methodology, researchers could have added a crack query to the UCR Incident Report in the early eighties or asked police about the incidence of methamphetamine (Ice) related criminality early on in the appearance of that drug.

Because the NCHS process is limited to a single variable, the cause of death, it probably results in a more accurate picture of what actually happened than would a query in the multi-variable research designs found in the social sciences. The important point for consideration is that the addition of a follow-up procedure does alter

the data obtained. Reviews such as this, outside of but analogous to the study of crime, merit study by criminologists confronted with similar data collection problems. Hopkins and colleagues conclude that "for mortality statistics to be of value as a national surveillance mechanism, it is important that data be collected in a standard and consistent manner" (1989).

Many of the data used in criminological research are based on national surveys which, in turn, rely on information supplied by police agencies. As noted above, inherent shortcomings in the collection processes make the usefulness of the data for scientific research problematic (Cook, P.J. 1985, 482-3; Inciardi 1986, 118). Loftin found the SHR unreliable for three reasons: 1) The codes used are mutually exclusive, but many homicides could be placed in several; 2) There are few systematic rules for classifying ambiguously motivated homicides and 3) The SHR places too many cases in the "Undetermined" circumstances category (1987, 201).

Regarding the first two of these deficiencies, Block observes that homicide is not a monolithic crime whose elements can be consistently identified. Rather, it is a heterogeneous composite of robbery/murder, assault/murder, rape/murder, dispute/murder or, most often, with some combination of factors underlying the motivation (1985, 13). Consequently, a single category coding of the homicide, according to Block, hides a true depiction of the event. Since it is questionable that a "true" depiction of criminality is possible, the preference here is to read Block's work as a call for more definitive and consistently defined data that provides more information than is presently available.

Broad reporting categories and the omission of drug related items (see App. B) make it virtually impossible to determine, for example, whether the offender or victim was a drug user, a trafficker or other actor in the drug distribution system; whether the pharmacological status of either victim or offender was related to the specific event, or if the underlying motive or circumstances were influenced in any way by the economic demands of personal drug use habits (see, Goldstein 1985; Shellow 1976b; Wiesmann et al. 1976). Questions such as these are critical to a full understanding of the crime of homicide, indeed to an understanding of the role drugs play in crime generally. Police submissions to the higher level collection agencies within the UCR/SHR systems, simply do not provide sufficient information for analyses at this level. Although local officials have much information concerning the circumstances of most crimes, they condense it to a brief statement which is then used by the superior reporting level, usually a state agency, to code the event within the very confining UCR definitions (Loftin 1986, 194; Brownstein et al. 1990, 13-14).

With respect to homicide, which due to the presence of a corpus in every sense of the term, and a relatively high clearance rate (i.e., 70% for murder cf. 13.8% for burglary in 1988, Jamieson and Flanagan 1989, 510), is the most reliable crime incidence category, the third criticism voiced by Loftin, that the SHR places too many cases in the "Undetermined" circumstances category (1987, 201), appears anomalous at first glance. Yet, the large number of responses in the "Unknown" category for homicide mirrors a similar distortion in the recording of criminal events generally. (This issue, at the local level, is discussed below.). Omissions in data submitted are partly a product of

the methods that give rise to the first two problems identified by Loftin (p. 66 above) and of singular importance, by the time constraints to which local agencies must adhere. These constraints frequently result in data being submitted to UCR (and SHR) before investigative work by the police has been completed (Mercy and Saltzman 1989, 598).

Particular to homicide, the multifaceted nature of this crime (Block 1985) tends to confuse those officials who are charged with statistically coding criminal events that do not readily fit into unambiguous categories. This is not bureaucratic bungling but a result of the way the reporters look at the event (the bias they bring to recording of events). The "Unknown" category catches a disproportionate share of criminal events probably because these crimes are not neatly packaged to fit one of the other circumstance categories, or, as Mercy and Saltzman (1989) note regarding the relationship category, the information is simply not known at the time the report must be submitted to the UCR.

Another major difficulty in estimating the extent to which drugs are related to crime using available data sources, is the lack of a descriptive component in the collection instrument that specifically includes drugs as a part of the event. Except for "drug crimes" (possession, sale and use of controlled substances) the drug relatedness of violent events is largely ignored in the UCR coding process. In the three categories where the UCR "Incident Report" does mention drugs, the relevant category labels containing the mention tend to be confusing.

As example (see Appendix B, *passim*): Under the heading "Offense-Type weapon/force involved:" the report contains a box

"Narcotics/drugs". It seems reasonable that this box would only be checked if narcotics or drugs was the proximate cause of death, a "hot shot" or adulterated dosage perhaps.

The "Victim-Aggravated assault/homicide circumstances:" category, contains an item "Drug Dealing" that ignores any offender participation in dealing drugs.

The "Property description code table:" is placed subordinate to questions regarding the description of lost property to aid the preparer in properly coding "Alcohol", "Drugs/narcotics" and "Drug/Narcotic equipment" as lost property. The format does not allow recording of drugs found at the scene, on the victim or perpetrator, or which are in any way connected to the incident, unless the drugs are "lost property".

The "Offense-Offender(s) Used" category does allow for coding "Drugs used" but this is in the same column as "Computer equip. [used]"; the only alternative responses are "Alcohol" and "Not applicable". If not confusing, this arrangement certainly is a diminution of the emphasis the drug question deserves or at least what the perception of reality a drug researcher thinks it deserves.

The "Relationship" category contains no code for drug associated parties (i.e. dealers, buyers, enforcers) and the otherwise amply sufficient demographic sections for victim and offender are without reference to either drug use, drug use habits or possession.

Using a data gathering instrument of this kind, it is not possible to link specific violent acts to antecedent or concurrent drug

activities of either victim or perpetrator because drug related questions are simply not asked.

The National Crime Survey

An alternative data source is the NCS issued annually by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). Its data is obtained from a stratified multistage cluster sample which uses the household as the basic sampling unit. Within households, respondents are asked for all instances of criminal victimization in the past year. Projections are then made to the nation as a whole.

As is the case with UCR, the NCS is not very useful for elaborating on the drugs/violence nexus. Street drug users frequently are not part of a household; they do not usually reside with family, preferring instead to habituate abandoned buildings, public transportation facilities or even public parks. Or, if resident in a household, the respondent will not freely offer information regarding another family member's drug use. A common characteristic of those addicted to drugs or alcohol is "denial" by both the user and the family (Kinney and Leaton 1987, 208; 165). If the addict does reside in a household and happens to be the respondent in the survey, it is a good bet that drug use information would be less than forthcoming. For these reasons then, a population that is posited to be at especially high risk for drug related criminality and violence is likely to be under-represented in these data.

The NCS provides little information on perpetrators' drug use habits since victims cannot be expected to have such information regarding their attackers. Moreover, since it is a survey of victims, the NCS produces little data on homicides, for obvious reasons.

One of the "anticipated" benefits of the redesigned UCR is the availability of "data on crimes for which data traditionally have been lacking, namely drug-related offenses, sex crimes, family violence and child abuse" (Woodworth 1985, 5). The need for this type of data is amply demonstrated in a review of previous studies on drugs and crime and is collected in Appendix C. Particular attention should be paid to the discussion therein about the creation by Heffernan et al. of a sociologically oriented taxonomy of homicides that functions more as an investigative tool. The mix of disciplines or occupations obvious in that work clearly demonstrates the practical effect of role conflicts in research, so frequently referred to above.

Footnotes to Chapter 2

1. Gibbs' famous four questions are: 1) What elements in the scheme are intended to be definitions rather than substantive theory? 2) Is the ultimate goal to explain deviant behavior or to explain reactions to deviation? 3) Is deviant behavior to be identified exclusively in terms of reactions to it? 4) Exactly what kind of reaction identifies behavior as deviant?

2. A "bible" in the police idiom refers to an expert on a particular subject. If a detective needs to know about a specific criminal gang or a particular specialized activity, (e.g. organized crime) he would seek out that police officer reputed to be a definitive source of information on the subject. Such expertise is not limited to one subject matter. One might be expert on a geographic area; the "bible" on the 41st precinct. The expertise can be concerned with inanimate things; the "bible" on VIN (vehicle identification) numbers. The appellation probably has etymological roots in the Judeo-Christian religions' theocentric reliance on the Bible. The Christian belief that it is Divinely inspired and was not lost on the predominantly Catholic majority that historically made up the New York City Police Department.

3 This fact was secured in conversation with DCJS personnel who for personal reasons choose not to be acknowledged. These State agency personnel are responsible for collecting and collating homicide data from police agencies prior to submission to the Federal level UCR and SHR. Alarmed at the discrepancy between the research findings and the "official" statistics, DCJS staffers contacted me for confirmation of the discrepancy and to request an assessment of which data were true, which were the picture of what was happening. DCJS people are in the process of reviewing the collecting methods they and the NYPD use.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Although this study compares two distinct data sets and each was collected for a different purpose, the actual process of collecting the data was identical. Lest the reader be misled: Each set of data describes the same set of events. Each set contains identical variables, identical numbers of events, participants and coding cells, and each is homolographic. The substantive difference between the two sets of data is in the information contained in each cell, in each bit of information. For example, address "X" in both sets codes the race of the victim; one set might contain data that a black was killed, the other that the victim was white. The critical difference between the two data sets is found in the reason each data set was collected.

The Researcher data was collected in response to a need to elaborate the drug/homicide nexus and to test the feasibility of collecting crime data at a more definitive level than heretofore accomplished. The "Police Data" set was collected, in effect, accidentally. In the original methodology, the police were to respond to a survey instrument much the way they respond to the UCR and SHR. Early returns of the instrument disclosed sufficient omissions, misinterpretations and misunderstandings. As a form of quality control, the methodology was changed to include a follow-up interview of every detective responding. At this point the germ of this research began to develop.

Rather than waste the initial police effort, detectives were allowed to continue to respond using the survey instrument. Without alteration that information was collected into what this dissertation labels Police data.

To summarize this opening point on the methods used: The Researcher set of data was collected in "traditional" research format and is being used by persons not connected with this study for purposes irrelevant to it. However, in anticipation of the work reported here, the information which the police initially reported was collected in a separate data set. The information was coded, as is, without consultation with the police to clarify and emend discrepancies in the data reported on the collection instrument.

Organization of the New York City Police Department

The New York City Police Department is organized hierarchically by Precinct, Zone (Detective Division) and Borough. The geographic lines of the first two are drawn by the Department; the last conforms to the political boundaries of the respective counties. The Detective Bureau is similarly structured with the addition of specialized squads, each autonomous and with its own chain of command, that are charged with the investigation of crimes that benefit from a particular expertise (i.e. Sex Crimes Unit, Bond and Forgery Squad, Major Case Squad).

The Precinct Level Detective Units (PDU) - The Squad - are housed in the local precincts and give the appearance of being integral to the station house operation, as if detectives work hand-in-glove with the uniformed patrol force. In fact, they only "borrow" office space

and their dealings with precinct officers are minimal. Only exceptional circumstances would find detectives and patrol officers working side by side. Detective units operate at the direction of the Detective Division commander, through the Detective Borough Office to the Chief of Detectives. Although technically a detective lieutenant is subordinate to a uniformed force captain, in practice, the latter has few opportunities to direct the detective's work.

There are 79 police precincts in the City and 79 corresponding detective units. The Detective Bureau is divided into eighteen division and seven borough commands. The City is divided into five boroughs; organizationally, the Department divides Manhattan and Brooklyn each into two separate "Borough Commands". Each detective borough includes a Task Force or Homicide Squad that reports directly to the respective borough commander and is available to assist the PDU detective in homicide or major case investigations.

The assignment of cases to a particular PDU for investigation is governed by the geographic location in which the homicide, or crime occurs. The PDU usually investigates the case without outside assistance and even in those cases in which the Task Force is called upon for assistance, responsibility for recording the investigation, maintaining files, directing the case, maintaining liaison with the District Attorney and even recording the arrest remains with the detective squad in whose geographical jurisdiction the event took place.

A fair amount of prestige and status attaches to assignment as a PDU detective relative to uniformed assignment, but when

comparisons are made with Task Force or assignments to the specialized squads, the PDU is commonly referred to as working "in the trenches". The numerical bulk of all investigations is handled by the precinct detectives, and they are the people who were dealt with during the data collection process. Throughout the study there was a continuous liaison with personnel in the Chief of Detectives office, and minimal dealings with staff in the borough commands.

Assignment of Cases

In many jurisdictions the first police officer on the scene takes an active and important role in the subsequent investigation and processing of a homicide. This is not the case in New York City. The patrol officer safeguards the scene, renders first aid, secures witnesses and evidence but of interest to the research, in NYC the first officer simply notifies the detectives to respond. The handling of a homicide investigation is exclusively the purview of the assigned detective.

It should be noted that the number and unpredictable frequency of homicides handled each year by any NYPD detective squad does not allow the assignment of detectives to one case exclusively. For example, in Brooklyn's 75th Precinct, one sergeant and a team of 4 or 5 detectives investigated 100 homicides in 1988, a workload not matched by most police departments.

The logistical problems of the 75th Precinct are mirrored in other precincts but for reasons other than sheer numbers. If a precinct enjoys a relatively low homicide rate, detectives are assigned to investigate other crimes and police matters or the staffing of that

squad is proportionally less than in the more active squads. It is not unusual that a team of detectives (the only investigators working in the precinct at the time) are told to put a homicide case they are actively investigating on hold and redirect their energies to a missing person case or a recently reported bias incident. To their credit, the work quality, at least of those detectives participating in the project, apparently did not suffer at the expense of numbers and/or the broad and diverse range of matters investigated.

Assignment of Detectives

Detectives are assigned - "catch" - cases in a systematic and orderly fashion. Most detectives work a "four and two" duty chart, four days on duty with two days off. If one is off Sunday and Monday this week, next week's excusal is Saturday and Sunday and so on. Usually the duty chart calls for two day tours (8 A.M. to 4 P.M.) and two evening tours (4 P.M. to 1 A.M. - 9 hours) in that succession. Detectives begin catching two or three hours before their scheduled start and are "taken off cases" one hour before the end of the week's work - the set. They catch cases in rotation by chronological sequence, each on-duty detective being assigned a case in turn as it is received. The assigned detective is responsible for the conduct of the investigation and must report case clearances and progress reports to the supervisor.

This system of individual control and responsibility is inviolate. Detectives work in teams of from two to five individuals and assigned detectives reciprocally rely on other team members for help. Detective squad supervisors may discretionarily assign additional

personnel to assist in the investigation, yet the documentation of the case, the paper work, irrevocably "belongs" to the person assigned.

Budgetary constraints effect the allocation of detectives' time to a given case. An assigned detective is expected to work eight or nine hour tours, then leave the investigation on hold until the next tour of duty. The popular notion that a detective is working "around the clock" to solve a homicide is a rarity. The common practice is to schedule interviews, conduct surveillances and generally follow-up investigative leads in accordance with the detectives' work schedule. Exceptional (usually newsworthy) cases are of course handled exceptionally.

The precinct detective squads are charged with the investigation of all crimes occurring in their precinct. Excepted are "specialized" cases, such as long term white collar or organized crime investigations, sex and child abuse crimes, bias incidents, missing persons cases of some duration and the like.

The PDU detective, however, is usually the member of the Department initially in closest physical proximity to the scene of the crime and so, is often delegated to conduct a "preliminary investigation" before the investigation is turned over to the specialized detective unit. In a given tour of duty then, detectives might catch, in order, a homicide, a larceny, an assault, a missing persons case and another homicide. Each, at least in the viewpoint of the aggrieved party, deserve the full commitment of the investigator. Time and volume of work do not always permit this.

The logic that says the individual closest to an event will probably know the most about it, would identify the PDU detective as the most logical person to contact if the facts of a criminal event were to be known. The detective synthesizes information held by victim, offender and witnesses. A detective selectively records crime data and can discretionarily return bits and pieces of information or return them after interpretive screening. These are facts-of-life, not easily altered - and they are at the core of this study.

The Data Collection Process

The following description of the collection process is separated into "Original" and "Dissertation" methodologies.

Original Methodology

Geographic Selection of Sample

Half of the data in this study ("Researcher" data set) were first collected by the DRCAH-2 research project (see, Foreword; note 1, Chap. One). For that work, one detective division was selected in four of the five boroughs (counties) in the City. They included the Fifth Division in Manhattan, the Ninth Division in the Bronx, Brooklyn's Thirteenth and the Eighteenth Division in Queens. Staten Island, which is the smallest geographically and the least populated of the five boroughs, was not included. Seventeen, of the NYPD's 79 precincts are in the selected areas.

The reason 17 precincts were selected is threefold. First, about 25% of all homicides that were likely to occur in 1988 appeared to be a logistically feasible sample; budget and staffing constraints

foremost, the City's approximately 1800 annual homicides poses problems in this area. Next, it makes sense to utilize the department's existing administrative structure whose hierarchical controls would assure a high degree of compliance and facilitate training and distribution of materials. Finally, a representative cross section of New York City, to include areas with both high and low homicide rates and a diversity of social and ethnic characteristics would tend to make the findings better able to be compared with similar research. Except for a higher concentration of lower SES areas in the Brooklyn precincts, the selected areas represent the best demographic mix possible using the existing NYPD organizational structure. The time frame was eight months-March 1, to October 31, 1988. Data were collected on 414 homicide events, involving 490 perpetrators and 434 victims. The 434 deaths are 23% of the 1,896 homicides that reportedly occurred in New York City, 1988.

Generalizability

Given the problem under study, the issue of generalizability is not a serious concern. Yet, whenever a study sample is one fourth of the population, there is a tendency to let the sample speak for the whole. A warning against such inference must be included here to protect any who would use the reported findings as an indication of the state of drugs and homicide in New York City or elsewhere. The findings herein are not intended as a descriptive presentation of what happened. No inferences in that regard should be made.

The sample is not random. The participating precincts were selected solely on the basis of a police commander's knowledge of the

City. Accordingly, the sample is not stratified in any scientifically acceptable manner.

For example, the attempt at a representative SES composition had to be made within the existing administrative structure of the NYPD. A police commander was asked to predict some number of precincts in which about 25% of all homicides would occur and at the same time to assure that the sample was a "good" demographic mix. For the latter, the only criteria was the commander's personal knowledge of the City. That he knew about crime frequencies and the City's geography is seen in the final tally. The researchers wanted to examine 25% of all homicides and the sample represents 23 percent.

What the demographic mix of the sample is comparable to, has not been tested. A descriptive presentation of homicides in New York City, circa 1988 is not part of this research. The generalizability issue and the issue of what descriptive and inferential findings about drugs and homicide are available from the sample is a separate study presently underway (p. 20, n. 1, re: DRCAH-2).

NYPD Cooperation - Investigative Protocol

Throughout New York City, all detectives are required to follow the same procedures in recording the progress of a homicide investigation. They routinely use a checklist of forms prepared, notifications made, interviews conducted, evidence vouchered (secured) and other pertinent reports prepared. The data collection form (Appendix A) was included as part of this "routine" paper work in the selected zones. This rather unique inclusion of a research instrument

in an investigative protocol could not have been accomplished without the full support and endorsement of the study by the NYPD.

The Detective Squad Commanders were allowed a fair degree of autonomy in having the forms completed. Some chose to personally complete them, others delegated the task to their sergeants and some sergeants passed the work down to the detectives. Because of some problems with the forms initially submitted and to insure standardization of the collected data, the methodology included a follow-up interview component. The project director met frequently with detective squad commanders or their representatives, reviewing each case to obtain as much information as was possible and to clarify information already submitted. The final cut off date for submission of data was December 31, 1988; knowledgeable observers said that if the police have not cleared the case within two months, it would most probably be closed only if information came to their attention exceptionally.

Selection of Subject Matter

Homicide was selected primarily for its relatively low frequency in the universe of all crime and its relatively high clearance rate.¹ More is known about the perpetrators of homicides than for all other type offenders since police departments historically clear more homicides by arrest than they do any other type of criminal event. It is important to note that a clearance is not necessarily a conviction or even evidence that an offender was processed for court. In some events, a case is cleared although no arrest is made. Perhaps the offender is known but fled the country and cannot be extradited; or the offender committed suicide or is otherwise is dead. Other cases are held open,

technically under active investigation; the police "know" who did the homicide yet the prosecutor feels the evidence insufficient for indictment; perhaps witnesses are unreliable in the forensic sense; the police know but cannot locate the person who did the crime.

In all non-arrest cases the pedigree information - personal characteristics - about the perpetrator is available. In the NYPD, a detective cannot clear a homicide investigation without sufficient documentation that all possible avenues to arrest are blocked. It is not sufficient to say that the perpetrator cannot be identified - the detective would be directed to continue the investigation. In documenting any of the "clearances" list above, a description of the wanted person is a requisite inclusion. (Of note to researchers is that the police have information of value available, and if the question is properly asked of the appropriate person, it can be obtained.)

Classification and Coding

Among other items, the data collection form asks the reporting detective whether or not an event can be classified as drug-related, not drug-related, or if there was simply insufficient evidence to make the determination. In addition, respondents were asked to classify each homicide according to a tripartite conceptualization of the way drugs are related to violence generally and homicide in particular (Goldstein 1985). An explication of the categories described by this model helps make the discussion of findings below meaningful.

Tripartite Conceptualization

The "classification" variable captures the primary identification of the event. It fits the entire event in the

theoretical model. The theoretical conceptualization posits that drugs and violence are related in three different ways: psychopharmacologically, economic compulsively and systemically.

Psychopharmacological

The psychopharmacological component suggests that some people may become excitable and/or irrational as a result of ingesting drugs and may act out in a violent fashion. Psychopharmacological violence may also result from the irritability associated with withdrawal symptoms from addictive substances. It may involve substance use by either victim or perpetrator; a victimization precipitated by drug use and the use of drugs to reduce nervousness or boost courage and thereby facilitate a criminal act are both considered in this category.

Economic Compulsive

The economic/compulsive classification suggests that some people feel compelled to commit economic crimes in order to finance personal drug use habits. These crimes are either inherently violent, as in a planned armed robbery, or the violence results from unintended, extraneous factors such as the presence or absence of weapons carried by either actor, the perpetrator's nervousness or an unanticipated reaction by the victim. Perpetrator motivation is the key. Included in this category would be the crimes of the stereotypical drug fiend who preys on the weak and innocent to support a drug use habit.

Systemic

The systemic component refers to the aggressive patterns of interaction typical of the drug use and distribution system. Most

systemic violence arises working or doing business in a black market. Examples of systemic violence include territorial disputes between rival dealers, assaults and homicides committed to enforce normative codes within a particular drug dealing operation, robberies of drug dealers, eliminations of police informants, retaliations for selling adulterated or bogus drugs and assaults and homicides done to collect drug-related debts. Systemic violence may also occur between users during disputes over drugs or drug paraphernalia.

Allowance is made for "multidimensional" events in which more than one classification best described what happened or if a case is drug related but none of the categories aptly described the exchange.

The classification of events within the tripartite framework by the police was not ever considered definitive for analytical purposes in the original research. The police "coding" of events was strictly informative. It served as a focal point for the follow up interview, a starting point from which to verify the accuracy of the other variables in the report. Having asked if the event was drug-related and for a classification of the case, the follow-up interview could then proceed on a broad footing of primary identification.

For the data used in the original work, (of which this study makes secondary use) the actual coding of cases was completed through a process involving two senior members of the research team. First, each case was coded by the project director (who is the author of this paper and had conducted most interviews of the police). Then a duplicate set of collection forms was independently coded by a principal investigator. The two then reviewed each case. As a quality control, about 15% of the

cases were coded by the co-principal investigator and compared with the others.

The majority of cases were in agreement. Some disagreements arose that required reconsideration of the information but they were few in number. The major disagreement centered on multidimensional events in which the relative contribution of each type of information needed to be resolved in conference (i.e. whether the case was best described as a systemic or a psychopharmacological event, or if, in fact, it contained elements of both classifications in equal weight).

The method for coding events in the Police data did not enjoy the benefit of conference. The bulk of the differences between the two sets of data is a product of the interview process that permitted review and revision by the police of the data they initially provided.

The researcher data represents change from first response. To return a second time to the police for conference regarding the reliability of the data, would be little more than a ping-pong game and so corrupt the police data as to make it meaningless. If the police data were to have purpose for this research, they had to be accepted as first recorded. Recall that intrinsic to the hypothesis is a comparison of data as reported by the police "when left to their own devices", just as they traditionally are when responding to the UCR.

Tripartite Dimensions

The description above of how cases were assigned a primary classification leaves room to speculate that perhaps drug-related elements might be overlooked in the information retrieval stage. Some

cases could not readily be categorized - A sex-related killing classified as "Not drug related" but in which the victim was a known drug abuser and the perpetrator a high level drug trafficker is example. It might appear that either datum of victim drug use or the perpetrator's connection to the drug marketplace would not be retrieved since either could be masked by the primary classification. Drug-related circumstances were quickly identified in consultation with the detectives but often it was a kind of information not responsive to the variables contained in the data collection instrument.

For example, the detective would know that one of an event's participants was a drug user or dealer but would have no "hard" facts indicating that "At the time of the event" (Appendix A) drug use was a contributing factor or that systemic factors were directly relevant. The latter may or may not have played a part. Nevertheless, this kind of information is too valuable to be cavalierly discarded simply because it could not be firmly identified as contributory.

In order to account for known facts not recorded in the available variables, the survey instrument includes categories designed to capture in a "reporting framework" (Gropper 1985, 2), any facts that are, standing alone, not sufficient evidence from which a primary classification can be made.

Usually, a systemic event would have a systemic dimension, a psychopharmacological one a like dimension and so on. In most events for which the primary classification is, for example, systemic there is sufficient evidence to say that the "dimension" of the event, the surrounding milieu, is also systemic. In certain events, the evidence

is not strong enough to say with certainty that the fact pattern fits one of the theoretical categories. A "good" piece of drug-related information might be known that would be lost if the dimension category were not available. An example serves to demonstrate this point.

A female drug user and prostitute was found in the bathtub in her apartment. She was the only tenant. In the past, she had supplied narcotics detectives with information about low level street sales of drugs. The detectives knew her to bring "johns" to the apartment and that the flat was regularly used as a "shooting gallery" where the victim and her drug associates would gather to "do" drugs. The body was abhorrently mutilated (her head was nearly severed at the neck) and the bathroom was in total disarray. Neither drugs nor drug paraphernalia were found at the scene. The victim was discovered by her landlord; no witness were available.

The detective assigned to the case suspected one of several reasons for the homicide: A disgruntled or crazed customer; retaliation by local drug dealers for her informant activities (a behavior whose severity gets rumored out of proportion in drug circles); a drug use "party" turned violent or a "straight" sex for thrill murder. The detective could not commit to a drug-related classification (i.e., If the murder is a sex-thrill event, he is correct). The case was accordingly classified "Not Drug Related" and both the psychopharmacological and systemic dimensions were indicated; the former because the victim was known as an active drug user and systemic for the possible connection to the drug distribution system the victim's life style suggested. (Note that in the data the police do not record either

of the dimensions. The assigned detective (in the follow-up interview) said that he simply did not know what "we" meant by "dimension".)

This example then is in the "Not Drug Related" category. Regardless of its classification in any official system, the facts of this case make it amenable to analysis in other ways. If, at some future time an analysis were done of this sample vis' à vis' the subculture of drugs, perhaps a comparative piece using Riedel and Zahn's work (1985), this case would be at hand for analysis and not lost in the batch of cases not identified with drugs.

Dimension labels correspond to the tripartite classifications but it is not a requirement that the "Dimension" and "Classification" variables parallel each other. A case primarily classified in one category, may contain a dimension describing another category of drug-relatedness, according to definition. The reporting framework provides the background necessary to a complete reading of the event. It captures the essence of the "transactional risks" that Zahn and Bencivengo (1974, 284) say make up such a large part of the subculture of violence.

Dissertation Methodology

The research question is examined quantitatively to measure the degree of agreement or lack of it between two distinct sets of data. The statistical method employed here originated in the medical field (psychiatry) and is used to measure differences in diagnoses of the same patient by two independent evaluators (Cicchetti et al. 1978)

A police data set was constructed using information supplied by the police about the same set of events that constitute the

researcher data. The major difference between the data sets is that the police data do not contain the information gathered in the follow-up interviews. Both sets of data are identically structured and include the same nominally ordered variables. The amounts of information (frequencies) recorded for any one variable will naturally differ.

The creation of two structurally identical sets of data to describe the exact same events constitutes a two-wave panel study. The differences between commonly used panel studies and this one are that here the data is collected, if effect, simultaneously and the subject matter, the raters and the instrumentation is the same for each panel. The second wave consists of data collection in which the researcher assisted and the first wave is data supplied by the police when left to their own devices..

Statistical analysis of the two data sets provides a quantitative argument supporting or rejecting the hypothesis that those closest to the criminal event are not the best source of sociological useful data.

Statistical Methods

Each of the data sets consists of the same set of discrete variables. When cross tabulated, the resultant square contingency tables can be viewed as statements of expected cell frequencies representing characteristics of the respective variables (Knoke and Burke 12). Simply put, frequency matrices allow comparisons of expected and observed characteristics of a sample.

When identically coded variables are cross-classified in this way, disagreement in the square contingency table could be caused

either by 1) marginal dissimilarity or 2) imperfect association (Hout et al. 1987, 149). Hout et al.(1987) demonstrate that, although marginal homogeneity is evident and suggests strong association, "structured dissimilarity" or "fallible reports on a continuous latent variable" may be present in a given square table. Evidence of association notwithstanding, say Hout et al., there can be at the same time a level of dissimilarity and (a cogent point) "the current state of methodology for studying" similarities and dissimilarities does not reflect the importance of the "distinct sources of dissimilarity" (1987, 149).

Masked influences are common place in the social sciences, especially for the usual cross tabulations that examine two separate variables for significant relationships. Just as correlation is no measure of causality, significance testing fails to account in any meaningful way for dissimilarity between variables of the kind shown in Illustration 1. The issue is confounded when, as is the case here, the researcher is concerned not with two discrete variables but with measurements of the same variable by two discrete raters. The commonly used standard tests of association do not provide answers when agreement between raters is in question.

But note that the testing of a single variable (with two raters) isolates any masked influences to the raters, the influences that may be intrinsic to the variable being constant for both raters.

Typically, researchers are concerned with the level of association or correlation to be found in such tables and implicitly look toward perfect association and marginal homogeneity (Hout et al. 149) to indicate a strong relationship. In many cases, comparisons of

the level of association are made using now standard methods such as Pearson's r (1904), Tschuprow's T (1939), Cramer's V (1946), λ (Guttman) and r (Goodman and Kruskal). Yet association is not necessarily agreement. The following illustration demonstrates this:

ILLUSTRATION 1

DISAGREEMENT					AGREEMENT				
B					B				
A		YES	NO	TOTAL	A		YES	NO	TOTAL
	YES	0	50	50		YES	50	0	50
	NO	50	0	50		NO	0	50	50
	TOTAL	50	50	100		TOTAL	50	50	100

The left side of the illustration shows high association with little agreement. Note the left to right diagonal. Intuitively, one knows that disagreement is present in the left side matrix, for if A and B were in even partial agreement, the diagonal cells would be other than zero. Conversely, if A and B agree totally, the diagonal cells would be full as they are in the right side matrix. Both matrices show statistical significance but the left side shows zero agreement while the opposite is true for the right side. In both cases the marginals mirror each other.

The kappa (k) statistic first demonstrated by Cohen (1960) measures inter-rater agreement. It is ideally suited for measurement of the agreement or lack of it between the police and the researcher data sets.

Chi-square and other measures of association measure the probability that cell frequencies have occurred by chance. Expected

frequencies in any of the cells are proportionally related to row and column totals. The relationship could be drawn using only horizontal and vertical lines. A comparison of expected and observed cell frequencies determines the significance level of the relationship.

On the other hand, kappa and weighted kappa (Cohen 1968), expecting total agreement would fill the diagonal cells, measure the level of departure from the diagonal for each of the two observations - how far from perfect agreement is the upper left to lower right diagonal. Drawn, the kappa statistic superimposes a diagonal line on the horizontal/vertical lines of significance tests. Kappa is discussed at length in the data analysis chapter. The formula is:

$$\text{kappa} = \text{PO} - \text{PC} / 1 - \text{PC} \quad [1]$$

where PO is the observed proportion of the total frequency and PC is the proportion expected by chance.

It is important to point out that Kappa corrects for agreement due solely to chance. Its attractiveness is in its simplicity. The formula for Kappa says that in a square cross tabulation the proportional shares in each cell on the left to right diagonal will sum to +1 if the raters are perfect agreement. The formula then removes the proportion due to chance (PC) from the observed proportions and from perfect agreement (+1). The chance corrected observed proportion is then divided by perfect agreement less chance agreement. The result is a score, less than +1 that indicates the degree of agreement between raters. It can be interpreted as a measure of agreement (or disagreement) between pairs that are responding to the same issue on the same scale (Liebetrau 1983, 32). The proportions PO

and PC are controlled by the marginals since each is a ratio of the marginal frequencies.

A computer program developed by Heavens, Jr. and Cicchetti (1978; Cicchetti et al. 1977) is used to calculate kappa.

This step in the analysis provides the basis for acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis. Rejection of the null hypothesis says in quantifiable terms, that there is disagreement between the data sets. The literature review above suggests reasons why the disagreement occurs, however, it is not imperative to this discussion to causally relate specific differences in the data to the way the police record information or the way researchers interpret it - that such disagreement is measurable is, of itself, a significant finding.

Footnotes to Chapter Three.

1. The Sourcebook Of Criminal Justice Statistics (Jamieson and Flanagan 1989) reports for 1988 that 70% of all homicides were cleared by arrest while for robbery (26.5), larceny (19.8%), motor vehicle theft (15.3%) and burglary (13.8%) were similarly cleared. The law enforcement response to interpersonal crimes is seen in the clearance by arrest for assault - 60%. It would seem that as the criminality moves away from property crime toward personal injury the arrest rates rise.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

Introductory Comments

To recapitulate, the data are arranged bilaterally in two distinct data sets. The first set of data is labeled "Police" data and contains information as it was first supplied by the police reporting on the homicide events. This method is akin to the way information is supplied to the UCR and SHR. The second set is called "Researcher" data and contains information gathered in an interview process.

In both cases an identical set of homicides is examined. The analysis should not be confused with a time series methodology wherein two raters examine the same subject matter at separate intervals. Rather, the analysis is a two-pronged effort in which two different sources of data about the same set of homicide events are examined simultaneously . By creating separate sets of data it is possible to observe whether or not re-construction of the subject matter would be significantly different when the police reporting mechanisms were left intact as opposed to when a researcher collected the data. In the analysis, both sets of data were treated alike. What was done to one was done to the other, exactly.

Before proceeding to a discussion of disagreement as measured using kappa, some comments regarding general differences in the respective products are provided to familiarize the reader with the kind of research questions the survey instrument contained and lend a sense of relevance to the foregoing discussion of how the respective biases of

police or social scientists might affect the way criminal events are understood. The examples provided are not comprehensive but are rather representative samples of the way interpretive bias can alter the "reality(ies)" described by the data.

Two Variables Examined

Among other items, the data collection form asks the whether the event can be identified as 1) Drug Related, 2) Not Drug Related, or 3) Do Not Know (When there is insufficient evidence to make the determination). It also asks which of the tripartite classifications (including multidimensional) best describes the event or if the case should be classified as not drug related. Respectively, variable labels for these questions are "Drug Related Question" and "Classification".

A response to the "Drug Related Question" is not as straightforward as first glance might suggest. The discussion of "Dimension" (another variable) on page 103 and the section on drugs and homicide (pp. 77-82) makes it clear that homicide is not a monolithic crime (Block 1985, 14) which arrives neatly packaged to fit the research variables. Many of the variables used to classify cases according to a theoretical model are subject to broad interpretation when more than one group is interpreting the elements that make up the subject matter. More than likely, material elements in a homicide event will be perceived differently by different observers. Fitting those perceptions into a theoretical model in a consistent manner depends heavily on a mutually agreeable understanding of the operational definitions used to describe them.

For example, in a sex related event in which the victim is high on drugs and the offender is a drug trafficker, the person recording the event must determine which element in the crime was the major contributor. In this case, whether the perpetrator's connection to the drug distribution system (systemic category) or the victim's drug use (psychopharmacological category) should serve as a basis for "Classification" or if both drug related elements are outweighed by the sex crime (not drug related category).

The operational definitions of the "Classification" categories are conservative - evidence of a drug related interaction must clearly be part of the event before it can be classified as drug related. This precludes classification of cases based on a status (e.g., as a drug dealer or user), prior arrest record, or any element not directly linked to the event.

Perhaps, for this example, the police rater determines that the event was primarily a sex-related crime, that neither the victim's drug use nor the perpetrator's occupation played a significant role. The case would be classified "Not drug-related" and the "Drug Related Question" would be "No". The researcher, however, might devalue the contribution sex played in the event and determine that the drug dealer to drug user relationship is sufficiently strong that a "Systemic" classification best describes the event. At least from the respective viewpoints of the two raters, there is a certain validity in saying the same event is not drug related in the first instance and in the next that the event is drug related.

The verbatim of the variables' definitions has certainly not changed from one assessment to the next. The way in which each is interpreted is the reason for the dissimilar results. Different assessments of individual cases in the sample are not limited to the "Classification" and "Drug Related Question" variables. By dint of conspicuousness alone, these variables provide a benchmark for the discussion below of how the problem of interpretive bias infects most of the other variables. The conspicuousness lies in their relationship; if an event's "Classification" is not drug related, internal consistency demands that "Drug Related Question" be "No". That this was not always so, is discussed below.

Differences Between The Data Sets

A CAVEAT: Four of the first six tables show a different N. Because they are made up of selected variables, the frequencies for each side of the tables are different. Further, these tables show different "N's" in places where the reader might expect they should be the same. Table 1, for instance contains 49 events in the police data and 59 events in the Research data. This is not an error.

Table 1 (p. 112) displays a composite variable that asks if either victim or perpetrator was "High or Irrational Due to [ingestion of] Drugs or Alcohol". A different N for each side of a single table might be confusing, at first: "How many participants were high, 49 or 59?"; "How can the same table show two N's?" In order to array the data in a more traditional style, two separate tables would be required and the reader would be forced to "flip" from one to the other. This discussion is concerned with the differences between data sets. In each

table the data are arrayed to highlight the differences. Accordingly, the left side of the tables represents the number of positive responses in the police data set and the right side, the same for the researcher data set.

In other words, the first data set says of the 414 events in the sample that 49 persons were effected by drugs or alcohol and the second data set says the same condition occurred 59 times. The difference says that in ten cases the police changed a "No" response in this variable to a "Yes" when interviewed by the researcher.

Internal Consistency

Recall that the police data were coded as reported. They were not examined for internal consistency nor were obvious contradictions questioned prior to the creation of the data set (see next paragraph). The national databases have no mechanism by which to recover missing data or to question inconsistency and the police data used here are meant to emulate that process. (The SHR is an attempt to amend the UCR's homicide file but it too is not a complete record principally because of the time constraints the process imposes on the reporting agency.) When the police were interviewed in the process that produced the researcher data, they gave information that differed from their original assessment of the event. Simply put, the answers changed. Because of this, the frequencies for a given variable can differ from the first data set to the second. These differences are precisely the reason the analysis was undertaken.

Tables 1, 2, and 3 demonstrate differences regarding the internal consistency of the two data sets. "Internal inconsistency"

refers to responses within a case that appear to contradict other responses in the same case. The data collection form includes 70 items with a response required for 288 items of information. The sheer number of responses serve as (for lack of a better term) a built in "lie scale". There is no predisposition here that the police lie. A large number of questions in the data collection form are related to other questions in the form and for a particular response to one question, a corresponding response is expected in other questions. For example, a "Yes" response in the variable "Victim was high on drugs at the time of the event" should be repeated in the "Drug Related Question" variable and a psychopharmacological classification would be expected. If the respective items contradict each other, either the fact that the victim was high did not contribute to the death or an error was made.

It is important to differentiate how what are herein called consistency errors might be considered a problem area. Put this analysis "on hold" for a moment to consider the data singularly. A researcher presented with the "Police" data, unaware that a second data set for the same sample exists, would probably deem the information valid and never raise a question about the description of drugs and homicide that it can be used to reconstruct. There would be nothing "wrong" with the data. It is only when another rater is present that a comparative assessment is available with which to highlight as "errors" what is actually disagreement.

Reference to this type of inconsistency as a "problem" is not usually a judgmentally disparaging one. Contradictory responses pose problems for the researcher. If the condition posed a "problem"

for the police who reported the information, it is reasonable to suppose that some attempt at correction would have been made. The discussion above of the way police gather, catalogue and return information suggests that they may have compelling reasons for reporting information in a particular way. An understanding of what happened is no less valid because police data is used to describe the event than if the description is based on the "scientific" data. This entire analysis is concerned more with the fact that the different descriptions are possible than with the validity of either.

Further, the consistency issue would probable go unnoticed outside of a specific research project. The close scrutiny brought to bear by researchers attempting to understand before they explain what the data say tends toward a logical progression from one piece of information to the next. This is not the case when data are merely "supplied", as are the police data here or data that feed the UCR. Without close scrutiny, errors within the data are usually unremarkable. When reviewing the tables that follow, the reader should keep in mind that this dissertation is characteristically a close scrutiny research effort.

The cases in Table 1 were selected from eight separate variables: Four variables that repeat for victim and perpetrator the questions: "At the time of the homicide was [Victim/Perpetrator] believed to be", 1) "high, on drugs"; 2) "high, on alcohol; 3) behaving irrationally due to the ingestion of alcohol; 4) behaving irrationally due to the ingestion of drugs.

The police data set identifies 49 events in these variables while the research data identifies 59 thus. Table 1 shows the tripartite conceptualization "Classifications" and the responses to the "Drug Related Question".

TABLE 1

SELECTED CASES: "HIGH OR IRRATIONAL DUE TO DRUGS OR ALCOHOL"		
	POLICE N = 49	RESEARCHER N = 59
IS THIS EVENT DRUG RELATED?		
NOT DRUG RELATED	20 (41%)	6 (10%)
DO NOT KNOW IF D/R	4 (8%)	0
DRUG RELATED	25 (51%)	53 (90%)
CLASSIFICATION		
Psychopharmacological	9	29
Economic Compulsive	8	0
Systemic	3	9
Multi-Dimensional	1	15
Other Classification	3	0
Not Classified	1	0
Not Drug Related	24	6

The police data classify as psychopharmacological only 9 events. Indeed, for these 49 killings in which the data say that one of the actors was using drugs, the police data identifies but 24 as "Drug Related"; (the "Not Classified" case in the police data is a recording error). The question of consistency in this example arises from a reasonable expectation that any case in which an actor was high on or acting irrationally because of drug ingestion should be identified as drug related and be classified as psychopharmacological. Expectation is stronger for the latter condition since "psychopharmacological" is operationally defined as drug use by one of the participants. The police data, then, say that of 49 events in which one of the actors was

affected by drugs or alcohol, about half are drug related while the researcher data say 90% of such events are drug related.

An examination of the right side of Table 1 emphasizes the value (and quite different outcome) of gathering data from those who have first hand access to the information. The research data, if not more consistent, makes more sense. From the scientific perspective, it makes sense that 90% of the cases in which one of the participants was high or acting irrationally because of drugs are classified drug related. Questions of data validity would be raised if the outcome were otherwise. For example, the police data say that overall (N = 49), 9 of the 25 drug-related events are in the psychopharmacological class. Since the 49 cases were selected because at least one of the actors was affected by drugs or alcohol, even a cursory examination would question why only 9 of 25 were recorded in the using or psychopharmacological classification and why the remaining 16 events were classified otherwise.

Although this question of apparent inconsistency was only addressed indirectly and informally to the police, four factors seem to be at work. Either 1) the detectives supplying the information did not understand the scientific taxonomy, 2) they discounted alcohol as a drug, 3) they discounted the contribution of an actor being under the influence of drugs or 4) they just did not recognize the inconsistency as such.

The latter was repeatedly voiced in the interview process in this way: When a detective who completed the survey instrument was asked by the interviewer to explain how an event in which either

participant was high or irrational on drugs could be denoted as a "Not drug related" event, a typical response was "Oophs", an admission of error and a request to change the response in the "Drug Related Question" to "Yes". How much such reactions were a function of the respondent giving what was thought to be the response expected by the interviewer or how much they were an honest effort to correct errors could not be measured. It is important however to recall that the usual methods of collecting criminological data do not include the luxury of a personal follow-up interview and without it, the data stand as recorded.

The effect of the four factors mentioned above is seen in the greater number of cases in the researcher data that are identified as "Yes" drug related; 53 versus 25 for the police data (Table 1). In both data sets the number of cases under the drug related "Classification" headings match exactly the number of "Yes" responses to the "Drug Related Question" (Police = 25; Research = 53). This phenomenon suggests disparate cognitive processes in which the police relate the drug related question to the drug classifications while the researcher relates the drug related question not only to the classification but to other, less obviously related variables such as the effects of drug use by participants. It seems that when a detective checks the "Yes" box in the "Drug Related Question", the corresponding drug related "Classification" is checked but when a researcher does the same, variables other than "Classification" and "Drug Related Question" are considered.

Note that the primary use of these data is for traditional research objectives; to inform appropriate audiences such as other

scientists, policy makers, the media and the public at large, about the drug relatedness of homicides. Scientists tend to pay close attention to issues of internal consistency, if only to divert negative criticism of their entire project that a simple "error" of the type shown in Table 1 for the police data would engender. The police have no such vested interest in "data". Table 1 makes it easier to understand how police chiefs can estimate that 40 to 95% of homicides are drug related (USA Today).

A final comment regarding Table 1 reinforces the observation regarding the recording of crime data by a researcher. In what is seemingly a more consistent fashion, the Research data (Table 1) say, first, that more of the selected cases are drug related (90%; Police = 51%). Then these data say that of the 53 events in which someone was using drugs, 55% (29 of 53) are clearly psychopharmacological and another 28% (15 of 53) fit more than one classification - are multi-dimensional. By recording them in the psychopharmacological or multi-dimensional categories, the Research data account in the drug related classifications for 83% of those events in which one of the actors was high on drugs. Comparatively, when these two categories are combined for the police data, less than half (40%) of the events in which either victim or perpetrator is affected by drugs or alcohol are similarly accounted for (10 of 25). Given the available data, there is just no way to speak to the validity of either data set, however remarkable the differences may be.

More Differences

From observations such as this it becomes apparent that the police, when working independent of social scientists, might unintentionally paint quite a different picture of the drug relatedness of homicides, than they would if interacting with a researcher. When the Research data were gathered, nothing was changed that had not been agreed to by the police themselves. As noted above, when an item was perceived by the interviewer as an anomaly and the deviation was pointed out to the police, more times than not the responses were aligned for the sake of what the researcher implied was consistency. Even though the implication was most often tacit, changes were frequently made for this reason.

Another consideration that might have induced change from the first data set to the next, was the police perception of the importance of their replies. Once put on notice that their work would be closely reviewed, most of the detectives interviewed reflected on their earlier responses and took time enough to consider items in the survey instrument relative to each other. Most detectives acknowledged the contradictions as a function of responding to what they saw as isolated questions. That the responses would be reviewed at all, came as a surprise to many respondents. It was perhaps, a "Hawthorne effect" at work.

Table 2 demonstrates this effect and its outcome on the reconstruction of the sample regards the critical "Drug Related Question". It shows the response frequency in the respective data sets to this question. Though simple, it is a telling variable.

TABLE 2

"IS THIS CASE DRUG RELATED?"					
			POLICE N = 414		RESEARCHER N = 414
YES		168	(40.6)		218 (52.7)
NO		165	(39.9)		155 (37.4)
DO NOT KNOW		68	(16.4)		41 (9.9)
NO RESPONSE		13	(3.2)		0 (0.0)

In Table 2 the "N" is the same for both data sets (A caveat to the caveat at page 108?). More than twice as many Police cases are in the "Do Not Know" category or are left blank as in the Research data. "Do Not Know" is a legitimate response but the frequency differential raises the question of how the presence of an interviewer could legitimately alter 40% of the responses in a particular category (68 to 41). How could the same persons who, when initially responding to the survey, did not have enough information to say "Yes" or "No", then, when confronted by a researcher, possess sufficient information to gainsay the initial response?

Table 2A reflects the intra-category changes within the variable, from one data set to the other; it shows to where the "No Response" and "Do Not Know" responses in the police data have gone.

There was a time lag of about one week between the submission of the collection form and the follow-up interview and the investigative process could have in that time span produced more information. Empirically, this notion is suspect. Possibly, the interview process forced responses not based on the available facts, again the function of giving expected responses. More likely, the

difference in the number of cases identified as drug related in the researcher data is the product of reflection, a second chance for the respondent to interpret the event in light of the researcher's questioning.

TABLE 2A

FREQUENCY CHANGE POLICE DATA TO RESEARCHER DATA VARIABLE = IS THIS EVENT DRUG RELATED? N = 414					
POLICE DATA	CHANGED TO IN RESEARCHER DATA				
	NO RES	YES	NO	DNK	TOTAL
NO RESPONSE		1	10	2	13
YES		159	6	3	168
NO		28	132	5	165
DO NOT KNOW		30	7	31	68
TOTAL	0	218	155	41	414

Note the left to right diagonal in Table 2A; respectively the data sets agree that 159 cases are drug related, 132 are not and in 31 events there is not sufficient information upon which to reply positively. The two sets agree in 296 cases or 71% of the time. Most of the decrease in the "Do Not Know" category were changes to the "Yes" category (30) and while 28 cases identified as not drug related in the police data set were changed to "Yes", at the same time, 6 cases that had been marked "Yes" were changed to not drug related.

This observation speaks to the possibility that researcher intervention, especially when the researcher is looking into the connection between drugs and homicide, might force change toward drug related classification of cases. Six cases went the other way. Seven cases the police data say are drug related were changed to not drug related and five case were switched the opposite way. Regarding the

largest change, the 30 responses that were changed to "Yes", the interview process empirically determined that the "Do Not Know" category was most often used when the detective did not fully understand how other variables indicating a drug involvement were connected to the "Drug Related Question" variable. These indications of drug involvement in one part of a collection form being contradicted in another part of the same form is at the core of the research question. They speak to the relative importance the police place on one piece of information over another. The researcher may see the two as relevant to each other while the police do not make a similar connection.

When the police data are used to reconstruct what happened, 40.8% of the homicides would be described in some way as being related to drugs whereas if the Research data were used, 52.7% of the sample are so described. A twelve percent margin of error must be evaluated dependant upon the particular methodological standards used by an individual researcher. The data in Tables 2 and 2A address the larger issue of overall agreement between the data sets, the issue examined in this dissertation. Its full impact is discussed below.

Differential Assessment of Drugs Involved

It would appear a fairly straightforward matter to ask the detective investigating a homicide which drug played a primary role in the event yet it seems that drugs are not a prime consideration to investigators. Knowledge of what drug is involved apparently has value more for the researcher than for the detective seeking forensic evidence.

An example serves to demonstrate this view (It is more fully expounded upon in the "Police Handling of Information" section above). Someone dies and the police and a researcher are both present during the investigation. A bit of information surfaces that the victim was a known user of cocaine (or any drug). Immediately the police officer thinks of the cocaine distribution and use system as an avenue for information. He or she cares little that the victim might have in fact been drinking alcohol or mainlining heroin at the time of death. For a detective, if a person is identified as part of a particular drug using or selling system, it is there that the forensic evidence will most probably be found, regardless of which particular drug was actually used during the event.

The scientist however thinks transactional drug use; what drug, if any was actually consumed near the time of death. The milieu and the people the police would turn to for information is of lesser concern. This is not to say a scientist would ignore the environment of a criminal event. Luckenbill (1977), Caven (1963) and Moran (1971), for example, pay particular attention to the setting in which homicides occur and in more general settings Goffman (1963) sees "public places" a crucial component of personal interaction. But, unless the scientist's perspective is interactionist, those persons who are not part of the transaction itself would probably not be viewed as prime contributors to an understanding of the event.

If a witness describes an antecedent dispute of a week past, the researcher would probably think of relationship and etiology while the investigator would seek the name of the other combatant. Detectives

seldom concern themselves with the nature of a dispute. That a dispute happened is suffice. A researcher, conversely sees the reason for the dispute as critical to understanding the transaction.

Even in the case of determining a motive, the police tend to be standoffish. For detectives motive is, at best, a mitigating circumstance of doubtful admissibility at trial and assessment of the forensic value of motive related information is usually left to the prosecuting attorney to develop.

The difference between an occupational prerogative that locates more than identifies (police) and another that looks to understand the participants in the event if the event is to be understood (researcher), is the gravamen of the issue under discussion. From it flows most of the disagreement between the respective reconstructions of the reality of crime.

Table 3 helps demonstrate the differential effects the two attitudes bring to a recording of which drug is primarily involved in an event. The Table 3 data reinforce the assertion that the police are more concerned with a person's connection to the drug scene than with the particular drug involved. The responses in the police data set to the question of what type of drug was involved in the event appear to be haphazardly made (Table 3). From Table 2, there are 168 drug related events in the police data set, yet a primary drug involved is named in a total of 187 events, an "over-reporting" of 18 cases - a primary drug is reported for 18 cases that are categorized as "Not drug related" events.

The over reporting of drugs involved is probably a function of replying on an impersonal form and being left to one's own devices,

for when asked the same questions in person, the responses were certainly adequate. The note in Table 3 helps to explain the "haphazard" surmise (i.e. If an event is classified as not drug-related, why is a drug named as being involved?).

TABLE 3

PRIMARY DRUG INVOLVED - DRUG-RELATED EVENTS			
		POLICE N = 187*	RESEARCHER N = 218
<u>DRUG INVOLVED</u>			
COCAINE	23 (12.3)	48 (22.0)	
CRACK	50 (26.7)	118 (54.1)	
ALCOHOL	7 (3.7)	21 (9.6)	
MARIJUANA	2 (1.1)	7 (3.2)	
HEROIN	3 (1.6)	3 (1.4)	
MULTIPLE DRUGS	5 (2.7)	18 (8.3)	
UNKNOWN/NO REPLY	97 (51.9)	3 (1.4)	

* There are 168 drug related events in the police data ("Drug Related Question" - Table 2). In 18 cases recorded as "Not Drug Related" or "Unknown" the police data do record a drug involved.

In over 50% of the drug related events, the police failed to identify a drug as being involved. Another reason for the over-reporting type of discrepancy shown in Table 3 is the inclusion of the "dimension" variable (described above, p. 96). "Dimension" is a methodological construct with which it seems, the detective/respondents were not fully conversant.

One detective who thought all homicides were psychopharmacological (and said so in large letters across the face of the collection form; p. 3, above) also has indicated (in smaller letters) that a systemic dimension was present. The case involved a drug free family dispute. As best as could be determined from this particular

detective, the "Systemic" dimension was checked because the event took place in a neighborhood heavily infested with illicit drugs. The detective explained, in a somewhat vague but not altogether ill informed way, that all crime (and social tragedy) have etiological roots in the drug distribution system - since this particular killing took place in a neighborhood ridden with drugs, it was causally related to the drug distribution system. From a sociological perspective, such reasoning is not unsound, but in light of the objectives of the drugs/homicide nexus research, it is hardly a usable assessment of the event.

Using the same logic underlying the "internal consistency" discussion, if any variable that is theoretically related to drugs contains a positive response, it would be consistent to record the drug involved. A perusal of Table 3 shows that for the police data in particular, the large number of "Unknown" and "No reply" responses diminishes the power of the aggregate numbers to accurately describe what kind of drug is involved in the homicides. It would be difficult indeed to demonstrate which drug predominates in drug related events when 51.9% of the sample fails to report any drug.

The suggestion above that the naming of a primary drug involved is made haphazardly, is supported by the 18 cases that list a drug but are said to be not drug related, the 97 indefinite responses and a comparison of the "revised" assessment that ensues after the police are interviewed. Of the 97 cases recorded as "Unknown" or for which no reply was provided in the police data, a specific drug was subsequently indicated in all but three of these cases. Sometimes the detectives would admit the contradiction as an oversight but more often

they voiced a honest desire to "fix" the survey instrument (Perhaps motivated by a want to meet the researcher's expectations). They did not manufacture the drug involved information. It was available when the collection form was initially submitted. The detectives had merely omitted its entry.

In the main, the "Unknown/No Reply" cases are revised to include Cocaine or Crack as the primary drug. In any case, the process of changing responses is a rather simple one. A detective would be questioned about a report that the victim was high on drugs by asking: If high, on what type of drug (there is no drug listed on the collection form)? The response would then indicate a drug involved.

The initial omission is understandable (even if not excusable to a scientist) in view of the mechanics involved. The items containing information about victim (or perpetrator) drug use and the question regarding drug type in a "Dimension" are on separate pages of the survey instrument. Is it reasonable to expect that a person involved in the relatively weighty primary task of locating a murderer to have scientific acumen sufficient to recognize that several questions are articulated without words in another, later question? The work of this dissertation would suggest otherwise.

This discrepancy is repeated in Table 4 where 177 (Police) events are recorded as being in one of the drug related primary classifications but, again from Table 2, only 168 are "Yes" drug related. In other words, the police data set classify as drug related more cases than are indicated by responses to a question that seems

rather uncomplicated on its surface. A similar observation is made regarding Table 1, so at least the discrepancies are consistent.

Where table 2 demonstrates the "Drug Related Question" variable for all 414 events, Table 4 presents the numbers of drug related cases in the "Classification" variable. Also, note that the N in Table 4 differs from Table 1. Both Tables show attributes of the "Classification" variable, "Psychopharmacological", et al., but the selection criteria for each table differs.

TABLE 4

TRIPARTITE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK-PRIMARY CLASSIFICATION				
		POLICE N = 177*		RESEARCHER N = 218
PRIMARY CLASSIFICATION				
PSYCHOPHARMACOLOGICAL		19 (10.7)		31 (14.2)
ECONOMIC COMPULSIVE		50 (28.3)		8 (3.7)
SYSTEMIC		62 (35.0)		162 (74.3)
MULTIDIMENSIONAL		16 (9.0)		17 (7.8)
OTHER DRUG RELATED		30 (17.0)		0

* There are 168 drug related events in the police data ("Drug Related Question" - Table 2). In 9 cases recorded as "Not Drug Related" or "Unknown" the police data do record a drug involved.

The difference in Table 4 between Police (35%) and Researcher (74.3%) classification of events as "Systemic" is striking and lends further support for the proposition that a different construct of reality will be made dependant upon which data source is used. This observation, restated, says that the role played by the system of drug distribution and use in homicides, can be weighed by either 35 or 74 percent, depending upon who collects the data. Hardly a scientifically

acceptable range, this, but one that is, nevertheless, an accurate statement of the products of two different data sources.

The "Systemic" classification is concerned with drugs generally. As demonstrated in Table 3, as the queries become more specific regarding the type of drug involved, the differential continues apace. The Table 3 police data show cocaine and crack as the primary drug in 39% of the drug-related cases while for the same sample the Research data say 76.1% involve cocaine and crack. Fully 51.9% of the events recorded by the Police do not indicate that any drug is involved; for the researcher data, this is a manageable 1.4%.

At a time when America is mounting an all out war on the distribution system that delivers cocaine and crack to our streets (Walton 1989), such disparate assessments of the systemic violence component and the share of that by type of drug involved, would tend to muddy rather than clarify the issue. If, for example, two social scientists working independently, one relying on the police data and the other on the researcher data, published their findings simultaneously, the reader would be forced to choose between 35 or 74.3% as the measure of systemic violence and between 39 or 74.1% as the measure of drug related homicides that involve cocaine and crack.

In the same way, the fairly widespread image of a dope "fiend" who plies a dirty trade on society's weakest in search of money to support a personal drug use habit is supported by the police data in Table 4. The way in which detectives participating in this research tended to group events whose elements connote some economic relationship into the "Economic/Compulsive" classification is discussed above. The

police data set says that in 50 of the 177 drug related events (28.3%), the underlying motivation was the compulsion to support a personal drug use habit. The Research data contradicts the "fiend" inference with a reported 3.7% events in this category. The latter assessment is repeated in other, similar research that reported 3.1% for this type of homicide event (Brownstein et al 1989, 10).

In view of the operational definition of "Economic/Compulsive" which seeks to identify homicides that could be attributable to personal level compulsion, any interpretive broadening of the definition would tend to distort the design of the research in unanticipated (and, for the researcher, undesirable) ways.

The variables shown in tables 1 through 4 contain verbiage, definitions, conceptualization and purpose not normally a part of the police lexicon. Indeed the conceptualization and purpose of the research are probably beyond the ken of most police merely as a function of lack of interest. It is not that most police could not understand interpretive schema; most of the detectives involved in this research were just not concerned with matters that did not pertain to the task at hand, solving crime.

More than once, however, they did indicate a willingness to share information which had been routinely collected as part of the investigation but which was not expressly asked for in the research instrument. (This point is elaborated ff p. 133.) Equally often the detectives demurred when asked to fit their knowledge into the tripartite conceptualization. Without having tested how this posture

affected the data supplied, it would be conjectural to impute a rationale.

The comparative data in Table 5 combines the information in the preceding tables. Although it speaks for itself, some comments follow.

TABLE 5

SELECTED VARIABLES COMBINED: FREQUENCY DIFFERENTIAL			
POLICE		RESEARCHER	
TABLE 2	168	"YES" DRUG RELATED	218
TABLE 3	90	DRUG INVOLVED NAMED	215
TABLE 4	177	CLASSIFIED AS DRUG RELATED	218

Plainly the respective pictures of these homicides is dramatically different but it would be wrong to dismiss what appear to be inconsistencies in the police data as resulting from a lack of attention to detail or an occupationally based prejudice against research and paper work generally. More likely the differences are so easily told simply because the researcher is doing the telling.

The Research data were gathered by the people who designed the survey instrument. They know intimately what each variable connotes, can reasonably anticipate what "consistent" responses should be and even that a particular response in one category should trigger a certain response in another. If the police, as an occupational group, had a like vested interest in the collection of crime data and, most importantly, a purpose akin to that of the scientific community, they would assuredly produce a set of data as responsive to a research

instrument designed by them as are the data produced by researchers using an instrument of their own design.

As the comparative review moved to matters more related to forensic issues, the differential between the two data sets lessened. In the discussion below of data analyzed using more advanced statistical methods, the observations presented thus far are, by and large, repeated. By way of preview, most disagreement is found in those variables created chiefly to answer research questions and the least disagreement in variables more germane to forensic matters.

Three variables, "Location", "Means Used" and "Relationship" are germane to most criminal investigations and highlight the observation that as the subject matter moves towards forensic issues there is a commensurate convergence of agreement.

"Location" "Means Used" and "Relationship"

TABLE 6

EVENTS BY LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE			
	POLICE N = 414		RESEARCHER N = 414
<u>LOCATION</u>			
VACANT BUILDING	5 (1.2)		5 (1.2)
BAR	2 (.5)		2 (.5)
COMMERCIAL SITE	12 (2.9)		15 (3.6)
STREET	181 (43.7)		185 (44.7)
OTHER PUBLIC AREA	31 (7.5)		34 (8.2)
TRANSIT FACILITIES	2 (.5)		2 (.5)
VICTIM'S RESIDENCE	83 (20.1)		80 (19.3)
PERPETRATOR'S RESID.	22 (5.3)		15 (3.6)
V AND P RESIDENCE	8 (1.9)		12 (2.9)
OTHER RESIDENCE	37 (8.9)		38 (9.2)
OTHER LOCATION	31 (7.5)		26 (6.3)

Table 6 shows little disagreement across the two data sets. Where differences occur, they are in the area of victim or perpetrator residence, a somewhat indefinite assignment of "ownership" of the premises, or in the "Other" and "Public Area" versus "Commercial Site" variables. Of all the variable groupings, "Location" shows the most agreement between the two data sets.

The "Means Used" to kill a person leaves little room for dispute. Perhaps in cases of poisoning or in which the victim's body is in an advanced state of decomposition and the like, a forensic expert must be consulted, but usually the means used to kill are evident. Certainly the differences shown in Table 7 are unremarkable in this regard since both sides of the table are nearly identical.

TABLE 7

EVENTS BY WEAPONS AND MEANS USED			
		POLICE N = 414	RESEARCHER N = 414
MEANS USED			
FIREARMS		280 (67.6)	283 (68.4)
KNIFE OR CUTTING TOOL		80 (19.3)	84 (20.3)
PHYSICAL FORCE*		38 (9.2)	39 (9.4)
ALL OTHER MEANS		11 (2.7)	8 (1.9)
NO RESPONSE		5 (1.2)	0
*Includes Use of Blunt Instrument and Strangulation.			

For most of the categories shown in Table 8, the frequencies in both data sets approximate each other. Yet once more, as the variable descriptions move away from generic definitions toward those which may be ambiguous to some persons because of the operational definitions attached, there is a higher level of disagreement.

Definitions of sexual and family relationships, a police officer or a stranger are in fair agreement, or so the Table 8 data suggests, and pose little problem for data analysis. However, the "Drug Associate", and "Friend, Acquaintance, Neighbor" attributes demonstrate that disagreement will occur when the variable "labels" lend themselves to interpretation. The large number of "Undetermined" responses in the police data points to a human tendency to account for ambiguity by resorting to something non-committal.

TABLE 8

EVENTS BY VICTIM/PERPETRATOR RELATIONSHIP			
	POLICE N = 414		RESEARCH N = 414
RELATIONSHIP			
SPOUSE/BOY, GIRL FRIEND	27	(6.5)	26 (6.3)
CHILD, PARENT, SIBLING	12	(2.9)	12 (2.9)
FAN*	82	(19.8)	114 (27.5)
DRUG BUSINESS ASSOCIATE	33	(8.0)	102 (24.6)
POLICE OFFICER	3	(.7)	5 (1.2)
STRANGER	73	(17.6)	93 (22.5)
UNDETERMINED	177	(42.8)	62 (15.0)
NO RESPONSE	7	(1.7)	0
* Friend, acquaintance, neighbor.			

Most of the 178 "Undetermined" cases in the police data (Table 8) were changed to the "FAN" or "Drug Associate" categories. The changes were made during the interview process, after the ambiguity, whether real or imaginary, was made clear. The data arrayed in Table 8 speak indirectly to an issue identified by Berger and Luckmann (1966, 118) that should be of critical concern to all who rely on practitioners for their data. They discuss the social construction of human activities as partly a function of the input of outside "experts". Although Berger and Luckmann are concerned with "social conflict", their

caveat is no less compelling in terms of research "experts" in other social sciences who would impose their own "construct of reality" upon practitioners:

What is likely to be particularly galling [to practitioners] is the experts' claim to know the ultimate significance of the practitioners' activity better than the practitioners themselves. Such rebellions on the part of the "laymen" may lead to the emergence of rival definitions of reality . . .

(1966, 117-18, emphasis added)

Extrapolating from the societal level of Berger and Luckmann to the instant case, it would be a fair assertion that the police substitute "Undetermined" rather than give an incorrect response or a response in accord with a definition by the "expert" researchers with which they do not agree, do not understand or do not accept.

In all of Tables 6, 7 and 8 the largest difference is found in Table 8 in the "Undetermined" category. The tendency toward non-committal categories in face of ambiguity, it would seem, is not at all unusual.

Cicourel says he is "interested in how we assign unequivocal meaning to" the subject matter of scientific research. He notes that provided two observers are from the same culture they can agree on the definition of a table or chair, but as the subject matter gets more complicated, "fixed choice" categories in survey instruments tend to confuse more than enlighten (1968, 3). The fact that throughout tables 6 and 7 items other than "Undetermined" show a reasonable level of agreement, supports Cicourel's observation and the contentions made above.

One final issue needs to be discussed to complete the "introduction" of the data analysis; specifically the use of "Other" categories by the police.

"Other Categories"

The police make use of open ended categories in a way that becomes a prerequisite consideration in the interpretation stage of this kind of research. Throughout the data collection instrument a category "Other" is provided for unanticipated elements. In every item labeled "Other" a "Specify" block is included. For example, if a drug involved was not one of the eleven drugs listed to choose from, an "Other drug, Specify _____" item was included in the collection form; for "Other circumstance", the "Specify" block asks that the circumstance be named.

Thirty-six times when the "Other, Specify_____" item was used in the circumstance variable, the other choices available - robbery, dispute, drug transaction et al. - would have adequately covered the information provided by the police as "specified" . More often, more information was provided than necessary to answer the question. Instead of indicating that the event was part of a drug transaction, the "Specify" item would contain such information as "Drug rip-off" or "Drug deal went bad."

Expansion of the "Other" category was not limited to "Circumstance". The classification section of the form provides for "Systemic" and "Other Drug Related, Specify_____", along with the other categories. For a case that was clearly systemic, detectives would leave the "Systemic" category blank, indicate that the event should be classified as "Other . . ." and add a "Specific", such as, the case

involved the robbery of drug dealers by other drug dealers or a fight over control of a drug sales location. The definition of systemic unmistakably includes this kind of activity and since other items in the form explicitly include such behavior, using the "Other" category was superfluous.

Further, often for emphasis or seemingly if the fact merely struck a fancy, detectives would add to the "Specify" item, a bit of information regarding the type of weapon used (i.e. a brand name), or the location (i.e. A dry cleaners used to launder money), or an actor (i.e. She was a street person who traded sex for drugs). Space was provided elsewhere in the collection form for all of this information or it was complimentary. However gratuitous, it was not irrelevant.

The penchant of detectives to expand on the information requested in this way (even though it was recorded in the wrong places) is useful data and provides an unexpected benefit. A number of the "Other" entries contained the type of information someone not "on the scene" could know. The comments are insightful and could be used in qualitative reports or for purposes of revising a research methodology. On the other hand, the widespread use of this kind of item in the instant research and the hours it cost in "data cleaning" expense, suggests that further research limit the availability of open ended questions, at least when the police are the respondents.

It is evident from these introductory comments that when raw frequencies are used to describe a single sample but the frequencies are contained in discrete sets of data collected by different "suppliers", quite different pictures of what happened will emerge. The police data

say more homicides are done by persons who need to support drug use habits, while researcher supplied data say more killings are connected to the system of drug distribution and use than any other single factor. The respective measures of what drug and the share drugs by type contribute to the drug/homicide nexus is disputable across a range of about 35%. The two data sets even have a problem agreeing about how many of the sample homicides are drug related (168 versus 218).

Agreement and Disagreement

Raw figures, untested for statistical significance, can be deceptive. Do the differences noted above mean anything or are they merely an artifact of the numbers themselves? From the hypothesis testing here it can be argued that significant differences will be evident in two sets of data because the reasons each set is collected are different and because the persons doing the collection will each interpret the research question differently - not the theoretical question but the "nuts and bolts" questions about what transpired.

In order to determine the level of agreement between the two data sets, the information within each was separated in "Event", "Victim" and "Perpetrator" variables (See Appendix D).

Demographic variables, those concerned with age, sex, race, ethnicity, date of birth and national origin, were excluded from this analysis because they routinely are in agreement regardless of who collects the data. The original research (DRCAH-2) faced some interpretive problems regarding ethnicity and national origin that go beyond the matter under discussion. Problems with these two variables

are noted here merely to alert those who might accept demographic data without question.

The hypothesis assumes that any unique characteristics of the police data are to some measure driven by organizational and/or occupational factors. The question of a comparable bias on the part of social scientists assumes that the researcher data will similarly be affected. Such assumptions are persuasive in light of the themes emerging from the review of the literature above. The purpose of this research is not to identify and quantify the subjectivity inherent in the respective data sets but to demonstrate that differences between the two do exist and that the differences are measurable.

The first step in the demonstration is a presentation of the results arrived at by using the kappa statistic to measure variables in the police data set by their counterpart in the researcher data.

kappa

On page 102 in the Methodology Section is a statement describing the choice of the kappa statistic for this work. Its use is supported by Cohen (1960), Fleiss et al. (1969), Fleiss (1981, 218) and Cicchetti. Presented here, briefly, are its mechanics.

A major advantage of kappa is that it corrects for the amount of agreement that can be expected to occur by chance alone (Cicchetti 1987, 606; Cohen 1960; Fleiss 1981). A second characteristic is that kappa is also a measure of reliability. It is described as an index of agreement for use with nominal scales, "analogous to an alternate form reliability coefficient" (Cohen 1968, 213).

In the context of reliability, it is important to note that equal weights are given to both sets of data. A difference that comes about from the police judging an event as "Systemic" where the researcher assigns the "Economic/ Compulsive" category, is of the same gravity as if the judgments were reversed. An equal system of weights (unweighted kappa) "is appropriate to the frame of reference of reliability, where the two sources of data are conceived as being of equal status," (Cohen 1968, 219; also, Fleiss et al. 1969). kappa provides a "conceptually simple" measure of reliability, the proportion of agreement after chance agreement has been removed.

Kappa yields negative values when there is less observed agreement than expected by chance, zero when the observed agreement is due entirely to chance or there is no agreement and unity or a value of +1, when there is complete agreement (Cohen 1968, 214-5). The formula for kappa (repeated from p.(109) is:

$$\text{kappa} = \frac{PO - PC}{1 - PC} \quad [1]$$

where PO is the proportion of observed agreement and PC is the proportion of agreement expected by chance. In the numerator, the function, -PC, removes the proportion of agreement that occurs by chance from the proportion of observed agreement; in the denominator, -PC, likewise removes the chance expected agreement from the maximum agreement possible (a kappa score of +1). The division then produces a measure of agreement corrected for agreement due to chance alone.

Using the kappa statistic scores were computed for individual variables grouped as follows:

<u>Event</u>	<u>Victim and Perpetrator</u>
Relationship	Event Action
Circumstances	Behavior
Means Used	Status
Motive	Drug(s) Used
Location	Drug(s) Found
Drug Related Question	Trafficking Level
Reason Drug Related	
Dimension	
Classification	

Appendices D and E provide a detailed list of variables.

Brief definitions of the variables examined are:

EVENT VARIABLES

Relationship, means the victim's relationship to the perpetrator.

Circumstance, means the primary behavior characterizing the event.

Means Used, defines the type of weapon or physical means by which the killing was accomplished.

Motive, can be one of six possible reasons underlying the action:

Furtherance of another crime	Irrational
Premeditated	Other Motive
Spontaneous Occurrence	Undetermined.

Location, defines one of ten possible sites.

Drug Related Question, asks "Is this event drug related?".

Reason drug related, - "Do you believe that the homicide resulted from (list in Appendix C).

Dimension, captures evidence of "other" drug relatedness.

Classification, is defined by the tripartite conceptualization.

VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR VARIABLES - (Appendix D)

Event Action, contains four variables indicating that one actor was buying or selling drugs or that drugs or drug paraphernalia (works) were found nearby.

Behavior, defines the effect of drug use on an actor's behavior at the time of the event; e.g. high or irrational.

Status, defines an actor's condition relative to drugs that may or may not have directly contributed to the event.

Drug(s) Used, defines the type of drug an actor was using at the time of the event.

Drug(s) Found, defines the type of drug found on or near the actor at the time of the event.

Trafficking Level, defines identification as either a high or low level drug trafficker.

Tables 9A, 9B, 9C, 10 and 11 represent the kappa scores for variables within each grouping. Event information is separated into tables according to level of "acceptable" agreement most frequently found within each of the variables. Just which are "acceptable" kappa scores will become evident as the discussion progresses.

TABLE 9A

EVENT VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORE ACCEPTABILITY = GOOD			
	KAPPA		KAPPA
<u>Means</u>	.9203	<u>Location</u>	.9737
Handgun	.9792	Bar Or Tavern	1.0000
Rifle	1.0000	Vacant Building	1.0000
Shotgun/Machine gun	.9617	Street	.9706
Transit System	1.0000	Commercial Site	.8853
Fire	1.0000	Public Area	.9499
Knife,Cutting Instrument	.9696	Victim's Residence	.9571
Physical Force*	.9857	Perpetrator Residence	.9416
All Other Means	.5685	Other Residence	.9853
		Other Location	.8359
* Includes "Blunt Instrument" and "Strangulation".			

TABLE 9B

EVENT VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORE ACCEPTABILITY = FAIR			
	KAPPA		KAPPA
<u>Relationship</u>	.5303	<u>Circumstances</u>	.6208
Spouse	.9798	Execute Police Officer	.6642
Parent/child	.7239	Drug Transaction	.5807
Sibling	.7657	Robbery	.7114
Friend*	.6526	Other crime	.5210
Drug Associate	.3474	Dispute	.7303
Police Officer	.4954	Vice/sex related	.4976
Stranger	.6547	Child abuse	1.0000
Undetermined	.3172	Other Circumstances	.5876
Drug Related Question	.6421		
* Includes Friend, Acquaintance and Neighbor			

As the subject matter turns to issues more strongly identified with the research methodology, the disagreement between the data sets widens. The variables in Table 9C are primarily a creation of the researcher. They define the theoretical model. Although they seem not of esoteric origin or definition, they certainly seem to pose problems when their developer and those who are asked to interpret them come together in a cross tabulation.

TABLE 9C

EVENT VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORE ACCEPTABILITY = POOR			
KAPPA		KAPPA	
<u>Motive</u>		<u>Dimension</u>	
Further Crime	.4726	Psychopharmacological	.2412
Premeditated	.3354	Economic Compulsive	.2494
Spontaneous	.3786	Systemic	.3933
Irrational	.1357		
Other	.0164		KAPPA
Undetermined	.2939	<u>Classification</u>	.3059
		Psychopharmacological	.3214
		Economic Compulsive	.0369
		Systemic	.3944
		Multidimensional	-.0415
		Other Drug Related	.0000
		Not Drug Related	.5251
<u>Reason Drug Related</u>		<u>KAPPA</u>	
Fight By Dealers Over Territory		.49785	
Dealer Killed For Selling Bad Drugs		.46560	
Buyer Killed In Fight With Dealer		.45681	
Execution Of Police Informant		.44205	
Dispute Over Works		.46027	
Dispute Over Theft Of Drugs		.48602	
Assault To Collect Drug Related Debt		.46090	
Punishment Of Workers By Dealer		.46971	
Robbery Of Drug Dealer		.50632	
Other Drug Trafficking		.45627	
Other Drug Related Circumstances		.42166	

The variables which pertain to victim and perpetrator information are mainly in the "Good" range of acceptable kappa scores.

TABLE 10

VICTIM VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORES			
KAPPA		KAPPA	
<u>Event Action</u>		<u>Behavior</u>	
Drug Buying	.7547	High On Drugs	.9105
Drug Selling	.7953	High On Alcohol	.7967
Drugs Found	.8922	Irrational Due Alcohol	.9321
Drug Works Found	.8811	Irrational Due Drugs	.8559
<u>Status</u>		<u>Trafficking Level</u>	
Heroin User	.6596	Low Level	.7699
Cocaine/Crack User	.8217	High Level	.8864
Alcohol Abuser	.9234		
Other Drug User	.6568		
<u>Drug(s) Used</u>		<u>Drug(s) Found</u>	
Heroin	.6656	Heroin	1.0000
Cocaine	.8088	Cocaine	.9665
Crack	.9434	Crack	.9208
Marijuana	.0000	Marijuana	1.0000
Alcohol	.9188	Alcohol	.8559

The variables in Table 10 concerning victims are mirrored in Table 11, concerning the perpetrator.

Table 11

PERPETRATOR VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORES			
KAPPA		KAPPA	
<u>Event Action</u>		<u>Behavior</u>	
Drug Buying	.7113	High On Drugs	.7428
Drug Selling	.6830	High On Alcohol	.8214
Drugs Found	.9079	Irrational Due Alcohol	.8309
Drug Works Found	.9219	Irrational Due Drugs	.7976
<u>Status</u>		<u>Trafficking Level</u>	
Heroin User	1.0000	Low Level	.5825
Cocaine/Crack User	.7065	High Level	.6585
An Alcohol Abuser	.8763		
Another Type Drug	.8547		
<u>Drug(s) Used</u>		<u>Drug(s) Found</u>	
Heroin	1.0000	Heroin	.6656
Cocaine	.8864	Cocaine	.9079
Crack	.7659	Crack	.4982
Marijuana	.7988	Marijuana	-.0024
Alcohol	.9684	Alcohol	.6656

Interpretation of kappa

The question remains however of how to read the kappa scores. What is the difference between the lowest score (.0164 for Other Motive) and the highest (1.0000 for Bar or Tavern) and are the two comparable in the sense that one variable is a more reliable assessor of what happened than is the other?

The latter score indicates perfect agreement. The former score indicates disagreement in that the police identified 79 cases in the "Other Motive" category while the researcher said only 12 cases where of this motivation. The matrices for these variables are:

TABLE 12

LOCATION = BAR OR TAVERN - FREQUENCIES				
P O D L A I T C A E	RESEARCHER DATA			
		NO	YES	TOTAL
	NO	412	0	412
	YES	0	2	2
	TOTAL	412	2	414

Note in Table 12, the left to right diagonal in perfect agreement and, in Table 13, the opposite diagonal which indicates 85 of 414 cases are in disagreement.

TABLE 13

OTHER MOTIVE - FREQUENCIES				
P O D L A I T C A E	RESEARCHER DATA			
		NO	YES	TOTAL
	NO	326	9	335
	YES	76	3	79
	TOTAL	402	12	414

Parenthetically, the "Other Motive" matrix reinforces the observation above regarding resort to non-committal categories when they are available. Although "Motive" may appear unambiguously defined, the interpretive function, having to fix the motivation of the person who did the killing, bears heavily on a general reluctance by detectives to "write down" any bit of information that may be seen as exculpatory or which might face challenge in a courtroom. When pressed to the task in the interview process, 76 "Yes" responses were changed to "No" in the "Other Motive" variable. In only three cases do both data sets agree that the underlying motive was not one of the other, more specific, motivation categories available in the survey instrument.

This is not the case with such a piece of information as the location of the crime. None can argue that a body was located at a particular type of premise or location, hence the high measure of agreement for this variable.

In order to give meaning to the bare kappa scores reliability indices were computed using a procedure described by Cicchetti as "Maximum Possible Agreement" (1987, 616).

Maximum Possible Agreement

The maximum value of kappa (1.0000) cannot be attained unless both sets of rater marginals are identical (Cohen 1960, 42). Kappa is a chance-corrected statistic in that it computes expected cell frequencies from the marginals and removes any chance agreement from the observed frequencies.

The maximum possible value of kappa is defined as:

$$\text{Kappa}_{\text{max}} = (\text{PO}_{\text{max}} - \text{PC}) / (1 - \text{PC}) \quad [2]$$

in which PO_{max} is the maximum value that the proportion of observed agreement can attain in any given fourfold inter-rater matrix. The only difference between formula [2] and [1] is in the numerator. Where kappa is chance corrected agreement based on proportions observed, $\text{Kappa}_{\text{max}}$ is chance corrected agreement based on the maximum possible value that proportion observed can attain. In both formulae $1 - \text{PC}$ is the maximum amount of chance-corrected agreement that is possible and PC is the proportion of chance agreement expected (Cicchetti 1987, 606). For a fourfold matrix, PO_{max} is a simple sum of the smallest of the four marginals (expressed in proportions) with its opposite diagonal marginal.

It should be noted that the more dissimilar the marginals the greater the increase in $\text{kappa} / \text{Kappa}_{\text{max}}$ (Maximum Possible Agreement) values relative to the unadjusted kappa values (Cicchetti 1987, 616). These differences are presented in Tables 16A through 18 below as "Distance From Kappa". In the tension between chance and observed proportions, it is meaningful to know how close a particular kappa score is to its maximum possible attained value. Also, in addition to Cohen's observation that equal status for each rater justifies the use of unweighted kappa, since the data are contained in dichotomous variables, unweighted and weighted kappa are essentially the same (Spitzer et al. 1967, 83).

The "Bar or Tavern" variable would be presented thus:

TABLE 14

LOCATION = BAR OR TAVERN - PROPORTIONS					
		RESEARCHER DATA			
			NO	YES	TOTALS
P O D L A I T C A E	NO	OBS	.9952	.0000	.9952
		EXP	.9904	.0048	.9952
	YES	OBS	.0000	.0048	.0048
		EXP	.0048	.0000	.0048
	<u>TOTAL</u>	OBS	.9952	.0048	1.0000
		EXP	.9952	.0048	1.0000

and the .0048 proportion in the "Yes" row (or because of the evident agreement in this example, the "Yes" column) would be selected as the lowest marginal; its opposite diagonal, the "No" response would be added to it to arrive at $PO_{\max}$. In this case, since there is perfect agreement their sum is +1 and both kappa and $Kappa_{\max}$ equal +1.

For the low score kappa found in "Other Motive" the proportion matrix is:

TABLE 15

OTHER MOTIVE - PROPORTIONS							
		RESEARCHER DATA					
			NO	YES	TOTALS		
P O D L A I T C A E	NO	OBS	.7874	.0217	.8092		
		EXP	.7857	.0235	.8092		
	YES	OBS	.1836	.0072	.1908		
		EXP	.1853	.0055	.1908		
		TOTAL		OBS	.9710	.0290	1.0000
		TOTAL		EXP	.9710	.0290	1.0000

The different marginals in Table 15 indicate disagreement. The procedure is the same as when there is total agreement. One divides

a given kappa by the highest kappa value possible ($Kappa_{max}$) to obtain the maximum chance-corrected agreement possible for the given fourfold table with a given set of marginals (Cicchetti 1987, 616). In this case (Table 15),

$$\begin{aligned} PO &= .7874 + .0072 = .7947 \\ PC &= .7857 + .0055 = .7913 \\ \text{kappa} &= .0164 \end{aligned}$$

and since the "Yes" column (Researcher Data) contains the lowest marginal, when summed with the proportion in the marginal of the "No" row for the Police Data, yields

$$PO_{max} = .0290 + .8092 = .8382.$$

Applying [2], to obtain

$$Kappa_{max} = \frac{.8382 - .7913}{1 - .7913} = \frac{.047}{.2087}$$

and $\text{kappa}/Kappa_{max}$ (.0164/.2252)

yields the maximum possible measure of agreement of .0729 for "Other Motive".

Using this procedure the kappa score takes on additional relevance and value vis à vis its upper limit especially in light of Cicchetti's assurance that $\text{kappa}/Kappa_{max}$ also has a perfect linear regression on both kappa scores and proportion of agreement observed (1987, 616).

Acceptable Levels Of Kappa - Event Variables

The procedure just outlined was applied to cross tabulations for each variable. The headings in Tables 9A, 9B, and 9C, hint at the need to derive some basis for assessing the kappa score for an individual variable or the compare one against another. Citing the work of Landis and Koch (1977) characterizing different ranges of kappa

values with respect to the degree of agreement they suggest, Fleiss says that "for most purposes", values greater than .75 "or so" may be taken to represent excellent agreement beyond chance; values under .40 represent poor agreement and the mid-range from .40 or so to .75, represent fair to good agreement beyond chance (1981, 218).

Such a typology is adopted here and is the reason for separating the "Event" variables by agreement levels of acceptability. Throughout this work there is remarkable disagreement between the two data sets when the variables concerned are of a theoretical orientation and much less so when definitions in common usage are at play. It seems that whenever the researcher saw a need to "define" the subject matter, just as often the practitioner ignored or misinterpreted it.

Note that the following tables are not exclusive in that each includes scores in all three ranges of acceptable values. The tables' headings denote that the majority of scores are in the specified range. Those variables not within the range specified in the table heading are denoted by "G", "F" or "P", respectively, "Good", "Fair" or "Poor".

Tables 16A, to 18 repeat the variables presented in Tables 9A to 11 with the addition of the maximum possible agreement score and the distance from it each kappa score attains. Event variables are discussed first.

Excepting the collective variable, "All Other Means", all items in Table 16A are in the good acceptable range. Such a finding was anticipated by the hypothesis. There is little room for equivocation in these two variables, neither is much room left for subjective

interpretation that might lend a differential assessment to the events. As is noted earlier, the location in which a homicide occurs and the means used to commit it are categories fairly fixed in definition and interpretation.

TABLE 16A

EVENT VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORE ACCEPTABILITY = GOOD			
	kappa Score	Kappa Max	Distance From Kappa
<u>Location</u>			
Bar Or Tavern	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
Vacant Building	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
Street	.9706	.9901	.0195
Transit System	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
Commercial Site	.8852	.9988	.1136
Public Area	.9499	.9997	.0498
Victim's Residence	.9571	1.0000	.0430
Perpetrator's Residence	.9416	.9601	.0185
Other Residence	.9853	.9999	.0146
Other Location	.8359	.9573	.1214
<u>Means</u>			
Handgun	.9792	.9895	.0103
Rifle	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
Shotgun/machine Gun	.9617	.9997	.0380
Fire	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
Knife, cutting Instrument	.9696	1.0000	.0304
Physical Force*	.9857	.9999	.0142
F All Other Means	.5685	1.0000	.4315
* Includes "Blunt Instrument" and "Strangulation".			

Cicourel's question about cultural differences begins to be evident in Table 16B that presents variables containing some attributes that may be defined differently depending upon one's "tacit knowledge". Several attributes show good agreement; the "Drug Associate" category is of poor acceptability and most of the other scores are in the mid-range, an indication that perhaps the respective interpretive schema of the police and researcher are having some effect on the data produced.

TABLE 16B

EVENT VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORE ACCEPTABILITY = FAIR				
		kappa Score	Kappa Max	Distance From Kappa
<u>Relationship</u>				
G	Spouse	.9798	.9998	.0199
	Parent/child	.7239	.9982	.2743
G	Sibling	.7657	1.0000	.2343
	FAN*	.6526	.8304	.1742
P	Drug Associate	.3474	1.0000	.6526
	Police Officer	.4954	.3594	.1640
	Stranger	.6547	.7692	.1145
P	Undetermined	.3172	.8306	.5134
<u>Circumstances</u>				
	Execute Police Officer	.6642	1.0000	.3358
	Drug Transaction	.5807	.6041	.0234
	Robbery	.7114	.8361	.1247
	Other crime	.5210	.7555	.2345
	Dispute	.7303	.9176	.1873
	Vice/sex related	.4976	1.0000	.4976
G	Child abuse	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
	Other Circumstances	.5876	.7138	.1262
Drug Related question		.6748	.8863	.2115
* Includes Friend, Acquaintance and Neighbor.				

In the "Circumstance" variable for instance, "Drug Transaction" and "Other Crime" are a type of variable whose definition might be subject to dissimilar understandings. The lowest kappa, in the "Undetermined" category, again reflects the penchant of police respondents to use it as surrogate for categorizations which would evince a more positive commitment to the research effort and then change the response in the follow-up interview process.

In cases where the drug involved variables contradict the theoretical classification of an event, detectives readily admit and correct what the researcher say is "error". This is not the case when

questions regarding the relationship or circumstances variables. The difference is subtle but crucially meaningful. In the first instance, the detective can rationalize or neutralize "error" by reference to the researcher definitions as unintelligible, a built in "lie scale" in the survey instrument of which they had no foreknowledge or any other methodological nuance that they can defend (usually to a peer) as researcher idiosyncrasy or mystique.

In the case of the circumstance and relationship categories however, any initial identification is implicitly a product of the detective's investigative shrewdness and a reflection of personal competence. To admit error on such a basic forensic issue is to admit a personal failing. Once committed to a circumstance, only production of newly acquired information mitigates against the personal level loss of face that contradiction would entail. For the variables in the fair range of acceptance, this denial of error process is not as evident. The observation is a qualitative one, not easily put into numbers. A reading of Table 16C, which reports variables that are wholly of researcher design and definition, reinforces this point and emphasizes the assertion that as the issues being examined move away from forensic concerns, the level of agreement moves away from perfect agreement in like manner.

The "Reason drug related" variable is included in the poor acceptable range table (even though more of those categories are in the good and fair range than the poor) is because of the high number of blank replies. The instructions in the survey instrument require that for every "Yes" drug related response a reason why the case is drug

related be supplied. In 86 (21%) of the cases in the police data, the reason why the event was or was not drug related was left blank.

TABLE 16C

EVENT VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORE ACCEPTABILITY = POOR				
		Kappa Score	Maximum Possible	Distance From Kappa
<u>Motive</u>				
F	Furtherance/Crime	.4726	.8472	.3746
	Premeditated	.3354	.8487	.5133
	Spontaneous	.3786	.5747	.1962
	Irrational	.1357	.4888	.3531
	Other Motive	.0164	.0729	.0566
	Undetermined	.2939	.8494	.5555
<u>Reason drug related</u>				
F	Fight	.6921	.9099	.2178
F	Dealer	.5398	.7455	.2057
F	Buyer	.4982	.9964	.4982
	Informant	.0000	.0000	Disagree
	Dispute Works	.3977	1.0000	.6023
F	Dispute Theft	.6102	.7017	.0915
F	Assault	.5774	.8368	.2594
F	Punishment	.5993	.9999	.4005
G	Robbery	.8058	1.0000	.1942
	Trafficking	.3851	.6118	.2297
	Other Circumstances	.3057	.4147	.1090
<u>Dimension</u>				
	Psychopharmacological	.2412	.5501	.1973
	Economic Compulsive	.2494	.4325	.1831
	Systemic	.3933	.5938	.2005
<u>Classification</u>				
	Psychopharmacological	.3214	.4312	.1098
	Economic Compulsive	.0369	.1474	.1105
	Systemic	.3944	.9453	.5509
	Multidimensional	-.0415	-.0429	.0014
	Other Drug Related	.0000	.0000	Disagree
F	Not Drug Related	.5251	.6569	.1318

The large number of "Fair" acceptable kappa scores in the "Reason" categories are an artifact of dichotomizing each variable for determination of maximum possible kappa. For a given variable, the

scores reflect the level of agreement indicated by the number of "Yes" responses in each data set opposed to all other responses. Since the frequencies are artificially dichotomized, the large number of blanks effectively take on a positive statement just as a "No" response would. For purposes of this exercise, a blank in variable X says "This is not the reason" just as strongly as does a "No" response. This is sufficient for the instant analysis, but would pose problems for traditional use of the data in an inferential or descriptive statistical modality.

The remaining variables in Table 16C present distinctive problems in the interpretive stage of the research. Many detectives opined that all homicides are "Irrational" and others apparently failed to grasp the meanings imputed by the researcher into the "Spontaneous" and "Furtherance of Another Crime" motivations. The "Other" and "Undetermined" categories were excessively used in the police data.

The "Dimension" and "Classification" variables in the police data are a research nightmare. They simply do not fit the theoretical model in a consistent way. One may conjecture about the underlying interpretive scheme, if any, that detectives relied upon to complete the survey but identification of that process is beyond the scope of this study. Crystal clear from an examination of the three preceding tables is that there is a linear relationship between variable types. As variables move away from forensic relevance towards issues imbued with methodological constructs, the level of agreement between police and researcher data declines.

Next the discussion turns to similar issues within the "Victim" and "Perpetrator" variables.

Acceptable Levels Of Kappa - Victim/Perpetrator Variables

For the most part, the variables relating to participants in the events are identifiable with the investigative process. Detectives do record information regarding drug buying or selling by a participant, not so much for its intrinsic communicative import, but for the reasons discussed above - It helps locate the investigative target or the milieu the target frequents. Even though this kind of information is gathered for different reasons than a researcher would collect it, the information loses little when transformed into "data".

All, save three, of the "Victim" categories are in the good range of acceptability. The "Event Action" categories, drugs found, victim behavior and whether or not the victim was a buyer or seller of drugs each attain good kappa scores. Variables of this kind are not subject to broad interpretation or conflicting definitions. At the same time that they serve the purposes of a researcher, the bits of information serve the needs of the investigator as well. The assertion of the hypothesis that the reasons why information is collected are different notwithstanding, the fact that both groups gather it for a purpose, the end product, the data produced, is usable by researcher and detective alike.

The "Status" categories presented in Table 17, graphically demonstrate the convergence of agreement that occurs in spite of the differential motivations for collecting information. The police want to know if an actor in the homicide is a drug user and will usually know

what type of drug is used. Researchers too, are interested in the same facts, hence a good level of agreement in these four categories.

TABLE 17

VICTIM VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORE ACCEPTABILITY				
		Kappa Score	Maximum Possible	Distance From Kappa
<u>Event Action</u>				
G	Drug Buying	.7547	.8047	.0500
G	Drug Selling	.7953	.7957	.0004
G	Drugs Found	.8922	.9391	.0469
G	Drug Works Found	.8811	.9576	.0765
<u>Victim Behavior</u>				
G	High On Drugs	.9105	1.0007	.0965
G	High On Alcohol	.7967	.8153	.0183
G	Irrational Due Alcohol	.9321	.9995	.0674
G	Irrational Due Drugs	.8559	1.0055	.1496
<u>Victim Status</u>				
F	Heroin User	.6596	.8540	.1944
G	Cocaine/Crack User	.8217	.9348	.1131
G	Alcohol Abuser	.9234	.9600	.0366
G	Other Type Drug User	.6568	.7180	.1612
<u>Drug(s) Used</u>				
F	Heroin	.6656	.9985	.3329
G	Cocaine	.8088	.9984	.1896
G	Crack	.9434	.9707	.0273
G	Marijuana	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
G	Alcohol	.9188	.9655	.0467
<u>Drug(s) Found</u>				
G	Heroin	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
G	Cocaine	.9665	.9927	.0262
G	Crack	.9208	.9995	.0787
G	Marijuana	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
G	Alcohol	.8559	1.0055	.1496
<u>Trafficking Level</u>				
G	Is Low Level	.7699	.9997	.2298
G	Is High Level	.8864	.9993	.1129

For the most part, the categories in Tables 17 and 18 are equally as identifiable with the investigative process as with the needs of the researcher. Note that the majority of items in both tables are in the "Good" range of acceptable kappa scores. The "Fair" ranking for

"Trafficking Level" in Table 18 reflects the high number of cases in which the perpetrator is not identified.

TABLE 18

PERPETRATOR VARIABLES - KAPPA SCORE ACCEPTABILITY				
		Kappa Score	Maximum Possible	Distance From Kappa
<u>Event Action</u>				
F	Drug Buying	.7113	.7417	.0304
F	Drug Selling	.6830	.6830	Agree
G	Drugs Found	.9079	.9994	.0915
G	Drug Works	.9219	.9996	.0777
<u>Perpetrator Behavior</u>				
G	High On Drugs	.7428	.8955	.1527
G	High On Alcohol	.8214	.9193	.0979
G	Irrational Alcohol	.8309	1.0000	.1691
G	Irrational Drug	.7976	1.0000	.2024
<u>Perpetrator Status</u>				
F	Heroin User	.5336	1.0000	Agree
F	Cocaine/Crack User	.70646	.9496	.2431
G	An Alcohol Abuser	.87627	.9138	.0375
G	Another Type Drug	.85474	.9987	.1440
<u>Drug(s) Used</u>				
G	Heroin	1.0000	1.0000	Agree
G	Cocaine	.8864	1.0000	Agree
G	Crack	.7659	1.0000	.2341
G	Marijuana	.7988	.9985	.1997
G	Alcohol	.9684	1.0010	.0326
<u>Drug(s) Found</u>				
F	Heroin	.6656	.9985	.3329
G	Cocaine	.9079	.9994	.9079
F	Crack	.4982	.9964	.4982
P	Marijuana	-.0024	-.0024	Disagree
F	Alcohol	.6656	.9984	.3328
<u>Trafficking Level</u>				
F	Is Low Level	.5825	.9726	.3901
F	Is High Level	.6585	.8266	.1681

For reasons noted earlier, detectives do record information regarding drug buying or selling by a participant in the event and the researcher does so for different reasons but the important point is that when little room is left for interpretation in a given variable the way the data for each is recorded tends toward agreement. When the variable

is less subject to the kind of "cultural" mutation questioned by Cicourel, it remains a chair whether one sits in it or the next person hits someone in the head with it. In either event, all interpretive schema flies in the face of the purposefulness to which the actor chooses to put the subject matter.

To carry the analogy one step further, if a researcher is interested in differential use of chairs and provides "operational definitions" of divan, pew, stool, loveseat and so on and then goes to a furniture dealer, a theater usher and a control group with a survey instrument instructing them each to count chairs, the researcher might be unpleasantly surprised by the results.

The information in the victim and perpetrator variables in both data sets lose little value when separately transformed into "data". The separate nature of the transformations must be stressed. Unless an interpretive consensus exists in both, the separate data sets will result in quite different reconstructions of the subject matter despite surface similarity in methodological design or interpretation.

Acceptable Kappa Scores and Variable Definitions

The variables used in this research tend to cluster by acceptable level of kappa. These clusters are not coincidental and are readily identifiable as to type - whether or not the variable is a product of the research methodology or, at the other extreme, one whose definitions need little external amplification.

Almost all of the variables pertaining to victim or perpetrator are in the "Good" range of acceptable agreement as are the event variables "Location" and "Means Used". The "Relationship",

"Circumstance", "Is this event drug related?" and "Drug Related Reason" variables are mainly in the "Fair" acceptable range. Those variables whose only justification for inclusion is to fit the data to a theoretical model, "Classification", "Dimension", and, to a lesser degree, "Motive" are predominantly of "Poor" acceptability, with about half of the scores in the "Fair" range and only one at the "Good" acceptable level.

Each data set contains 108 variables; 60 in the Event and 24 in each of the Victim and Perpetrator partitions. Kappa scores were ranked (as in Tables 16 through 18) within the typology described in the preceding paragraph. Those variables that had some forensic relevance can just as easily be typified as having common definitions. Little information regarding researcher interpretation of these variables had to be given to the practitioner respondents. The other two clusters are not so uniformly handled.

The second grouping of variables are mainly in the "Fair" range. They evince characteristics of common usage in the "Spouse", "Parent", and "Child Abuse" variables and at the same time, reflect a measure of interpretive breadth in variables such as "Drug Associate" or "Friend, Acquaintance, Neighbor".

The final group of variables are theoretical. Goldstein modeled the drugs/homicide nexus (1985) to include three distinct types of drug related violence. This paper introduces itself with the reaction of one practitioner to "psychopharmacological" and the way "economic/compulsive" was transformed to rather tenuously connect all

crimes of economic connotation to an operational definition whose specificity is crucial to meaningful interpretation within the model.

An "Instruction Manual" was prepared for the original project and distributed to the participating detectives. Not surprisingly, the collection form contains directions to "refer to the instruction manual for definition of terms and for further explanation" and likewise for "definitions" (see Appendix A, pp. 2, 3). This is a common practice. It implies the need for consistent interpretation of operational definitions and shows researcher awareness that some of the terms used and the definitions to be applied in completing the survey instrument may need further explanation. Herein is the "rub": The very inclusion of instructions to consult the "manual" warns of possible disagreement; it demonstrates researcher familiarity with problems of interpretation and implies a willingness to proceed in face of the possibility that what is returned by way of information might not be exactly what is desired.

In most research designs, the operational definition is the most facile transmitter of the researcher's definitions. Externally they help students of the work to understand it, and internally they are needed so that those working on the project will consistently interpret what they observe. Parkinson said in reference to work, that it expands as the time allows (1977, 2). He calls his thesis a "Law of the Rising Pyramid". The same dynamics seem to be at work in the material of this research.

The level of disagreement between researcher and practitioner rises linearly with the complexity of operational

definitions available. Parkinson's data describe a geometric escalation of administrative staff relative to the ships of the line in the British navy; the data here are not as precise or dire. Here the progression is arithmetical and the consequences less titanic. Parkinson's work demonstrates that something (work) will expand to fill a thing available (time). Substitute "disagreement" for work and "operational definitions for time and the corollary of Parkinson's law is: Two sets of data being equal, disagreement expands as operational definitions allow.

Table 19 totals the kappa scores for all variables by acceptable range and arrays them within the typology that reflects the level of researcher input required to define the variables within each type.

TABLE 19

ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF KAPPA SCORES GROUPED BY LEVEL OF DEFINITION REQUIRED VARIABLE				
VARIABLE GROUP	LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE			
	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	TOTAL
COMMON USAGE DEFINITIONS				
Victim Information	21	3	0	24
Perpetrator Information	15	8	1	24
Location	10	0	0	10
Means Used	6	1	0	7
TOTAL	52	12	1	65
MIXED				
Relationship	2	4	2	8
Circumstances	1	7	0	8
Drug Related Question	0	1	0	1
Reason Drug Related	1	6	4	11
TOTAL	4	18	6	28
RESEARCHER DEFINED				
Classification	0	1	5	6
Dimension	0	0	3	3
Motive	0	1	5	6
TOTAL	0	2	13	15
COMBINED TOTAL	56	32	20	108

Table 19 is at the crux of the dissertation. That there is a measurable and quantifiable difference between the data is demonstrated with kappa and maximum possible score. Where, in what kind of variables, the differences mainly lie is demonstrated by the typology of Table 19. About half of the variables examined are in the "Good" acceptable range and 93% of these are in the group requiring the least explanation of how they are to be interpreted. Of the 20 variables in the "Poor" range, 65% are variables wholly created by the researcher. These are the variables whose only design purpose is to fit the data to the theoretical model. Consequently they require the greatest amount of explanation and this is usually delivered via the operational definition mechanism.

Inter-rater agreement as measured here is a measure of reliability. In light of the results obtained, any who would seek agreement between their theoretical postulations and the products of those who apply them, would be well advised to consider beforehand the content of the operational definitions they use.

Footnotes to Chapter Four

1. In a telephone interview with the author, (May 1989) Cicchetti reported that although he was not aware of any prior research in the field of Criminology that had used kappa (Cohen 1960) and Cicchetti's modifications of it (1987), including the computerized application (Heavens and Cicchetti 1978) he offered no disincentives for its use. Indeed Cicchetti was enthusiastic in his endorsement and quite interested in what he termed a "novel" expansion of the application. More specifically, the proposal for this dissertation was outlined to Cicchetti and he saw no mathematical objections to using kappa, provided the aim of the research remained fixed on testing the reliability of the two data sets.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Support of the Hypothesis

The findings of this research are simply stated. The hypothesis is generally supported, provided a modification to it is made to reflect the "occupational" bias of the social scientific community. Before the task at hand, testing the possibility that agreement between data sets is quantifiable, could proceed, it was necessary to first examine the social organization of knowledge. It was necessary since the unintentional bias suspected in the police data seemed to be the product of the way the police interpret the facts before them and record and retrieve information about "what happened".

From the literature of the sociology of knowledge emerges a focus on "domain assumptions" (Gouldner 1970, 31) and "tacit knowledge" (Cicourel 1966, 116). It became obvious as the work progressed that perhaps the microscope of scientific research focused tunnel fashion on a subject matter without regard for what Schutz asserts are a "stock of pre-interpreted experiences built up by sedimentation" within the researcher's own conscious life (Wagner 1970, 56).

On the other side of the coin, what has often been described as lying, deception, secrecy and control of information (e.g., the work of Manning, Skolnick, Barker, Van Maanen, Bittner) might just as easily be a function of the organizational manipulation of ignorance designed to enhance a personal position by controlling the amount of knowledge shared with others (Moore and Tumin 1945). The police seek to control

the ownership of knowledge both within the organization and with outsiders. That the police would lie and deceive emphasizes the bias in information they supply but the concept is a fact of life characteristic of most bureaucracies. The protectionism surrounding knowledge within any bureaucracy can indeed be described as a basic quality of this organizational form.

Two distinct prejudices are at play. For this reason the dissertation gives equal footing to data regardless of its source. From this basic premise proceeds the statistical analysis that quantifies the level of agreement between the discrete sets of data.

The variables examined were grouped by those whose definitions are in fairly common usage, those that are wholly defined by the researcher and a third grouping that contains both types. The first group shows the highest level of agreement while variables that required explanatory interpretation by the researcher scored lowest on the measure of agreement used.

If a bias is at work that is exclusively a characteristic of the police occupation, it is at work least when those in the occupation can identify with the reason why a research question is asked. The "identification" seems to be related to the forensic relevance of the subject matter. The bias is felt most when the needs of testing theoretical models require clarification and interpretation that tacitly impute the scientist's experiential knowledge.

The tension between theoretical models and practitioners' understanding of them is what produces the difference between the

respective constructs of reality. The roots of the difference are bilateral and are both potentially strong.

The summary result of the hypothesis testing finds there is an occupational bias in police supplied data and that it can be quantified and measured. The modification of the hypothesis says that, similarly, there is a compelling bias in data supplied by the scientific community.

Validity

Simply because a researcher reports on a bias associated with someone else, there is a tendency to label it "bad", to say that something must be done to eliminate it. The inclination to assign neutrality to variables of one's own creation concomitantly tends to discount the same in the telling of reality by others. This work did not examine the truth of the realities separately constructed from each data set. Nevertheless, it does suggest that "validity" attaches to research findings only within the explanatory context of the researcher.

A common research problem is reconciling a comparison between apples and oranges because the best available data are about apples and oranges. The justification of such work usually takes the form of explanatory discussion that is laden with interpretations of how "apples" are analogous to "oranges". However, the question remains if whether the accounting of the subject matter accurately describes what actually took place.

The danger in allowing a particular bias to "infect" either the interpretive stage of research or the level at which data is first

collected is minimal, for, it seems, that in social science research pure objectivity is elusive. But, research must continue because the telling of "what happened" serves the advancement of knowledge. The danger is in according to a single perspective a superior position. If, for example, a social scientist, dissatisfied with the data available from national channels (as so many are), turns to ethnographic methods to inform a subject and then credits the ethnographic piece superior to that of another piece of research based on the former data, the assertion of superiority rings hollow. "Deformation professionelle" (Rheingold 1989) rears its erudite head. Holding fast to a view of reality biased by one's profession is analogous to a blind man describing a belfry tower. It is better that observers of social phenomena take heed from other men, both blind and sighted, and learn how their "reality" improves one's understanding of the reality the first observer knows.

Contribution

For over thirty years, investigators have examined the possibility that different raters each bring a distinct bias to the assessment of a subject matter. The inquiry has largely been centered in the medical field. In keeping with the inter-disciplinary nature of criminology, this research reached out to that field for its expertise in aid of addressing the criminological issue of inadequate data sources within its own field.

The use of kappa and modifications to it enabled a concrete assessment of the level of agreement between two data sources. The dissertation elaborates the connection between the social organization

of knowledge within the scientific and police communities to posit that an equal "bias" is present in both. Heretofore, parochial attitudes widened rather than bridged the gap between the two.

The arrangement of research variables into groups of "Good", "Fair" and "Poor" agreement provide a seminal way of looking at the reliability with which two different sources of data reconstruct a description of the same sample. Where relatively large disagreement exists, there should be a reluctance to present that variable as an accurate portrayal of reality.

The major contribution of this work to the literature of criminology is of a less pragmatic nature. By drawing attention to the possibility of an occupational bias in researcher produced data, as well as in police supplied data, this work moves "data" into the realms of epistemology. The findings suggest that if we are to understand a social event as common as homicide, we should first look to the unspoken knowledge and worldly assumptions from which we frame the questions.

Recommendations

Just as the hypothesis testing is simply stated, so is the recommendation to the scientific community from this work. Research in criminology will not foreseeably be independent of the need to rely on practitioner agencies for information. This research demonstrates the high level of unfulfilled expectations a researcher must be prepared to address when practitioners are asked to respond to questions imbued with theoretical concerns. They simply do not reply in a manner consistent with the researchers' definitions of what constitutes a given condition.

The major recommendation then, is that survey instrumentation must be designed for practitioner understanding and with an appreciation of the practitioners' objectives, the reasons why they collected data for other than research purposes. The advice of Berger and Luckmann against the imposition of "expertise" on the normal cognitive process of practitioners is supported by the dissertation findings. More concretely, scientists should solicit practitioner input before the actual collection of data begins. Ask the cop, or the correction officer, the social worker or the probation officer what they "think" about the research question. Ask if terms such as "psychopharmacological" are understandable.

If operational definitions require explanation of the language with which they are constructed, the definitions should be discarded, else the information returned about them will so biased as to be useless. The more common practice, of course, is to not require the respondent to interpret anything. Let he or she provide the facts only and let the researcher do the interpretation. Yet, there are some times (The project from which this study borrowed data is a case in point.) when the researcher must allow some degree of interpretive input by the respondents and then the possibility of differential interpretations must be guarded against.

The empirical indication garnered during interviews of detectives of a "Hawthorne" effect suggests that design consideration should be given to fixing responsibility on a small number of respondents rather than asking people involved with their agency's primary mission to don a researcher's hat.

The collection of qualitative material enhances the quantitative. Even in so large an undertaking as the UCR, it would be beneficial to bring to the task the expertise of those closest to the event. If we let the police and the scientists collaborate in writing the questions about crime reports, we could reasonably expect replies that mean something to the scientist because they mean approximately the same thing to the practitioner. More theoretically congruent replies would result in less disagreement between respective constructs of reality.

Further Research

The subject matter of this dissertation is probably not exclusive to New York City. Police everywhere bring a particular bias to the information they share with outsiders. One area of interest would be the differential between departments. Regardless of researcher bias, do the police in New York interpret X variable in the same way as do the police in San Francisco?

There is too the question of replication. Would the findings reported here be true universally true? In most cases, the logistics of duplicating every set of research data are nearly insurmountable. There is however a good deal of research that uses prospective (as opposed to archival) collection methods. It would not be too difficult a task to include a comparative analysis akin to the one used here in the prospective studies.

Lastly, the statistical methods used here for the first time in criminological research could be similarly used in intra-disciplinary comparisons. Wherever like variables are found in separate research projects, an evaluation of how reliably the separate sources assay the subject matter would broaden the interpretive context of the work and hence our understanding of the matter under study.

Appendix A

Appendix A contains a facsimile of the data collection form (survey instrument) used in the original research. Space and format considerations preclude duplication of the actual instrument. Accordingly, the layout of the form here, is different. In the original the print was set at 8 points, condensed and all information was contained in three pages. However, the information contained herein is a verbatim of the original.

Two changes were effected in the analysis phase of the ordinal research: 1) In the Relationship variable, "Innocent Bystander" was substituted for "Homosexual Friend" and 2) an "Undetermined" attribute was added to the Circumstance variable.

Homicide Zone _____ Precinct _____ Preparer's Title _____
 Squad Case # _____ Date Reported _____ Preparer's Name _____
 (Optional)

DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES
 NARCOTIC AND DRUG RESEARCH, INC
 Drug Related Crime Analysis - Homicide (2)
 Data Collection Form

Complaint No. _____ Date of Homicide _____
 No. of Victims _____ (Use a separate form for each additional VICTIM.
 No. of Perpetrators _____ (Use a blue supplementary sheet for each
 additional PERPETRATOR. Attach to this form.)
 Victim's Name (1) _____ NYSID No. _____ DOB _____ Sex _____
 Victim's Race (Check one) ☐ Black ☐ White ☐ Oriental ☐ Other (Specify _____)
 Victim's Ethnicity (Check one) ☐ Hispanic (If Hispanic national origin _____)
☐ Chinese ☐ Japanese ☐ Other (Specify _____)
 Perpetrator's Name (1) _____ NYSID No. _____ DOB _____ Sex _____
 Perpetrator's Race (Check one) ☐ Black ☐ White ☐ Oriental ☐ Other (Specify _____)
 Perp.'s Ethnicity (Check one) ☐ Hispanic (If Hispanic national origin _____)
☐ Chinese ☐ Japanese ☐ Other (Specify _____)
 Perpetrator's Arrest No. _____ Arrest Date _____ Exceptional Clearance _____

Directions: Based on whatever information is known about this homicide event please check or circle all that apply.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Victim Relationship to Perpetrator?</p> <p>☐ Spouse pr Common Law Spouse</p> <p>☐ Boy-Girl Friend</p> <p>☐ Parent</p> <p>☐ Child</p> <p>☐ Sibling or Other Relative</p> <p>☐ Homosexual Friend</p> <p>☐ Friend Acquaintance Neighbor</p> <p>☐ Drug Business Associate</p> <p>☐ Police or Peace Officer</p> <p>☐ Stranger</p> <p>☐ Undetermined</p> | <p>2. Circumstances of Homicide?</p> <p>☐ Execution of Police Officer</p> <p>☐ Execution of Peace Officer</p> <p>☐ Drug Related Transaction</p> <p>☐ Organized Crime Related</p> <p>☐ Forcible Sex Crime</p> <p>☐ Robbery</p> <p>☐ Burglary</p> <p>☐ Arson</p> <p>☐ Other Crime (Specify _____)</p> <p>☐ Youth Gang Activity</p> <p>☐ Dispute</p> <p>☐ Vice/Sex Related</p> <p>☐ Child Abuse</p> <p>☐ Other (Specify _____)</p> <p>☐ Undetermined</p> |
| <p>3. Means Used?</p> <p>☐ Handgun _____ Type _____ Cal. _____</p> <p>☐ Rifle _____ Cal. _____</p> <p>☐ Shotgun _____ Gauge _____</p> <p>☐ Machine Gun _____ Cal. _____</p> <p>☐ Explosive _____ Type _____</p> <p>☐ Fire</p> <p>☐ Knife</p> <p>☐ Other Cutting Instrument</p> <p>☐ Blunt Instrument</p> | <p>☐ Physical Force</p> <p>☐ Motor Vehicle</p> <p>☐ Poison</p> <p>☐ Neglect/Abandon Child</p> <p>☐ Strangulation</p> <p>☐ Drug</p> <p>☐ Other (Specify _____)</p> <p>☐ Undetermined</p> |

4. Motive?

- ☐ The Furtherance of Another Crime (Specify _____)
☐ Premeditated (Specify _____)
☐ Spontaneous Occurrence (Specify _____)
☐ Irrational (Specify _____)
☐ Other (Specify _____)
☐ Undetermined (Specify _____)

5. Location of Homicide?

6. Was this a 'known' drug
(except alcohol) site?

- | | | | |
|---|-----|----|-------------|
| ☐ Bar or Tavern..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |
| ☐ Vacant/Abandoned Building..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |
| ☐ Street..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |
| ☐ Transit System..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |
| ☐ Commercial Site..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |
| ☐ Public Area..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |
| ☐ Victim's Residence..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |
| ☐ Perpetrator's Residence..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |
| ☐ Other Residence..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |
| ☐ Other (Specify _____)..... | Yes | No | Do Not Know |

7. If yes, what type of drug site?

- ☐ Drug Growing Area
☐ Shooting Gallery
☐ Drug Factory/Mill
☐ Drug Sales Location
☐ Drug Smuggling Location
☐ Other (Specify _____)

8. Below briefly describe how and why the killing occurred.

[END OF PAGE ONE]

Directions: The following questions refer specifically to the drug relatedness of the case. Based on whatever information is known about the homicide, please answer these questions by circling the Y for YES the N for No and the DNK for Do NOT KNOW under the heading VICTIM and PERPETRATOR

When a line is available under the heading SOURCE, please write:

P when the source was a perpetrator's account

O when the source was a Police Officer's account

W when the source was a witness's account

M when the source was the Medical Examiner

I when the source was independently developed and none of the above, or

T when the source was other than any of the above. (Specify _____)

Please refer to the instruction manual for definitions of terms and for further explanation.

Was he she believed to be	VICTIM	SOURCE	PERPETRATOR	SOURCE
9. a heroin user.....	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
10. a cocaine or crack user.....	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
11. a alcohol abuser	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
12. another type of drug user	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
13. in a drug treatment program ...	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
14. an alcohol treatment program ..	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	

At the time of the homicide event was he she believed to be using	VICTIM	SOURCE	PERPETRATOR	SOURCE
15. heroin.....	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
16. cocaine (Not crack).....	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
17. crack.....	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
18. barbiturate	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
19. marijuana	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
20. PCP	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
21. alcohol	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
22. amphetamine	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
23. methadone	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
24. hallucinogen	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
25. tranquilizer	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
26. other (Specify _____).....	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	

Did this homicide event include	VICTIM	SOURCE	PERPETRATOR	SOURCE
27. drug buying by the	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
28. drug selling by the	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
29. drugs found on near the	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	
30. drug paraphernalia on near the	Y N DNK.._____		Y N DNK..._____	

Was the following drug(s) found on|near the

	VICTIM	SOURCE	PERPETRATOR	SOURCE
31. heroin	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
32. cocaine (Not crack).....	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
33. crack	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
34. barbiturate	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
35. marijuana	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
36. PCP	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
37. alcohol	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
38. amphetamine	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
39. methadone	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
40. hallucinogen	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
41. tranquilizer	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
42. other (Specify_____)	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____

At the time of the homicide was he|she believed to be

	VICTIM	SOURCE	PERPETRATOR	SOURCE
43. sick, in need of drugs	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
44. high, on drugs	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
45. high, on alcohol	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
. behaving irrationally due to				
46. the ingestion of alcohol.....	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
47. the ingestion of drugs.....	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____

Was he|she believed to be a

	VICTIM	SOURCE	PERPETRATOR	SOURCE
48. low level drug trafficker	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____
49. high level drug trafficker	Y	N	DNK.._____	Y N DNK..._____

[END OF PAGE 2]

Directions: Some of the following questions refer to the drug relatedness framework described in the instruction manual. Please see the manual for definitions.

50. Would you identify this case as drug related.....Y N DNK

Do you believe that the homicide resulted from _____ If Yes, SOURCE

51. drug user's committing a crime to obtain money for a drug purchase.(Specify type of drug _____).....Y N DNK..____
52. fight by rival dealers over territory.....Y N DNK..____
53. drug dealer killed for selling bad drugs.....Y N DNK..____
54. drug buyer killed in fight with dealer who.....Y N DNK..____
was selling bad drugs
55. execution of police informer.....Y N DNK..____
56. dispute over works or other drug paraphernalia.....Y N DNK..____
57. dispute over theft of drugs.....Y N DNK..____
58. assault to collect drug related debt.....Y N DNK..____
59. punishment of drug workers by dealer.....Y N DNK..____
60. homicide during robbery of drug dealer.....Y N DNK..____
61. other drug trafficking (Specify _____).....Y N DNK..____
62. other drug related circumstance.....Y N DNK..____
(If 'other drug related circumstance', specify (_____))

If you do consider the case drug related, which of the following were used to make that determination

63. evidence of drug consumption by the victim and/or perpetrator...
.....Y N DNK..____
64. contraband or drugs found at the scene.....Y N DNK..____
65. known drug involvement of the victim or perpetrator....Y N DNK..____
66. Other (Specify _____).....Y N DNK..____

In your opinion did this case include

67. a psychopharmacological dimension (Primary drug involved _____)....
.....Y N DNK..____
68. an economic compulsive dimension (Primary drug involved _____)....
.....Y N DNK..____
69. a systemic dimension (Primary drug involved _____)....Y N DNK..____

Primarily this case should be classified as (Check one)

70. ____Psychopharmacologically drug related
____Economic Compulsively drug related
____Systemically drug related
____Multidimensionally drug related
____Other drug related (Specify _____)
____Not drug related

Please use bottom of this form to provide any additional information. If you are referring to a particular item, please indicate the item number. Thank you for your help.

Appendix B

Appendix B is a photocopy of the "incident report" used in the Uniform Crime Reports data collection process.

Appendix B

OFFENSE	
OFFENSE #: INCIDENT #: REPORT TYPE: ☐ INITIAL REPORT ☐ SUPPLEMENT INCIDENT REPORT (EXAMPLE) INCIDENT STATUS: ☐ UNFOUNDED ☐ CLEARED BY ARREST ☐ CLEARED EXCEPTIONALLY EXCEPTIONAL CLEARANCE DATE: ☐ A ☐ DEATH OF OFFENDER ☐ B ☐ PROSECUTION DECLINED ☐ C ☐ EXTRADITION DECLINED ☐ D ☐ REFUSED TO COOPERATE ☐ E ☐ JUVENILE, NO CUSTODY ☐ F ☐ NOT APPLICABLE	
COMPLAINANT: (Last, First, Middle) ADDRESS: (Street, City, State, Zip) LOCATION OF INCIDENT: (Address Or Block No.) PHONE: (Home) () () (Business) () ()	
LOCATION OF INCIDENT: (Address Or Block No.) OFFENSE: 1. 2. 3.	
LOCATION OF OFFENSE: (Check Only One) ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ A ☐ ATTEMPTED ☐ ATTEMPTED ☐ ATTEMPTED ☐ C ☐ COMPLETED ☐ COMPLETED ☐ COMPLETED OFFENDER(S) USED: (Check As Many As Apply) ☐ A ☐ ALCOHOL ☐ C ☐ COMPUTER EQUIP. ☐ D ☐ DRUGS ☐ N ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (For Burglary Only) NUMBER OF PREMISES ENTERED: METHOD OF ENTRY: ☐ FORCEFUL ☐ NO FORCE	
LOCATION OF OFFENSE: (Check Only One) (Enter Code Number for Offense #2 - #3) ☐ 01 ☐ AIR / BUS / TRAIN TERMINAL ☐ 02 ☐ BANK / SAVINGS & LOAN ☐ 03 ☐ BART / NIGHT CLUB ☐ 04 ☐ CHURCH / SYNAGOGUE / TEMPLE ☐ 05 ☐ COMMERCIAL / OFFICE BUILDING ☐ 06 ☐ CONSTRUCTION SITE ☐ 07 ☐ CONVENIENCE STORE ☐ 08 ☐ DEPARTMENT / DISCOUNT STORE ☐ 09 ☐ DRUG STORE / DRUG OFFICE / HOSPITAL ☐ 10 ☐ FIELD / WOODS ☐ 11 ☐ GOVERNMENT / PUBLIC BUILDINGS ☐ 12 ☐ GROCERY / SUPERMARKET ☐ 13 ☐ HIGHWAY / ROAD / ALLEY ☐ 14 ☐ HOTEL / MOTEL / ETC. ☐ 15 ☐ JAIL / PRISON ☐ 16 ☐ LAKE / WATERWAY ☐ 17 ☐ LIQUOR STORE ☐ 18 ☐ PARKING LOT / GARAGE ☐ 19 ☐ RENTAL / STORAGE FACILITY ☐ 20 ☐ RESIDENCE / HOME ☐ 21 ☐ RESTAURANT ☐ 22 ☐ SCHOOL / COLLEGE ☐ 23 ☐ SERVICE / GAS STATION ☐ 24 ☐ SPECIALTY STORE (TV, FURN., ETC.) ☐ 25 ☐ OTHER / UNKNOWN TYPE CRIMINAL ACTIVITY: (Check Up To Three) ☐ S ☐ BUYING / RECEIVING ☐ C ☐ CARRYING / MANUFACTURING / PUBLISHING ☐ D ☐ DISTRIBUTING / SELLING ☐ E ☐ EXPLOITING CHILDREN ☐ O ☐ OPERATING / PROMOTING / ASSISTING ☐ P ☐ POSSESSING / CONCEALING ☐ T ☐ TRANSPORTING / TRANSMITTING / IMPORTING ☐ U ☐ USING / CONCEALING ☐ 76 ☐ NARCOTICS / DRUGS ☐ 80 ☐ OTHER ☐ 88 ☐ UNKNOWN ☐ 99 ☐ NONE	
TYPE WEAPON / FORCE INVOLVED: (Check Up To Three) (Enter A In Box If Automatic) ☐ 11 ☐ FIREARM (type not stated) ☐ 12 ☐ HANDGUN ☐ 13 ☐ RIFLE ☐ 14 ☐ SHOTGUN ☐ 15 ☐ OTHER FIREARM ☐ 20 ☐ KNIFE / CUTTING INSTRUMENT ☐ 30 ☐ BLUNT OBJECT ☐ 35 ☐ MOTOR VEHICLE ☐ 40 ☐ PERSONAL WEAPONS ☐ 50 ☐ POISON ☐ 60 ☐ EXPLOSIVES ☐ 65 ☐ FIRE / INCENDIARY VICTIM # 1: (Last, First, Middle) PHONE: (Home) () ()	
ADDRESS: (Street, City, State, Zip) TYPE OF VICTIM: (Check Only One) ☐ I ☐ INDIVIDUAL ☐ B ☐ BUSINESS ☐ F ☐ FINANCIAL ☐ G ☐ GOVERNMENT ☐ R ☐ RELIGIOUS ☐ S ☐ SOCIETY / PUBLIC ☐ O ☐ OTHER ☐ U ☐ UNKNOWN RACE: (Check Only One) ☐ W ☐ WHITE ☐ B ☐ BLACK ☐ I ☐ INDIAN ☐ A ☐ ASIAN ☐ U ☐ UNKNOWN SEX: ☐ M ☐ MALE ☐ F ☐ FEMALE ☐ U ☐ UNKNOWN AGE: DOB: NO. OF VICTIMS:	
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT / HOMICIDE CIRCUMSTANCES: (Check Up To Three) ☐ 01 ☐ ARGUMENT ☐ 02 ☐ ASSAULT ON LAW OFFICER ☐ 03 ☐ DRUG DEALING ☐ 04 ☐ GANGLAND ☐ 05 ☐ JUVENILE GANG ☐ 06 ☐ LOVERS QUARREL ☐ 07 ☐ MURDER KILLING ☐ 08 ☐ OTHER FELONY INVOLVED ☐ 09 ☐ OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES ☐ 10 ☐ UNKNOWN CIRCUMSTANCES INJURY TYPE: (Check Up To Five) ☐ N ☐ NONE ☐ B ☐ BROKEN BONES ☐ I ☐ POSS. INT. INJURIES ☐ L ☐ SEVERE LACERATION ☐ M ☐ MINOR INJURY ☐ O ☐ MAJOR INJURY ☐ T ☐ LOSS OF TEETH ☐ U ☐ UNCONSCIOUSNESS	
RELATIONSHIP OF VICTIM TO OFFENDER: (For multiple offender relationships enter offender number(s) in space) ☐ SE ☐ SPOUSE ☐ CS ☐ COMMON - LAW SPOUSE ☐ PA ☐ PARENT ☐ SB ☐ SIBLING ☐ CH ☐ CHILD ☐ GP ☐ GRANDPARENT ☐ GC ☐ GRANDCHILD ☐ IL ☐ IN-LAW ☐ SP ☐ STEPPARENT ☐ SC ☐ STEPCHILD ☐ SS ☐ STEPSIBLING ☐ OF ☐ OTHER FAMILY ☐ AQ ☐ ACQUAINTANCE ☐ FR ☐ FRIEND ☐ NE ☐ NEIGHBOR ☐ BE ☐ BARTENDER (Barry) ☐ BO ☐ BOY / GIRL FRIEND ☐ CF ☐ CHILD OF BOY ABOVE ☐ HR ☐ HOMOSEXUAL REL. ☐ EX ☐ EX-SPOUSE ☐ EE ☐ EMPLOYEE ☐ EP ☐ EMPLOYER ☐ OK ☐ OTHERWISE KNOWN ☐ ST ☐ STRANGER ☐ RU ☐ RELATIONSHIP UNKNOWN	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY DESCRIPTION CODE TABLE: (Enter Number In Code Column Above) ☐ 01 ☐ AIRCRAFT ☐ 02 ☐ ALCOHOL ☐ 03 ☐ AUTOMOBILES ☐ 04 ☐ BICYCLES ☐ 05 ☐ BUSES ☐ 06 ☐ CLOTHES / FURS ☐ 07 ☐ COMPUTER HARDWARE / SOFTWARE ☐ 08 ☐ CONSUMABLE GOODS ☐ 09 ☐ CREDIT / DEBIT CARDS ☐ 10 ☐ DRUGS / NARCOTICS ☐ 11 ☐ DRUG / NARCOTIC EQUIPMENT ☐ 12 ☐ FARM EQUIPMENT ☐ 13 ☐ FIREARMS ☐ 14 ☐ GAMBLING EQUIPMENT ☐ 15 ☐ HEAVY CONSTRUCTION / INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT ☐ 16 ☐ HOUSEHOLD GOODS ☐ 17 ☐ JEWELRY / PRECIOUS METALS ☐ 18 ☐ LIVESTOCK ☐ 19 ☐ MERCHANDISE ☐ 20 ☐ MONEY ☐ 21 ☐ NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS ☐ 22 ☐ NON-NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS ☐ 23 ☐ OFFICE-TYPE EQUIPMENT ☐ 24 ☐ OTHER MOTOR VEHICLES ☐ 25 ☐ PURSES / HANDBAGS / WALLETS ☐ 26 ☐ RADIOS / TVs / VCRs ☐ 27 ☐ RECORDINGS - AUDIO / VISUAL ☐ 28 ☐ RECREATIONAL VEHICLES ☐ 29 ☐ STRUCTURES - SINGLE OCCUPANCY DWELLINGS ☐ 30 ☐ STRUCTURES - OTHER DWELLINGS ☐ 31 ☐ STRUCTURES - OTHER COMMERCIAL / BUSINESS ☐ 32 ☐ STRUCTURES - INDUSTRIAL / MANUFACTURING ☐ 33 ☐ STRUCTURES - PUBLIC / COMMUNITY ☐ 34 ☐ STRUCTURES - STORAGE ☐ 35 ☐ STRUCTURES - OTHER ☐ 36 ☐ TOOLS - POWER / HAND ☐ 37 ☐ TRUCKS ☐ 38 ☐ VEHICLE PARTS / ACCESSORIES ☐ 39 ☐ WATERCRAFT ☐ 77 ☐ OTHER ☐ 88 ☐ PENDING INVENTORY ☐ 99 ☐ ()	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	
PROPERTY LOSS / ETC. CODE QUANTITY PROPERTY DESCRIPTION INCLUDE MAKE, MODEL, SIZE, TYPE, SERIAL #, COLOR, ETC. VALUE DATE RECOVERED	

Appendix B

NUMBER OF OFFENDERS: _____				
1. OFFENDER: (Last, First, Middle)		ADDRESS: (Street, City, State, Zip)		
AGE: _____	SEX: ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE ☐ UNKNOWN	RACE: ☐ WHITE ☐ BLACK ☐ INDIAN	HEIGHT: _____ feet inches	WEIGHT: _____ pounds
2. OFFENDER: (Last, First, Middle)		ADDRESS: (Street, City, State, Zip)		
AGE: _____	SEX: ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE ☐ UNKNOWN	RACE: ☐ WHITE ☐ BLACK ☐ INDIAN	HEIGHT: _____ feet inches	WEIGHT: _____ pounds
3. OFFENDER: (Last, First, Middle)		ADDRESS: (Street, City, State, Zip)		
AGE: _____	SEX: ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE ☐ UNKNOWN	RACE: ☐ WHITE ☐ BLACK ☐ INDIAN	HEIGHT: _____ feet inches	WEIGHT: _____ pounds
NUMBER OF ARRESTEES: _____		MULTIPLE CLEARANCE INDICATOR: ☐ MULTIPLE ☐ COUNT ARRESTEE ☐ NOT APPLICABLE		
ARRESTEE #1: (Last, First, Middle)		ADDRESS: (Street, City, State, Zip)		
AGE: _____	SEX: ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE ☐ UNKNOWN	RACE: ☐ WHITE ☐ BLACK ☐ INDIAN ☐ ASIAN ☐ UNKNOWN	DOB: _____	ARRESTEE ETHNICITY: ☐ HISPANIC ☐ NON-HISPANIC ☐ UNKNOWN
ARRESTEE WAS ARMED WITH: (Check Up To Two) (Enter A in Box if Automatic) 01 ☐ UNARMED 11 ☐ FIREARM (type not stated) 12 ☐ HANDGUN 13 ☐ RIFLE 14 ☐ SHOTGUN 15 ☐ OTHER FIREARM 16 ☐ LETHAL CUTTING INSTRUMENT (e.g. Switchblade Knife, etc.) 17 ☐ CLUB / BLACKJACK / BRASS KNUCKLES		TYPE OF ARREST: ☐ ON-VIEW ☐ SUMMONED / CITED ☐ TAKEN INTO CUSTODY		DISPOSITION OF ARRESTEE UNDER 18: ☐ HANDLED WITHIN DEPARTMENT ☐ REFERRED TO OTHER AUTHORITY
HEIGHT: _____ feet inches	WEIGHT: _____ pounds	EYES: _____	HAIR: _____	ARREST NUMBER: _____
NAME: (Last, First, Middle)		ADDRESS: (Street, City, State, Zip)		RESIDENTIAL PHONE: _____
BUSINESS PHONE: _____		UCR ARREST OFFENSE CODE: _____		
NARRATIVE				

Appendix C

Focus of Prior Research - Homicide

Homicide, it seems, has been studied to death. In the early research on homicide, drugs, other than alcohol, were not of major concern. The seminal work of Wolfgang (1958) and most replicative studies (e.g. Pokorny 1965; Voss and Hepburn 1968) commonly focused on the relationship of victim to offender, the location and time of the event, weapons used, interracial and gender make-up, demographics and victim precipitation.

Wolfgang's 1958 study describing the homicide experience in Philadelphia focused on such variables as victim/offender relationships, race, sex, age, weapons, spatial and temporal patterns, alcohol use, prior criminal records, offenders' motives and felony murders. Pokorny in Houston and Voss and Hepburn in Chicago replicated Wolfgang's study with an added focus on homicides between and within the races and genders. Munford et al. (1976) in Atlanta conducted a decade long longitudinal study designed to identify trends in the makeup of the crime. The findings throughout these works are generally consistent.

Block, in Chicago, concluded a massive review of that city's homicide experience over seventeen years. She sees homicide as a "heterogeneous" and "non-monolithic" crime whose etiology is more likely found in the actions of the participants or in the criminal events that precipitate the homicide than in the homicide itself. Block arranged the sample on a continuum from instrumental (premeditated) to impulsive (no advanced planning) homicide events (1985, 13). Megargee (1982) reviews the differences different researchers bring to psychological

categorizations of homicide. The categorizations are only problematical when comparative study is attempted. For example, Block concentrates on the underlying criminality, a robbery or a burglary perhaps, to identify causation whereas Wolfgang and others rely on variables that more readily lend themselves to quantification (demographics, prior record, relationships, weapon used, location et al.) and Luckenbill would have us concentrate on the transactional risks associated with the event.

Hewitt found "generally consistent" patterns in the characteristics of offenders who did their homicides in rural areas and homicide offenders in large cities (1988, 32). Cheatwood studied the association of seasonal variations in homicide rates as regards a postulation that violent crimes are related to hot weather under the governance of a "thermic law" (1988, 287). Even though aggregate homicide numbers are higher during the months of July, August and December, months when schools are out, travel is more frequent, alcohol consumption is up and personal level interaction are generally high, he found no significant correlation between increased human interaction and homicide (1988, 287, 302). For crimes other than homicide however, "many observers" have identified seasonal patterns in the incidence rates, a finding more consistent with popular perceptions (BJS Data 1989, 16).

Gastil identified a "Southernness" in the American culture rooted in antebellum traditions, regressed his crime index on standard sociological variables and concludes that "there is a significant relationship between murder rates and residence in the South" (1971, 425). From a structuralist perspective Jacobson (1975) "unlike Hackney

(1969) and Gastil (1971) goes beyond concern for differential homicide rates" (226) and concludes that whatever differences exist between the overall North-South crime indexes, overall, there is a convergence of the two measures that evidentially speaks to a reducing differential in regional cultures and contradicts the "Southernness" hypothesis.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) funded an extensive survey of deaths resulting from drug abuse in nine cities (Gottschalk et al. 1979). Relying on medical examiner information, the survey naturally had no information regarding offender drug use. Notably, and not unlike researchers who use the UCR, sufficient errors were found to warn that the data "may be 'soft' and should be accepted as at best crude estimates" of the true cause of deaths (1979, 2).

Much of the drug and violence research has focused on the individual use of drugs or alcohol by either victim or perpetrator (e.g. Wolfgang 1958; Ellinwood 1971; Vaillant 1971; Voss and Hepburn 1968; Hepburn and Voss 1970; Shellow 1976b; Riedel and Zahn 1985; Abel 1987). However, evidence of drug use by participants in a homicide event does not in itself yield a complete picture of the event. When analysis is based on the nature of the event rather than the nature of the participants a more comprehensive description of the homicide transaction emerges.

Luckenbill (1977) has examined homicide as a situated transaction, an interactive exchange in which the protagonists engage in a "face" saving character contest (178 citing Lyman and Scott 1970, 37-43) during which the actors, often with the assistance of bystanders, make "moves" on the basis of the other's moves and the position of their

audience (179, citing Goffman 1967, 5, 239-258; 1969, 107-112). The difficulty researchers face in reconstructing homicide events and indeed the breadth of operational definitions used to study the crime, is illustrated in Luckenbill's categorization of victim and offender.

He bases his differentiation on the participants' actions during the exchange that preceded the killing rather than on the more common categorization, by the outcome of the exchange. He says the designation "victim" and "offender" are "heuristic labels . . . that either emerge in the transaction or are an artifact of the battle" (178). In 36% of Luckenbill's sample the "initially cast victim" kills while the adversary, the "initially cast offender" is killed (178). In other words, while most researchers label the dead participant in the event the "victim", Luckenbill sees, and demonstrates, a benefit in concentrating on the action preceding the final outcome. Cheatwood endorses analytical methods that take into account the variegated activities actors in "differing forms of homicide" as the "most promising avenues for future research" (1988, 303).

Such theoretical modeling mirrors Block's observations regarding the diverse etiology of homicides. She would rather concentrate on the murder than the murderer. "In fact", Block says, in those homicides precipitated by an argument or an assault "it may be difficult to distinguish the victim from the offender at the outset" (1985, 14). Most studies that concentrate on interactive, situational factors are based on the assumption that the outcomes of an aggressive interaction are not necessarily determined by the participants' characteristics or initial motivations but rather "they are at least

partly a function of [the actions] that occur during the incident" (Felson and Steadman 1983, 59-60; see also, Athens, 1977; Ball-Roekeach 1973; Hepburn 1973; Stark et al. 1974). The data used in this study are also "event" based.

Historical studies of homicide are interesting in this regard. They have little direct relevance to the issues raised here yet the notion that the "field of honor" of earlier times is analogous to the modern day face saving risks in homicide is not without further research possibilities. Studies of the phenomenon of dueling, and resultant casualties, for example, have focused on the life-threatening and life-taking activity as rational behavior conducted for purposes of reputation enhancement and upward social mobility (Schwartz et al. 1984; Simpson 1988). No less so is the transaction between an incumbent crack seller and an upstart rival who challenges for control of a drug dealing territory.

Focus of Prior Research - Drugs and Homicide

Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) suggests that differential homicide rates among classes may be explained by a "subculture of violence". Contrarily, Zahn and Bencivengo contend that other "notions" must augment the "subculture" explanation (1974, 283) and argue that this is especially true when the subject matter is murder among those who use illegal drugs. Zahn and Bencivengo ask: "What accounts for such high rates of homicide among this [drug using] population?" They examine the question using twofold hypotheses based on the "transactional risks" identified in two sets of behavior: The risk of

homicide in the violently criminal subculture; and a like risk in the daily routine of doing drugs (284).

A number of studies have concentrated on the role which illicit drugs play in homicides but have done so in a variety of ways. For example, Ellinwood (1971) studies offenders who committed homicide while under the influence of amphetamines. A recent and extensive study of the drugs/homicides nexus in New York State concentrates on "street drugs" (Goldstein and Brownstein 1987) while a study by Senray and Wettstein examined the association of "large amounts of psychoactive" drug use and homicides that "would not have occurred" without one of the participants having not been under the influence of drugs (1983, 157). Senray and Wettstein theoretically link large drug dosages to adverse effects in the brain systems upon which reality testing and judgement depend.

From a different perspective, that of the law enforcement practitioner, Heffernan et al. (1982) attempt a conceptualization of those homicides related to drug trafficking as a "subtype of homicide". Their study highlights the increase in "drug related" homicide, yet its conceptualization broadens the definition of "drug related" homicide to include many cases other researchers, particularly the interactionists, would reject as not drug related.

This conceptualization is particularly troublesome in the criteria used to classify a homicide as related to drugs. The authors propose that if any four of sixteen items in a "checklist" of drug-related identifiers are present, the homicide "almost certainly" related to drugs (1982, 4)

For example, the fact that 1) either offender or victim had a history of prior arrests for drugs; 2) that drugs were found at the scene; 3) that a witness or family member "believes" the homicide is drug related; 4) that the victim had drugs in his system; 5) that a victim or offender is "listed" in the police files as being a drug dealer or 6) that there is "no other apparent motive" (1982, 4), do not provide for a variety of questionable scenarios. Being part of the drug scene does not necessarily certify one's death as drug related - Cannot druggies have love triangles, too?

Following the five facts from the check list used by Heffernan et al., scenarios involving 1) an ex-convict, former druggie, now a robbery victim in an event without drug involvement; 2) a victim in a "push-in" burglary who just happened to be a drug user who left drugs and works unsecured in the residence; 3) a self-serving witnesses looking to ingratiate himself with the police; 4) a "recreational" drug user killed in a non-drug related mugging; 5) a drug dealer killed in a lovers' triangle or 6) a "dump job" (a homicide sans victim identification, witnesses or solid evidence) do not allow classification of the homicide as non-drug related. Fact number six is especially troublesome. If there is "no apparent motive", what is the justification for classifying the homicide drug related?

This minor criticism of the work of Heffernan et al. is not self-serving. Rather it spotlights and goes to the core of the dissertation topic. At the time he wrote, Heffernan was a Detective Sergeant in a New York City police precinct, the 44th, which has one of the highest aggregate and rate incidence of homicide in the City. He

knows which homicides in his area are "drug-related" and experientially he constructs an apparently valid criteria for coding homicides as drug related (1982, 4). The criteria for the list were submitted to other NYPD homicide investigators who agreed that if any four of the items were evident in a homicide case they would classify it as drug-related.

As an investigative tool, the checklist is excellent. It allows a detective to systematically organize the conduct of an investigation, to systematically identify bits and pieces of data that will test suspicions about who did the killing and where, in which milieu, the search should begin. Heffernan's conceptions of drug-relatedness reflect the problem-oriented approach of the criminal investigator, not the broader concerns of the social scientist.

For purposes of a police investigation, it is not a major error to be wrong regarding the assessment of an event as etiologically of drugs. "Drug-relatedness" is not a forensic matter; the courts will not weigh it. A prosecutor might attempt to enter it into a trial with negative connotations and the defense might try to suppress it but the issue itself, whether or not a crime is related to drugs (possession and sale excepted), is not sanctioned by law and is seldom a matter before the bar. An assessment error of this type, when made by police investigators, merely indicates that they were looking in the wrong place. Its repercussions are minimal; a change in the locale of the inquiry, a "writing-off" of hours spent "barking up the wrong tree" or a reworking of the investigative protocol.

Detectives could not go about their work successfully without a conceptualization such as one described by Heffernan et al.

No investigative inquiry would be complete without one. As was noted above, assessment by detectives that an event is drug-related simply points to a location from which the information trail should begin. The assessment says little more. Naming the location provides the necessary general background information about the persons involved. A checklist is a beginning step that leads the next and if the first implies a drug relatedness, nothing requires that the second step be also about drugs.

However, for the reasons noted above, this conceptualization has failings as an operational definition for the social researcher. Nonetheless, such an operational definition may be no less reasonable than those used in more academic studies. Is Heffernan's, practitioner-oriented conceptualization any more or less valid a reconstruction of the reality of homicide events than is a social scientist's model constructed for the same purpose? Recall, from the problem statement above, this question and its corollaries: If there is disagreement between the two, is it a measurable one? Heffernan and his colleagues reached conclusions similar to, and as compelling as, those of other researchers reviewed in this work.

In formulating their "socio-psychological" theory of the existence of a violent subculture Wolfgang and Ferracuti focused on "the preponderant kind of homicide", the passion crimes, unpremeditated killings that display no psychotic manifestations (1967, 273). Their emphasis is apparently justified by "significantly high rates of homicide" and a "concomitance of meaningfully related variables" (1967, 279) found in "certain race-sex-age-specific groups" (1967, 275) that

are not fully explained by traditional sociological theories of deviance.

When the violent sub-culture theory is viewed along with research relating to females (Zahn 1975; Weishelt 1984; Mann 1988; Browne and Williams 1989), blacks (Hawkins 1986) and overall patterns of homicide (Riedel and Zahn 1985), the evidence is clear that previous patterns of violence generally can be viewed as predictors of homicide. Furthermore, when the violence is related to the use of drugs, the work of Zahn and Bencivengo (1972) strongly suggests that those involved in the use and distribution of illicit drugs could just as readily be identified as member of a sub-culture; in this case, a violent sub-culture of drug related activities (also, Agar, 1973; Lindesmith and Strauss 1956, 663-687) that is separate from but that overlaps other ethnic, regional or SES defined sub-cultures.

Research Problems In The Usual Data Sources

As the focus of the research on violence changed over time and social scientists and law enforcement practitioners turned their attention to the drug relatedness of violence in general and homicide in particular, their efforts were universally faced with the problems of validity and usefulness in the relevant national level data bases. Frequently scientists resorted to jurisdictionally specific samples for their analyses (Shellow 1976a, 133) for the obvious purpose of avoiding problems associated with using data definitions which were created by others. A recounting of the different types of data sources on which several of the homicide/drug studies base their research helps

understand the need to go outside of the usually available national data bases for adequate measuring devices.

Langevin et al. (1982), in a controlled study of the synergistic effects of drugs and alcohol, relied on psychiatric assessment records. A study over twelve years of the drug and alcohol habits of drug addicts at Lennox Hill Hospital in New York City used treatment records (Vaillant 1966). In reporting his study of seventy-one convicted murderers, Wilcox notes that previous research on the characteristics of murders is "anecdotal or described groups in mental hospitals or clinics" or used "computer compiled state arrest records, or prison population" files (1986, 48). His data came from a compilation of personal treatment records, court, police, district attorney, morgue, and legal defense sources.

As early as 1925, Kolb was using criminal history files of a specific jurisdiction to identify salient variables. A study of Helsinki, Finland's murderers who were using alcohol at the time they killed, relied on use specific police and court records (Virkkunen 1974). Another longitudinal study similar to that of Vaillant (1966) but instead concerned with the criminal activity of narcotic users in methadone maintenance treatment, likewise relied on police criminal records (Cushman 1974).

The case history method was used by Ellinwood (1971) in research on amphetamine abuse and homicide. A related source of research data commonly used is the personal interview. Inciardi (1986) and Inciardi and Chambers (1972) studied drug use habits using this method. Ball et al. used it to study "The Day To Day Criminality of

Heroin Addicts in Baltimore . . ." (1983, 119) as did James et al. (1979) to examine the relationship between female criminality and drugs. Senray and Wettstein (1983) combined the interview and case history techniques. In an economic study of employment status and drug use, Faupel also went to the source and interviewed his sample (1988, 469).

Although it speaks only indirectly to defects in the national data bases, the case for ethnographic research bears mention. Manning admits an ". . . Ethnographic Conceit" (1987, 56) and points out several failings of the method. Ill defined researcher roles, a lack of comparative continuity among studies, methods of data collection that are "sometimes are not even mentioned", an informal writing style that reflects irony and a problem selection that seems "adventitious" and atheoretical, are several of Manning's criticisms (1987, 57), yet he of course remains one of ethnography's staunchest advocates. Manning would probably agree with Irwin's paraphrasing of Matza's contention that "positivistic social scientists have distorted the meaning of naturalism in their pursuit of objectivity" and Irwin's expansion of that idea to posit "that any approach not based firmly on qualitative or phenomenological ground is not only a distortion of the phenomenon, but also is very likely a corruption." (Irwin 1987, 41-42).

A good part of this dissertation, indeed the hypothesis, is the result of gathering qualitative data from those very close to the subject matter. This aspect of the study, "drawing close to the subjects" to better understand "the fundamental human processes" (Irwin 1987, 41) allowed the question of differing perspectives reconstructing different realities to be raised. Although the analyses presented here

are not ethnographic, the similarity in their basic approach should be noted in this review of the literature.

To return to the general review of data sources used in research on drugs and violence: Hewitt (1988) found sufficient data in the records of Muncie, Indiana's criminal courts to explore the victim-offender relationship of murderers. More often than not, the available research concentrates on the victim in homicide events. In New York City, Haberman and Baden (1974) measured alcohol levels found in victims during autopsy while Abel (1987) used comparable toxicological data in upstate New York's Erie county. Zahn and Bencivengo's 1974 review of drug and non-drug using victims of homicide is based on autopsy reports as is Zahn's later work on female victims in Philadelphia (1975).

Victims were also the focus of the research done by Monforte and Spitz of the toxicological examinations of 207 Wayne County (Detroit) homicide victims (1974; also Goodman et al.(1986).

The homicide offender, as a distinct entity in the criminal event has received less attention than the victim, even though the crime of homicide produces more arrested perpetrators than any other "indexed" crime in the UCR. As a rule, the only perpetrators for whom demographic and SES data are compiled are those arrested for homicide (e.g. Wolfgang 1958; Block 1985; Johnson 1989). Little attention is paid to information in police files that have not been cleared by arrest. It is a difficult number to fix, but contacts with the police during this research indicate about 15-20% of the open murder cases include the identity of the perpetrator. These data remain in police record rooms.

A number of drug studies do examine offenders' involvement (Rizzo 1982; Holcomb and Anderson 1983; Wilcox 1986; Wilkes 1987) but due to problems in the selection criteria or in the size of the sample, comparison to a larger population cannot be made. Offender characteristics are usually part of those analyses which examine component parts of homicide events, such as relationship categories or interactional behavior (Hewitt 1988; Loftin 1986; Loftin 1987; Luckenbill 1977; Mann 1988; Mercy and Saltzman 1989; Williams and Flewelling 1987).

In studies that collect drug-related information, in most cases, the sample is small and gives questionable representation of the offender population (i.e. Ellinwood 1971; Virkkunen 1974; Holcomb and Anderson 1983). Recent work using urine testing of perpetrators (Wish 1987; Carver 1986) holds some promise that more definitive data will become available, yet, here too, the research may or may not speak to the true effect of drug use simply because the testing occurs at the time of arrest and not at the time the homicide occurred.

In many of the homicide studies examined in this study, illicit drugs, unless made central to the research, seldom played other than a secondary role. Nonetheless, alcohol as a contributing factor in homicide has been studied extensively. In particular, the relationship between suicide and alcohol use has attracted a great deal of attention (e.g. Goodwin 1973; Virkkunen 1974; Haberman and Baden 1974; Riddick and Luke 1978; Langevin et al. 1982; Gary 1986).

In all, these studies rely on data sources that were readily available and apparently more valid than the larger national data bases. Whether the problems are jurisdictional, temporal, or specificity of data source, the generalizability of such studies remains problematic.

Appendix D

VARIABLE LIST - EVENT VARIABLESRELATIONSHIP

Spouse
 Parent/child
 Sibling
 Friend,
 Acquaintance,
 Neighbor
 Drug Associate
 Police Officer
 Stranger
 Undetermined

CIRCUMSTANCES

Execution of Police Office
 Drug Transaction
 Robbery
 Other crime
 Dispute
 Vice/sex related
 Child abuse
 Other Circumstances

MEANS

Handgun
 Rifle
 Shotgun/machine gun
 Fire
 Knife, Cutting Instrument
 Physical Force,...
 Blunt Instrument,
 Strangulation
 All other means

MOTIVE

Furtherance Of Another Crime
 Premeditated
 Spontaneous
 Irrational
 Other Motive
 Undetermined

LOCATION

Bar Or Tavern
 Vacant Building
 Street
 Transit System
 Commercial Site
 Public Area
 Victim's Residence
 Perpetrator's Residence
 Other Residence
 Other Location

DRUG RELATED QUESTIONDIMENSION

Psychopharmacological
 Economic Compulsive
 Systemic

CLASSIFICATION

Psychopharmacological
 Economic Compulsive
 Systemic
 Multidimensional
 Other Drug Related
 Not Drug Related

REASON EVENT IS DRUG RELATED

Fight By Dealers Over Territory
 Dealer Killed For Selling Bad Drugs
 Buyer Killed In Fight With Dealer
 Execution Of Police Informant
 Dispute Over Works
 Dispute Over Theft Of Drugs
 Assault To Collect Drug Related Debt
 Punishment Of Workers By Dealer
 Robbery Of Drug Dealer
 Other Drug Trafficking
 Other Drug Related Circumstances

Appendix E

VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR VARIABLES

EVENT ACTION

Drug Buying
Drug Selling
Drugs Found On/nearest
Drug Works Found On/near

VICTIM BEHAVIOR

High On Drugs
High On Alcohol
Irrational Due to Alcohol Ingestion
Irrational Due to Drug Ingestion

VICTIM STATUS

Heroin User
Cocaine or Crack User
Alcohol Abuser
Other Type of Drug User

DRUG(S) USED

Heroin
Cocaine
Crack
Marijuana
Alcohol

DRUG(S) FOUND

Heroin
Cocaine
Crack
Marijuana
Alcohol

TRAFFICKING LEVEL

Is Low Level Drug Trafficker
Is High Level Drug Trafficker

LIST OF WORKS CITED

- Abel, E. L. (1987) "Drugs and Homicide in Erie County, New York." International Journal of the Addictions 22: 195-200.
- Agar, M. (1973) Ripping and Running: A Formal Ethnography Of Urban Heroin Addicts. New York: Seminar.
- Athens, L. H. (1977) "Violent Crime: A Symbolic Interactionist Study." Symbolic Interaction 1: 56-70.
- Ball, J. C., Schaeffer, J. W. and Nurco, D. N. (1983). "The Day to Day Criminality Of Heroin Addicts in Baltimore: A Study In The Continuity Of Offender Rates." Drug and Alcohol Dependence 12: 119-42.
- Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1973) "Values and Violence: A Test of The Subculture of Violence Thesis." American Sociological Review 31: 736-49.
- Banton, M. (1964) The Policeman In The Community. New York: Basic.
- Barker, T. (1978) An Empirical Study of Police Deviance Other Than Corruption. Journal of Police Science and Administration 6: 264-272.
- Becker, H. S. (1963) Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: Free Press.
- , (1987) "Whose Side Are We On?" Social Problems 14: 239-247.
- Bittner, E. (1970). The Functions of the Police in Modern Society. Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency.
- , (1974) "Esprit De Corps and the Code of Secrecy." Goldsmith, J. and Goldsmith, S. Eds.. The Police Community. Pacific Palisades, CA: Palisades. 237-46.
- Black, D. (1980) The Manners and Customs of the Police. New York: Academic.
- Block, C. R. (1985). Lethal Violence in Chicago Over Seventeen Years: Homicides Known To The Police, 1965-1981. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Agency.
- Brown, M. K. (1981) Working the Street: Police Discretion and the Dilemmas of Reform. New York: Russell Sage.
- Browne, A. and Williams K. R. (1989) "Exploring the Effect Of Resource Availability and The Likelihood Of Female-Perpetrated Homicides." Law & Society Review 23: 75-94.

- Brownstein, H. H., Goldstein, P. J., Ryan, P. J. and Bellucci, P. A. (August, 1989) "Homicide and Drug Trafficking." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Berkeley, California.
- , Goldstein, P. J., Ryan, P. J. and Bellucci, P. A. (1990) "Drug-Related Homicide In New York, 1984 and 1988." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Research in Brief (Forthcoming).
- Buckner, H. T. (1967) "The Police: The Culture Of A Social Control Agency." Ph.D. Diss. University of California, Berkeley.
- Bureau of Justice Administration (1988) "Drug Related Homicides" Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice. Newsletter.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (1989) BJS Data Report 1988. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.
- Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T. (1966) The Social Construction of Reality. New York: Anchor.
- Carver, J. D. (1986) "Drugs and Crime: Controlling Use and Reducing Risk Through Testing." Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice. NIJ Reports SNI 199.
- Cavan, S. (1963) "Interaction In Home Territories." Berkeley Journal of Sociology 8: 17-32.
- Cell, E. (1984) Learning To Learn From Experience. New York: SUNY.
- Cheatwood, D. (1988). "Is There A Season For Homicide?" Criminology 26: 287-306.
- Child, A. (1941) "The Theoretical Possibility of the Sociology of Knowledge." Ethics 6: 392-441.
- Cicchetti, D. V., Lee, C., Fontana, A. F. and Dowds, N. B. (1978) "A Computer Program For Assessing Specific Category Rater Agreement For Qualitative Data." Educational and Psychological Measurements 38: 805-813
- , (1987) "When Diagnostic Agreement is High, but Reliability is Low: Some Paradoxes Occurring in Joint Independent Neuropsychology Assessments." Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology 10: 605-622.
- , Aviano, S. L. and Vitale, J. (1977) "Computer Programs For Assessing Rater Agreement and Rater Bias For Qualitative Data." Educational and Psychological Measurement 13: 195-201.
- Cicourel, A. V. (1968) The Social Organization of Juvenile Justice. New York: Wiley.

- Clifford, J. (1988) The Predicament of Culture. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Cohen, A. K. (1986) Seminar on Advanced Criminology. Graduate Center, City University of New York, Doctoral Program in Criminal Justice.
- , (1981) "Criminal Actors: Natural Persons and Collectivities." Crime and Social Deviance 9: 18-26.
- Cohen, B. and Chaiken, J. (1987) Investigators Who Perform Well. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Cohen J. (1960). A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement 20: 37-46.
- , (1988) Set Correlation and Contingency Tables. Applied Psychological Measurement, 12.4, 425-34.
- , (1968) "Weighted kappa: Nominal Scale Agreement with Provision For Scaled Disagreement Or Partial Credit." Psychological Bulletin 70: 213-220.
- Congressional Quarterly. (1975) Watergate: Chronology of A Crisis. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.
- Cook, F. J. (1964) The FBI Nobody Knows. New York: Macmillan.
- Cook, P. J. (1985). "Is Robbery Becoming More Violent: An Analysis of Robbery Murder Trends Since 1968." The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology 76: 480-489.
- Coser, L. A. (1977) Masters of Sociological Thought. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich.
- Cramer, H. (1946). Mathematical Methods of Statistics. Princeton: Princeton Univ.
- Culbert, S. A. (1974) The Organization Trap and How To Get Out Of It. New York: Basic.
- Cushman, P. (1974) "Relationship Between Narcotic Addiction and Crime." Federal Probation 38: 38-43.
- Davis, K. C. (1974) "An Approach to Legal Control of the Police." Texas Law Review 52: 622-704.
- de Tocqueville, A. (1945) Democracy in America. Trans. Reeve, H. New York: Vintage.
- Donoghue, D. (1989) "The Strange Case of Paul de Man." The New York Review 36: 32-37.

- Duncker, K. (1945) "Psychological Monograph." Ed. Dashiell, J. S. Trans. Lees, L. S. On Problem Solving. Westport: Greenwood.
- Dunning, C. M. and Hochstedler, E. (1982) "Satisfaction With Communication In A Police Organization: 'Shooting the Shit', 'Horsenecking' and 'Brownie' Reports." Green, J. R. Ed. Managing Police Work: Perspectives In Criminal Justice 4. Beverly Hills: Sage. 140-157.
- Durkheim, E. (1969) The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. Trans. Swain, J. New York: Free.
- Ellinwood Jr., E. H. (1971). "Assault and Homicide Associated With Amphetamine Abuse." American Journal of Psychiatry 127: 90-95.
- Faupel, C. E. (1988) "Heroin Use, Crime and Employment Status." Journal of Drug Issues 18: 467-479.
- Felson, F. B. and Steadman, H. J. (1983). "Situational Factors Leading To Criminal Violence." Criminology 21: 59-74
- Fleiss, J. L. (1981). Statistical Methods For Rates and Proportions 2ed. New York: Wiley, Chapter 13.
- , Cohen, J. and Everitt, B. S. (1969) "Large Sample Standard Errors Of Kappa and Weighted Kappa." Psychological Bulletin 72: 323-327.
- Foucault, M. (1979) Discipline and Punish. Trans. Sheridan, A. New York: Vintage.
- France, P. (1969) "The Charter of the Land: Custom and Colonization in Fiji." Melbourne: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Gandossey, R. P., Williams, J. R. Cohen J. and Harwood, H. J. (1980) Drugs and Crime: A Survey and Analysis of the Literature. National Institute of Justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Gary, L. E. (1986) "Drinking, Homicide, and the Black Male." Journal of Black Studies 17: 15-31.
- Gastil, R. D. (1971) "Homicide And A Regional Culture Of Violence." American Sociological Review 36: 412-27.
- Gerson, L. W. and Preston, D. A. (1979). "Alcohol Consumption and The Incidence of Violent Crime." Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 40.3, 307-12.
- Gibbs, J. P. (1966) "Conceptions of Deviant Behavior: The Old and the New." Pacific Sociological Review 9
- Goff, T. W. (1980) Marx and Mead: Contributions to a Sociology of Knowledge. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Goffman, E. (1963) Stigma. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- , (1963) Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings. Glencoe: Free Press.
- , (1967) Interaction Ritual: Essays on Fact-to-Face Behavior. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- , (1969) Strategic Interaction. New York: Ballantine.
- Goldstein, P. J. and Brownstein, H. H. 1987. Drug Related Crime Analysis - Homicide. Report to the National Institute of Justice, Drugs, Alcohol and Crime Program.
- . (1986) "Homicide Related To Drug Traffic." Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine 62: 509-516.
- , (1985) "The Drug/Violence Nexus: A Tripartite Conceptualization." Journal of Drug Issues 14: 493-506.
- , and Hunt, D. (1984) The Impact of Drugs On The Health of the Nation. Report to the Carter Center. Atlanta: Emory Univ.
- Goodman, L. A. and Kruskal, W. H. (1951) "Measures of Association for Cross Classification." Journal of the American Statistical Association 49: 1732-69.
- Goodman, R. A., Mercy, J. A., Loya, F., Rosenberg, M. L., Smith, J. C., Allen, N. H., Vargas, L. and Kolts, R. (1986) "Alcohol Use and Interpersonal Violence: Alcohol Detected In Homicide Victims." American Journal of Public Health 76: 144-49.
- Goodwin, D. W. (1973) "Alcohol In Suicide and Homicide." Quarterly Journal of Studies of Alcohol 34: 144-156.
- Gordon, C. (1989) "Rochester Faces Image of Violence." Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, 15 Jan.: 1.
- Gottfredson, D. M. (1987) "Prediction and Classification." Gottfredson, D.M. and Tonry, M. Eds.. Prediction and Classification (Vol. 9). Tonry, M. and Morris, N. Eds.. Crime and Justice: A Review of Research. Chicago: Chicago Univ. 1-20.
- Gottschalk, L. A., Mc Guire, F. L., Heiser, J. F. Dinovo, E. C. and Birch, H. (1979) Drug Abuse Deaths In Nine Cities: A Survey Report. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute On Drug Abuse, Monograph Series, 29.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1968) "The Sociologist As Partisan: Sociology And The Welfare State." The American Sociologist 3: 103-116.
- , (1970) The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. New York: Avon.

- Graham, M. C. (1987) "Controlling Drug Abuse and Crime: A Research Update." Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, NIJ Reports, SNI 202.
- Griffin, J. (1958) Statistics Essential for Police Efficiency. Springfield: Thomas.
- Gropper, B. A. (1985) "Probing the Links Between Drugs and Crime." Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Research in Brief.
- Guttman, L. (1941). "An Outline of the Statistical Theory of Prediction." Horst, P. Ed. The Prediction of Personal Adjustment. New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 48.
- Haberman, P. W. and Baden, M. M. (1974) "Drinking, Drugs, and Death." International Journal of the Addictions 9: 761-73.
- Hackney, S. (1969) "Southern Violence." Graham, H. D. and Gurr, T. R. Eds.. Violence In America. New York: Signet.
- Hagen, F. E. (1982) Research Methods in Criminal Justice and Criminology. New York: Macmillan.
- Handler, R. (1984) "On Sociocultural Discontinuity: Nationalism and Cultural Objectification in Quebec." Current Anthropology 25: 55-71.
- Hanson, A. "The Making of the Maori: Culture Invention and Its Logic." American Anthropologist 91: 890-902.
- Harriston, K. (1988) "14 Killings Tie Record In P. G." Washington Post, 2 Feb.: A1+.
- Harwood, H., Napolitano, D., Kristiansen, P., and Collins, J. (1984). Economic Costs to Society of Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Mental Illness. Report to the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration.
- Hawkins, D. F. Ed. (1986). Homicide Among Black Americans. Lanham, Md.: Univ. Press of America.
- Heavens, Jr., R. and Cicchetti, D. V. (1978) "A Computer Program for Calculating Rater Agreement and Bias Statistics Using Contingency Table Input." Paper presented to the Joint Meetings of the American Statistical Association, San Diego, CA.
- Heffernan, R., Martin, J. M. and Romano, A. T. (1982) "Homicides Related To Drug Trafficking." Federal Probation 46: 3-7.
- Hepburn, J. R. (1973) "Violent Behavior in Interpersonal Relationships." Sociological Quarterly 14: 419-429.
- , and Voss, H. L. (1970) "Patterns of Criminal Homicide - A Comparison of Chicago and Philadelphia." Criminology 8: 21-45.

- Herzfeld, M. (1982) Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece. Austin: Univ. Texas Press.
- Hewitt, J. D. (1988). "The Victim-Offender Relationship in Convicted Homicide Cases: 1960-1984." Journal of Criminal Justice 16: 25-33.
- Hewitt, J. P. and Hall, P. M. (1973) "Social Problems, Problematic Situations, and Quasi-theories." American Sociological Review 38: 367-74.
- Holcomb, W. R. and Anderson, W. P. (1983) "Alcohol and Multiple Drug Abuse In Accused Murderers." Psychological Reports 52: 159-64.
- Hopkins, D. D., Grant-Worley, J. A., and Bollinger, T. L. (1989) "Survey of Cause-of-Death Query Criteria Used by State Vital Statistics Programs in the US and the Efficacy of the Criteria Used by the Oregon Vital Statistics Program." American Journal of Public Health 79: 570-574.
- Horton, J. (1966) "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems as Competing Ideologies." The American Journal of Sociology 71: 701-713.
- Hout, M., Duncan, O. D. and Sobel, M. E. (1987). "Association and Heterogeneity: Structural Models Of Similarities and Differences." Clogg, C. C. Ed. Sociological Methodology 1986-87 (Vol 2.). Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association. 145-184.
- Hughes, E. C. (1965) "Professions." Professions In America. Lynn, K. S. Ed. Boston: Beacon. 1-14.
- Humphries, D. (1981) "Coverage and Ideology: A Content Analysis of Crime Coverage." Crime and Delinquency 27: 191-205.
- Inciardi, J. (1986) "The Drugs Crime Connection." Inciardi, J. Ed. The War on Drugs: Heroin, Cocaine, and Public Policy Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield. 115-430.
- , and Chambers, C. D. (1972) "Unreported Criminal Involvement Of Narcotic Addicts." Journal of Drug Issues 2: 57-64.
- Innes, C. A. (1988) State Prison Inmate Survey, 1986: Drug Use and Crime. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Special Report.
- Irwin, J. (1987) "Reflections on Ethnography." Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 16: 41-48.
- Jacobson, A. L. (1975). Crime Trends in Southern and Nonsouthern Cities: A Twenty-Year Perspective. Social Forces 53: 226-42.
- James, G. "Murders in Queens Rise 25%; Crack Is Key Factor." New York Times, 20 Apr.: A1+.

- James, J., Gosh, C and Wohl, R. W. (1979) "The Relationship Between Female Criminality and Drug Use." International Journal of the Addictions 14: 215-29.
- Jamieson, K. M. and Flanagan, T. J. Eds.. (1989) Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics 1988. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs.
- Johnson, C. (1989) "Homicide Linked To Drug Use In The District of Columbia." CJSA Forum 7: 4-6. Washington, DC: Criminal Justice Statistics Association.
- Kinney, J. and Leaton, G. Loosening the Grip. St. Louis: Times Mirror.
- Klien, G. S. (1970) Perception, Motives, and Personality. New York: Knopf.
- Klockers, C. (1985) "The Dirty Harry Problem." Elliston, F. A. and Feldberg, M. Moral Issues in Police Work. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Allanheld. 55-71.
- Knapp, W. (1972) Chair. The Knapp Commission Report on Police Corruption. New York: Braziller.
- Knoke, D. and Burke, P. J. (1980). Log-Linear Models. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Kolb, L. (1925) "Drug Addiction and Its Relation To Crime." Mental Hygiene 9: 74-89.
- Kuhn, T. (1973) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: Univ. Chicago.
- Lachenmeyer, C. W. (1971) The Language of Sociology. New York: Columbia Univ.
- Lakoff G. and Johnson, M. (1980) Metaphor We Live By. Chicago: Univ. Chicago.
- Landis, J. R. and Koch, G. G. (1977) "The Measurement Of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data." Biometrics 33: 159-174.
- Langevin, R., Paitich, D., Orchard, B., Handy, L., and Russon, A. (1982) "The Role Of Alcohol, Drugs, Suicide Attempts and Situational Strains In Homicide Committed By Offenders Seen For Psychiatric Assessment." Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 66: 229-42.
- Larcom, J. (1982) "The Invention of Convention." Mankind 13: 330-337.
- Legge, J. D. (1958) Britain in Fiji, 1853-1880. London: Macmillan.

- Lavine, T. Z. (1953) "Note to Naturalists On The Human Spirit." Journal of Philosophy 15: .
- Leinen, S. (1984) Black Police/White Society. New York: New York Univ.
- Liebetrau, A. M. (1983). Measures of Association. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Lindesmith, A. and Strauss, A. L (1956). Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt-Dryden.
- Linnekin, J. S. (1983) "Defining Tradition: Variations on the Hawaiian Identity." American Ethnologist 10: 241-252.
- Loftin, C. (1986). "The Validity of Robbery-Murder Classifications in Baltimore." Violence and Victims 1: 191-203.
- , Kindley, K. Norris, S. L. and Wiersema, B. (1987) "An Attribute Approach To Relationships Between Offenders And Victims In Homicide." The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology 78: 480-489.
- Luckenbill, D. F. (1977) "Criminal Homicide as A Situated Transaction." Social Problems 25: 176-86.
- Lyman, S. M. and Scott, M. B. (1970) A Sociology of the Absurd. New York: Meredith.
- Malinowski, B. (1925) "Magic, Science and Religion." Needham, J. Ed. Science, Religion and Reality. New York: Macmillan.
- Mann, C. A. (1988) "Getting Even? Women Who Kill In Domestic Encounters." Justice Quarterly 5: 33-52.
- Manning, P. K. (1987) "The Ethnographic Conceit." Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 16: 49-68.
- , (1977) Police Work: The Social Organization of Policing. Cambridge: MIT.
- , (1978) "Lying, Secrecy and Social Control." Manning, P.K. and van Maanen, J. Eds.. Policing: A View From The Street. Santa Monica: Goodyear.
- , (1982) "Organization Work: Structuration Of Environments." British Journal of Sociology 33: 118-134.
- , (1980) The Narcs Game: Organizational and Informational Limits on Drug Law Enforcement. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Martz, L, Miller, M., Hutchinson, S., Emerson, T. and Washington, F. (1989) "A Tide of Drug Killing." Newsweek, 16 Jan: 44-5.
- Matza, D. (1969) Becoming Deviant. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

- Mc Bride, D. C. (1981). "Drugs and Violence." In Inciardi, J. A. Ed. The Drugs/Crime Connection Beverly Hills: Sage. 105-24.
- Mc Cauley, C. (1989) "The Nature Of Social Influence In Groupthink: Compliance and Internalization." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 57: 250-260.
- Megargee, E. I. (1982) "Psychological Determinants and Correlates of Criminal Violence." Wolfgang, M. E. and Weiner, N. A. Eds. Criminal Violence. Beverly Hills: Sage. 81-170.
- Mercy, J. A. and Saltzman, L. E. "Fatal Violence Among Spouses in the United States, 1976-85." American Journal of Public Health 79: 595-599.
- Merton, R. K. "The Sociology of Knowledge." Gurvitch, G. and Moore, W. Eds.. Twentieth Century Sociology. New York: The Philosophical Library. 366-405.
- Miller, E. M. (1986) Street Women. Philadelphia: Temple Univ.
- Miller, W. B. (1973) "Ideology and Criminal Justice Policy: Some Current Issues." The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 64: 141-162.
- Molotsky, I. (1988) "Capital's Homicide Rate Is At A Record." New York Times, 30 Oct.: A1+.
- Montefore, J. and Spitz, M. (1975) "Narcotics Abuse Among Homicides In Detroit." Journal of Forensic Sciences 20: 186-90.
- Moore, W. E. and Tumin, M. M. (1949) Some Social Functions of Ignorance." American Sociological Review XX: 787-795.
- Moran, A. (1971) "Criminal Homicide: External Restraint and Subculture of Violence." Criminology 8: 357-374.
- Muir, Jr., W. K. (1977) Police: Street Corner Politicians. Chicago: Univ. Chicago.
- Munford, R.S., Kazer, R., Feldman, R. and Stivers, R. (1976). "Homicide Trends In Atlanta." Criminology 14: 213-31.
- Muzzio, D. (1982) Watergate Games. New York: New York Univ..
- New York Times, 21 April , 1988: B1, B4.
- Parkinson, C. N. (1957) Parkinson's Law and Other Studies in Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Pareto, V. (1935) The Mind and Society. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Parsons, T. (1937) The Structure of Social Action. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

- Pearson, K. (1904). "Mathematical Contributions To the Theory of Evolution. On The Theory of Contingency and Its Relation to Association and Normal Correlation." Draper's Company Research Memoirs Biometric Series. London: Cambridge.
- Poggio, E. C., Kennedy, S. D. Chaiken, J. M. and Carlson, K. E. (1988) Blueprint for the Future of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.
- Pokorny, A. D. (1965) "A Comparison of Homicides in Two Cities." Journal of Criminal Law 56: 479-87.
- Powers, R. G. (1983) G-Men: Hoover's FBI in American Popular Culture. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois Univ..
- Preble, E. and Miller, T. (1977) "Methadone, Wine, And Welfare." Weppner, R. S. Ed. Street Ethnography: Selected Studies of Crime and Drug Use In Natural Settings. Beverly Hills: Sage. 229-248.
- , and Casey, Jr., J.J. (1969). Taking Care of Business-The Heroin User's Life on the Street. International Journal of the Addictions, 4.1, 1-24.
- Punch, M. (1984): The Divided Organization: Deviance, Conflict and Defense In Police Work. Police Studies 7.1: 3-18.
- Rabow, J. (1980) "Research and Rehabilitation: The Conflict of Scientific and Treatment Roles." Talarico, S.M. Ed. Corrections and Criminal Justice Research: Approaches, Problems and Policy. Cincinnati: Anderson: 237-254.
- Reidel, M. and Zahn, M. (1985) The Nature and Pattern of American Homicide. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Reiss, Jr., A. J. (1971) The Police and The Public. New Haven: Yale Univ.
- Rheingold, H. (1989) "On Language: Succinctly Spoken." New York Times, 27 Aug., sec.6: 18.
- Riddick, L. and Luke, J. L. (1978) "Alcohol Associated Deaths in the District of Columbia--A Postmortem Study." Journal of Forensic Sciences 23: 493-502.
- Rizzo, N. D. (1982) "Murder In Boston: Killers and Their Victims." International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 26.1: 42.
- Rubinstien, J. (1973) City Police. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Ryan, Patrick J. (1987) "Accountability, Discretion and the First-Line Supervisor." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology. Montreal, Canada: November.

- Sacks, H. (1972) "Notes on Police Assessment Of Moral Character." Sundow, D. Ed. Studies in Social Interaction. New York: Free. 280-293.
- Sanders, W. B. (1977) Detective Work: A Study of Criminal Investigations. New York: Free.
- Schlesinger, S. R. (1985) "Redesign of the National Crime Survey and the Uniform Crime Reporting Program." Woodworth, G. G. Ed. Proceedings of the Third Workshop . . . : 1-5.
- Schwartz, W. F., Baxter, K. and Ryan, D. (1984) "The Duel: Can These Gentlemen Be Acting Efficiently?" Journal of Legal Studies 13: 321-55.
- Scimecca, J. A. and Lee, S. (1978) "Paradigm Shifts In Criminology and Deviance: A Sociology of Knowledge Approach." Flynn, E. and Conrad, J. P. The New and the Old Criminology. New York: Praeger. 39-49.
- Senray, E. C., and Wettstein, R. (1983) "Drugs and Homicide: A Theory." Drug and Alcohol Dependence 12: 137-66.
- Shellow, R. (1976a) "Drug Abuse and Crime: Fact or Fancy?" Journal of Drug Issues 6: 131-147.
- , (1976b) Chairman, Drug Causes and Crime. Report of the Panel On Drug Use and Criminal Behavior, Research Triangle Group.
- Simmel, G. (1964) The Sociology of Georg Simmel. New York: Free.
- Simpson, A. E. (1988) "Dandelions on the Field of Honor: Dueling, the Middle Classes, and the Law in Nineteenth-Century England." Criminal Justice History 9: 99-155.
- , (1977) The Literature Of Police Corruption. Vol I. New York: John Jay Press.
- Skolnick, J. (1986) Justice Without Trial. 2nd Ed. New York: Macmillan.
- , (1982) "Deception By Police." Criminal Justice Ethics 1.2: 40-54.
- Solso, R. L. (1979) Cognitive Psychology. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich.
- Spitzer, R. L., Cohen, J., Fleiss, J. L. and Endicott, J. (1967) "Quantification of Agreement In Psychiatric Diagnosis." Archives of General Psychiatry 17: 83-87.
- Stammer, O. Ed. (1971) Deutscher Soziologentag 15th, 1964: Heidelberg, Germany. 'Max Weber and Sociology Today'. Trans. Morris, K. New York: Harper and Row.

- Starbuck, W. H. (1982) "Congealing Oil: Inventing Ideologies to Justify Acting Ideologies Out." Journal of Management Studies 19: 3-27.
- Stark M. J. A., Raine, W. J. Burbeck, S. L. and Davis K. K. (1974) "Some Empirical Patterns in A Riot Process." American Sociological Review 39: 865-876.
- Stephens, R. C. and Ellis, R. D. (1975) "Narcotic Addicts and Crime: Analysis of Recent Trends." Criminology 12: 474-88.
- Stoddard, E. R. (1968) "The 'Informal Code' of Police Deviance: A Group Approach to 'Blue Coat'". Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 59: 201-213.
- Sundow, D. (1964) "Normal Crimes: Sociological Features of the Penal Code In A Public Defenders Office." Social Problems :256-276.
- Sykes, G. W. (1985) "The Functional Nature of Police Reform: The 'Myth' of Controlling the Police." Justice Quarterly 2: 51-65.
- Taylor, S. (1956) Conceptions of Institutions and the Theory of Knowledge. New York: Bookman Associates.
- Tschuprow, A. A. (1939) Principles of the Mathematical Theory of Correlation. New York: Hodge.
- Vaillant, G. E. (1971) "A Twelve-year Follow-up of New York Narcotic Addicts: The Relation of Treatment To Outcome." American Journal of Psychiatry 127: 90-95.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988) Tales of the Field. Chicago: Univ. Chicago.
- , (1978) "The Asshole" Manning, P. K. and Van Maanen, J. Eds.. Policing: A View From The Street. Santa Monica: Goodyear.
- Virkkunen, M. (1974) "Alcohol As A Factor Precipitating Aggression and Conflict Behaviour Leading To Homicide." British Journal of Addictions 69: 149-154.
- Voss, H. L. and Hepburn, J. R. (1968) "Patterns in Criminal Homicide in Chicago." Journal of Criminal Law 59: 499-508.
- Wagner, H. R. (1970) Ed. Alfred Schutz On Phenomenology and Social Relations. Chicago: Univ. Chicago.
- Weishelt, R. A. (1984) "Female Homicide Offenders: Trends Over Time In An Institutionalized Population." Justice Quarterly 1: 471-89.
- Wickelgren, W. A. (1979) Cognitive Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

- Wiesmann, J. C. (1982) "Understanding the Drugs and Crime Connection." Wiesmann, J. C. and Du Pont, R. L. Eds.. Criminal Justice And Drugs: The Unsolved Connection. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat. 8 42-73.
- , Marr, S. W. and Katsampes, P. L. (1976) "Addiction and Criminal Behavior: A Continuing Examination of Criminal Addicts." Journal of Drug Issues 6: 153-165
- Wilcox, D. E. (1986) "Characteristics Of 71 Convicted Murderers." American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry 7: 48-52.
- Wilford, J. N. (1990) "Anthropology Seen as Father Of Maori Lore." New York Times, Feb. 20: C1+.
- Wilkes, J. (1987) "Murder In Mind." Psychology Today x: 27-32.
- Williams, K. R. and Flewelling, R. L. (1987) "Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger Homicide: Alternative Procedures For Rate Calculation." Criminology 25: 543-560.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1978) Varieties of Police Behavior. Cambridge: Harvard Univ.
- , (1978) The Investigators. New York: Basic Books.
- Wish, E. D. (1987) "Drug Use In Arrestees In Manhattan: The Dramatic Increase In Cocaine From 1984 to 1986." New York: Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc.
- Wolff, C. (1988) "As Drug Trade Rises In Hartford, So Does Violent Crime." New York Times, 24 June: A1+.
- Wolfgang, M. (1958) Patterns in Criminal Homicide. Montclair: Patterson Smith 1975.
- , and Ferracuti, F. (1967) "Subculture of Violence - A Socio-Physchological Theory." Wolfgang, M. Ed. Studies in Homicide. New York: Harper and Row. 272-280.
- Woodworth, G. G. (1985) Ed. Proceedings of the Third Workshop On Law and Justice. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.
- Zahn, M. A. and Bencivengo, M. (1974) "Violent Death: A Comparison Between Drug Users and Non-Drug Users." Addictive Diseases 1: 283-96.
- Zahn, M. A. (1975) "The Female Homicide Victim." Criminology 13: 400-15.