

Crime & Delinquency

October 1992, Volume 38 Issue 4, p. 477, 15 p., 4 charts

By Robert MacCoun and Peter Reuter

ARE THE WAGES OF SIN \$30 AN HOUR? ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF STREET-LEVEL DRUG DEALING

One hundred and eighty-six probationers in Washington, D.C., who acknowledged a recent history of drug dealing were interviewed regarding their legitimate and illegitimate activities. They reported median net earnings of \$721 per month from drug sales - \$2,000 per month among the 37% who reported selling drugs on a daily basis. These figures compare with median monthly earnings of \$800 from legitimate employment for the 75% who reported such earnings. Street-level drug dealing appears to be a complement to, rather than a substitute for, legitimate employment, and it appears to be less profitable than media reports would suggest.

As the drug problem has become more visible, the apparent explosion of involvement in drug distribution by young urban males has received considerable attention. The public generally sees drug dealing as enormously lucrative, even at the lowest levels of the trade; the media regularly report earnings of hundreds of dollars a day for young, poorly educated sellers.[1] The trade's financial attractions are seen as a primary reason why the drug problem is proving so intractable; with such large earnings available, many young males will continue to sell, even at very high risk of imprisonment.

All these concerns rest on beliefs about the high returns available to young persons from street dealing and about the numbers and characteristics of persons involved in drug distribution. Yet the evidence about earnings levels is almost entirely anecdotal, and some of that evidence is decidedly contrary. For example, a recent New York Times article ("Despite Its Promises" 1989) asserted that crack dealing had become the sweatshop for urban minorities in the late 1980s, with lower level employees barely earning minimum wage from their involvement and spending much of what they did earn on their own drug needs. This statement strongly contradicts much of the Times' earlier reporting.[2] Whether this contrast represents a deterioration of the market (from the sellers' point of view) or simply the vagaries of reporters' sampling cannot be determined.

In addition, no one has estimated either the total number of drug dealers in a community or the share of particular population groups involved in drug distribution. Young minority males may dominate the visible population of crack dealers, but this fact does not show either that crack dealing is an occupation of a substantial fraction of this same population group or that drug dealing (perhaps in less conspicuous settings and involving other drugs) does not heavily involve other groups.

This article provides some results from a study of drug dealers in Washington, D.C. That study, reported in detail in Reuter, MacCoun, and Murphy (1990), described the population of persons charged with drug selling and developed a rough estimate of the size of the population engaged

in street dealing in the District of Columbia in 1988. We very briefly summarize those findings here but devote most of the article to our results concerning the earnings of drug dealers and how that drug dealing fits into their economic life. (For a similar study conducted in New York City, see Fagan 1992.)

Unfortunately, no compelling method exists for enumerating the population of drug distributors. We were, however, able to obtain data from the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency (PSA) which at least allowed us to count the individuals charged with drug selling and other offenses between 1985 and 1987 and to describe criminal careers and other characteristics of persons charged with drug-selling offenses in the District.

We estimated that 14,544 different adults were charged with drug distribution during the 3-year period, 79% of them District residents. The remainder of this summary focuses on their characteristics.

The PSA data showed that a substantial fraction of young, poorly educated African-American males were involved in drug selling. The population of adult District residents charged with drug selling was predominantly male (88%), young (40% were age 18-24), and African-American (99%). These percentages were all larger than the same percentages for other offenses. We estimated that about one out of six African-American males born in 1967 (i.e. age 18-20 between 1985 and 1987) was charged with a drug-selling offense. If drug-possession offenses are included, then one out of five was charged with some drug offense. As compared to other criminal offenders, those charged with drug distribution were younger and less likely to have completed high school.

DATA COLLECTION[3]

To obtain data on earnings from the drug trade, we sought a sample of males who had current or recent involvement in the drug trade. We explored several possible sampling frames, including drug treatment programs, prisons, and general population surveys in high-risk neighborhoods; we abandoned these either as presenting very skewed populations (for example, persons in drug treatment are older than the drug-dealing population and are probably more involved with heroin) or as posing a high risk to interviewers and being costly (finding dealers in the general population).

We therefore approached the Social Services Division of the District of Columbia Superior Court, which administers probation programs. From previous work we knew that large numbers of drug dealers were sentenced to terms of supervised probation.[4] The setting of probation presented fewer problems for conducting personal interviews; the complexity of the information we sought made carrying out the interviews with a written questionnaire infeasible, particularly given a relatively poorly educated set of respondents.

The field staff were experienced interviewers from the Washington area; all were African-American and all but one were female. Interviewers initially approached potential respondents to obtain a screening interview, the purpose of which was to establish whether the individual had earned money from selling drugs (broadly defined) in the 6 months before probation. Self-

reported drug selling rather than a recent conviction for drug distribution determined eligibility, along with demographic requirements (age 18-40, male, resident in the District of Columbia). The field staff approached a total of 524 persons, 219 of whom did not meet eligibility requirements and 119 of whom did not complete the interview for a variety of reasons. We completed 186 interviews. Respondents received \$15 for completing interviews, averaging approximately one hour in length.

We interviewed the majority of our respondents (75%) at the onset of their probationary period. The remaining respondents were interviewed between 1 and 12 months after the onset of probation, with a median delay of some 2 months.[5] Our survey questions focused primarily on the 6-month period before the onset of probation, which we refer to as the target period. We expected this time period to be wide enough to capture a significant amount of criminal activity, yet recent enough to minimize recall problems.[6]

RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

The sample consisted of 186 male residents of Washington, D.C., between the ages of 18 and 40 who were currently on probation and had obtained income from selling drugs in the 6 months before entering probation. Most (71%) of our respondents reported that they had always lived in the District; 97% were African-American, and the mean and median age was 27 years. Probation sentences ranged from 5 to 60 months: most (61%) were for 12 months or less. Although it was not a sampling criterion, the majority of offenders (76%) were on probation for a drug offense—30% for drug selling or manufacturing.

Almost all respondents were single, but only 6% reported that they lived alone; 70% named parents or other relatives as the head of household. Ninety-one percent reported living in a private house, apartment building, or boarding house; fewer than 10% reported living in a housing project or a halfway house or shelter. One fourth of the respondents reported that they did not contribute to monthly housing expenses. More of them reported monthly clothing expenses (perhaps because that is generally an individual rather than household expenditure), and the expected value and median for clothing were both higher than those for housing.

Education and Employment History

As seen in Table 1, approximately two thirds of the sample reported having received at least a high school diploma or an equivalent degree. Persons in the 18-24 age category were significantly less likely to have completed high school. This finding reflects the low completion rates for 18- and 19-year-olds, 62% of whom had not completed high school. Only 5% of that group were currently enrolled in some form of educational program; the rest appear to be true dropouts.

Overall, 64% of the sample were currently employed at a legitimate job, and 60% reported working 5 or more days a week.[7] The typical reported hourly wage among currently employed respondents was \$7. Most employed respondents described their occupations in terms

classifiable as either skilled labor or sales and service. The hourly wage rates and occupational categories suggest a population that is doing relatively well in the labor force, given its educational attainments.

Criminal Histories

We asked respondents to list any arrests or convictions for more than 20 different criminal offenses; we combined these offenses into the categories presented in Table 2.

Given that we included only probationers who admitted earning income from illicit drugs during the target period, it is not surprising that our respondents were more likely to have been arrested and convicted of drug offenses than nondrug offenses. However, many respondents had a history of nondrug crimes, particularly property crimes. One third reported a nondrug arrest in the target period, but only 6% reported arrest for a violent crime in that same time. The first drug arrest occurred at a relatively late age: 24 for drug possession and 25 for drug selling, compared to approximately 20 for nondrug offenses. This finding is suggestive of the increasing importance of drug offenses in recent years.

We also asked whether the individual had participated in particular kinds of offenses during the target period. Only 2% reported involvement in violent crime during the target period, though one in five reported prior violent crime. About a third reported property crime during the target period, and over half reported a history of property crime.

Drug-Selling Activity

Each of the men in our sample acknowledged having earned income from the distribution of illicit drugs during the target period, which was a requirement for sample eligibility. Some 79% of the respondents earned income from selling either crack (25%) or powdered cocaine (34%) or both (20%); 30% had earned income from PCP sales, 20% from heroin, and 18% from marijuana. Only a few respondents reported earning income from the distribution of methadone or other drugs. The mean number of different drugs generating income for respondents was 1.7; 55% of the sample reported selling only a single drug.

We asked respondents to describe how frequently they participated in drug-selling activity; to simplify our presentation, we have collapsed the responses into three levels. As seen at the top of Table 3, few differences occurred across drug specialties in the frequency of sales activity--most respondents reported selling drugs on a weekly basis, usually more than once per week. Marijuana differed from the other drugs in the low percentage of persons reporting full-time sales activities.[8]

To learn more about the activities involved in the street-level drug markets, we asked respondents several detailed questions about the last day they actively participated in the distribution of their most profitable drug.[9] We summarize their responses in Table 3. The typical respondent spent only 3 hours participating in drug distribution activities, suggesting again that this was not a full-time activity for most respondents.[10] Marijuana distribution appears particularly casual, with a median of a single hour per day, consistent with the fact that

relatively few sellers reported daily selling of that drug. Respondents typically reported some 13 sales per day across all drugs--a rate of approximately 4 sales per hour. In general, sellers made 1 sale per customer, although cocaine and heroin customers were somewhat more likely to return twice in the same day.

Most respondents did not manufacture the drugs they distributed. Approximately half reported keeping some of the drugs they were distributing for their own consumption, although usually only "a little of it." More than half the heroin and marijuana dealers kept some drugs for their own use, whereas only about a third of the crack, cocaine, and PCP dealers did so. Very few nonusers market heroin for reasons we discuss in Reuter et al. (1990, Section 2); this finding explains the high percentage who report retaining some of the drug, but why so few retain half is less clear. Additional data on respondents' personal drug consumption appear later in this section.

We asked respondents whether they were hired by others to help distribute drugs and whether they themselves hired others to assist them. We created a four-level classification that roughly captures the organizational structure of our respondents' drug-dealing operations. Considerable variation occurred across drugs. Almost half of the respondents reported that they worked alone. This was most common among marijuana dealers, as one might expect given the small amount of capital necessary to operate in the retail end of that market. Crack, cocaine, and PCP dealers who worked with others were as likely to be hired by them as to have hired them, but more than half the heroin dealers were hired by others; one third of these were middlemen in a chain of command.

Legal and Illegal Sources of Income

As documented in Reuter et al. (1990, Section 6), selling illicit drugs in urban street markets is a very risky business; we estimated that dealers spent about one third of their time in prison and faced a 1.4% annual risk of death--an order of magnitude above the already high homicide rate for young African-American males. Why would anyone endure such risks? One popular and intuitively plausible hypothesis is that individuals are attracted to street dealing as a means of compensating for inadequate opportunities for legitimate employment. Although this survey was not designed to test the causal relationship between legitimate employment and criminal activity, our data are inconsistent with the hypothesis that individuals are driven to street dealing by sheer economic necessity--by an inability to secure a minimally adequate level of income through legitimate means.

Eighty-two percent of our respondents reported receiving some form of legitimate income during the target period.[11] As seen in Table 5, total legitimate income, averaged across all respondents, was approximately \$850 per month; the vast bulk of this came from a legitimate job or business. Legitimate earnings for these respondents represent approximately 133% to 150% of the poverty line. Across respondents, the major source of legitimate income came from legitimate jobs or businesses, as opposed to transfer payments from family or social programs. The percentage reporting earned legitimate income (75%) is somewhat higher than our previously reported 64% employment rate, because 11% who were not currently employed reported income from a job they had held earlier in the target period. The mean reported earnings per month of those who were employed is well above the minimum wage level for a 40-hour

week, though lower than we would expect from full-time work at the hourly earnings we reported earlier.

To assess illegal income, we asked respondents to estimate the amount of money they had earned during the target period as a result of various different illegal activities. Ten of these activities involved nondrug-related crimes; the remainder involved drug sales (manufacturing drugs, selling drugs for yourself and/or others, carrying drugs between a buyer and a seller, finding customers for a seller, directing a customer to a seller, and other activities that help to make, move, and sell drugs for yourself and others). We combined these into two subtotals: nondrug criminal income and gross income from drug-selling activity (see Table 4).

In addition to gross drug income, Table 4 also contains our estimates of net drug income, which we derived by subtracting from gross earnings respondents' self-reported drug-business expenses (see Reuter et al. 1990, Section 4).[12] The 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles indicate that the typical respondent grossed about \$1,300 a month from drug selling during the target period; the typical small earner, about \$300; the typical large earner, about \$3,700. Of course, the estimated net earnings are more modest: about \$700 per month for the typical dealer in our sample, \$25 for the typical small earner, and \$2,500 for the typical large earner. Because the income data are skewed, the mean estimates are inflated and are less descriptive of the typical dealer's income.

The striking feature of the data in Table 4 is that drug-selling income is so much greater than earnings either from other crimes or from legitimate sources (though we must remember that the sample is one of self-admitted drug dealers). But for the approximately one third who reported involvement in nondrug income-generating crime, drug-crime earnings were more than an order of magnitude greater than earnings from other crimes. Mean drug earnings were also twice as large as legitimate earnings for those with income from a legitimate job or business. The total income, taking into account all sources, was very substantial, with a median of \$1,647 per month. The mean income was about twice as high at \$2,863; persons who succeed in drug selling make very large incomes indeed, particularly when we take into account their income from all sources.

We can use the reported number of hours per day along with the monthly earnings to estimate sellers' hourly earnings. If we assume that those who sold daily operate 22 days per month and sell for 3 hours per day (the median we report in Table 4), then the typical (median) number of hours per month is 66. With median net earnings of \$2,000 per month for daily sellers, we arrive at an hourly wage of nearly \$30-- approximately four times the sample median hourly wage from legitimate employment. Note that this calculation of hours does not make allowance for other time necessary for the selling activity, such as that required to obtain the drugs for sale or to do any packaging. Also, although sellers averaged \$30 an hour during the hours they actually spent selling drugs, they would probably average far less per hour selling on a full-time, 40-hour-a-week basis, for reasons we discuss at the end of this section.

Personal Drug-Consumption Patterns

Every respondent had used an illicit drug other than or in addition to marijuana. Most respondents had tried more than one drug. The most popular drugs were marijuana (77%) and

cocaine (72%), followed by crack (52%) and PCP (54%); relatively few respondents had tried heroin (33%) or methadone (7%).

During the target period, 79% reported use of some illicit drug; the mean number of drugs used was 1.70 (median, 2; standard deviation, 1.36).[13] If we exclude marijuana, 71% used an illicit drug during that period. The most frequently used drugs per week were heroin and methadone. However, when crack was being used, it was used the most frequently per day (more than three times for 40% of the crack users), followed by other forms of cocaine. Marijuana and PCP were consumed less frequently, and our three methadone users got one dose a day, every day.

Just over half the respondents reported spending money for personal drug consumption during the target period. Among those who did, the median monthly expenditure was \$400, with a mean of \$1,596; this comprised some 28% of net monthly drug income, or 20% of total monthly income. However, some respondents reported spending more on personal drugs in a month than they earned from drug sales.

CAVEATS

Naturally, we were concerned about problems of selection bias and the reliability and validity of responses. Our examination of these issues is reported elsewhere (Reuter et al. 1990, Appendix c), but we can briefly summarize our conclusions here. First, we compared our survey sample to the District of Columbia's PSA data on the population of individuals charged with drug selling in 1985-1987. The samples match quite closely with regard to age, race, and employment, but our respondents tended to be somewhat better educated. Second, within our sample of self-identified drug dealers, respondents who had never been arrested for a drug offense did not differ in their demographic characteristics, drug-dealing frequency, or drug-dealing income from those who had been arrested for a drug offense, although our survey may not generalize to dealers who completely evade the criminal justice system. The sample is probably most representative of the population involved in selling in exposed settings; it undoubtedly underrepresents individuals selling in covert settings like dormitories or work settings.

Our estimates of income from drug dealing are based on self-reports that are vulnerable to distortion through memory loss, and perhaps even through systematic exaggeration or underreporting. Comparisons to official statistics indicated that self-reported arrest and conviction histories were generally accurate and often more extensive than probation unit records, although some discrepancies that appeared to result from definitional differences existed (for example, what constituted "intent to distribute"). Reports of drug income were somewhat, but not completely, internally consistent across different interview questions. The income data are much softer than typical data used in economic analysis, but we are measuring income from covert, serious criminal activity, and to our knowledge, better estimates are unavailable and would be quite difficult to obtain.

We are confident that our estimates are more reliable than the anecdotal figures that often appear in the media. Thus, although our estimates likely contain some error, we believe that our statistics probably indicate the general magnitude of drug-selling income for full-time street dealers in Washington, D.C. That is, the typical net monthly figure is probably in the high

hundreds or low thousands of dollars, but almost certainly not in either the low hundreds on the one extreme or the tens of thousands on the other.

CONCLUSIONS

Among dealers who are caught by the criminal justice system, drug selling is indeed a much more profitable activity than that same population's legitimate occupations, both on an hourly basis and in total monthly earnings. Persons who sold daily reported median monthly gross earnings of \$3,600 and monthly net earnings of \$2,000; even this latter figure is more than twice what the same respondents might have expected to earn from full-time legitimate employment. Nor did they sell for many hours on days they sold at all. Many sold on only a part-time basis and earned correspondingly smaller, but still substantial, amounts.

Though more lucrative than their legitimate employment, drug dealing still did not launch this population on a path to high incomes. The money reported here is not the stuff from which Mercedes are purchased. Higherlevel dealers may indeed make extraordinary incomes, as were reported in 1989 during the trial of a leading Washington figure, Rayful Edmond. But for each one of those, the pyramidal nature of drug dealing ensures that there are many hundreds earning the much more modest incomes reported by our sample.

Drug dealing appears to be a far more financially rewarding activity than other crimes. This assessment is based on the figures we report here and an analysis of incomes from other crimes, reported in Reuter et al. (1990, Appendix D). Most property crimes yield no more than \$300 per offense, and many yield a great deal less; committing a sufficient number to generate a monthly income of more than \$3,000, though not impossible, requires a great deal of energy and luck. Previous studies of individual earnings from property crime, though mostly by the drug dependent (more committed but perhaps less skillful), point to earnings of less than half those reported by the active drug dealers in our sample.

The finding that most persons charged with drug selling are currently employed is somewhat perplexing. If drug selling is so profitable, why maintain a legitimate job as well--particularly one with a relatively modest wage? Understanding this phenomenon may have some policy relevance; we offer here some speculations.

First, consider the possibility that the job is used to limit current drug-selling risks (that is, those who want to keep their risks moderate combine legitimate employment with drug selling). In fact, persons who sell frequently are more likely than occasional sellers to have a job. Observation suggests the possibility that drug selling is complementary to legitimate employment. Such is the case for some other crimes, such as larceny, where employment (for example, as a store clerk) can provide improved opportunities for criminal activities. If work and drug selling are complementary, though, the nature of the relationship is probably different. These drug sellers are generally apprehended selling in settings unlikely to be associated with their employment; we cannot, however, discount the possibility that they sell in the workplace. Second, the job may be a form of risk diversification. If the risks of drug selling--and the prospect of being unable to continue that career for very long--are salient, dealers may also wish to have developed a legitimate skill that can provide a reasonable source of income after their

dealing career ends. Having a job may also help when a dealer is convicted and faces sentencing: currently employed persons are likely to receive lighter sentences.[14]

Perhaps a more useful way of viewing the relationship of drug dealing and legitimate work is to see that the former provides an underground form of "moonlighting" for poorly educated urban males- an opportunity for a few hours of more highly paid work to supplement their primary jobs. In particular, drug dealing may provide the kinds of employment opportunities, in terms of working infrequent hours, that college students derive from waiting tables in restaurants.

Few dealers in our sample reported working long hours at drug selling. Even those who reported dealing on a daily basis sold only an average of 4 hours per day. This may reflect the fact that the market for drugs probably has sharp hourly peaks. Few transactions occur during daylight hours; most buyers may seek to purchase in the early part of the evening. Thus, the opportunities to make high hourly earnings may be quite restricted.

This may also explain why many dealers sell only 1 or 2 days each week. Demand may be much higher on weekends or on paydays than on other days, offering narrow time slots with highly paid activity. Those who want to obtain high hourly earnings may have to be very selective about the days on which they sell. Comparisons of current earnings per hour from dealing with those available from legitimate work may be misleading because marginal dealing hours have a much lower return than the current average. Dealers who try to turn drug selling into a full-time activity will frequently find themselves in conspicuous isolation (i.e., at high risk of arrest and with few income generating opportunities).

The finding of reasonably high employment rates is disturbing. It suggests that creating jobs, even relatively high-paying jobs, may do little to reduce willingness to participate in drug markets, at least in Washington, D.C. Certainly those who were most heavily involved in drug selling reported earnings from legitimate employment that were well above the minimum level.

NOTES

1. See, for example, Time, May 9, 1988, pp. 21-33.
2. See, for example, "Crack at Retail: Experiences of Three Former Dealers," August 2, 1988, p. B1.
3. A more complete description of the data collection procedures, analyses, and results appears in Reuter et al. (1990, Section 4 and Appendices B and c).
4. Probation was the most frequent outcome for drug-trafficking convictions nationally in the mid-1980s. Cunniff (1986, p. 3) reports probation imposed at sentencing for 70% of drug trafficking convictions. This was more frequent than larceny (55%), burglary (45%), robbery (29%), rape (28%), or homicide (14%). By 1988 the distribution had changed, with 70% receiving either prison (44%) or jail (26%).

5. We were unable to detect significant relationships between the length of time from the target period to the interview and any of the major survey responses reported here.
6. Some 83% of our sample had spent time in jail during the target period; the typical stay was for about 3 days. This reduction in time at risk had little effect on our results.
7. This employment rate closely matches the 67% rate for the PSA population of charged drug sellers residing in the District during the same period.
8. Respondents reporting earnings from marijuana sales were less specialized than were other respondents. They sold a greater variety of drugs in the target period (mean = 2.35 drugs, median = 2) than did non marijuana dealers (mean = 1.55 drugs, median = 1); $t(183) = 4.30$, $p < .0001$. Marijuana may be sold as a complementary product.
9. We specifically asked most respondents to exclude the day they were arrested.
10. Analysis of hours spent selling, number of different customers, and sales per day failed to yield any significant differences among respondents classified by frequency of selling. In other words, heavy sellers did not report selling for longer hours or to more customers on the last day of selling. Frequent sellers simply sell on more days.
11. The licit and illicit income data were skewed by some extremely high outliers. We were unable to validate these responses and cannot be certain that they are not valid, but they distort the aggregate statistics. Rather than dropping the extreme cases, we opted to "Winsorize" the distribution, replacing the three most extreme values by the fourth most extreme value. This method has the virtue of representing these cases as extremes, but attenuating their effect on the moments of the distribution (see, for example, Winer 1971).
12. Almost half (46%) of the respondents were apparently working on commission for others and reported no business expenses; for them, gross and net income were the same. The other half (54%) reported median monthly drug-business expenses of \$1,064 (mean = \$3,272), the bulk of which went to drug wholesalers further up the chain.
13. Dealers (especially crack and heroin dealers) tended to use the same drug they sold. Similarly, dealers of multiple drugs tended to use multiple drugs.
14. Such farsighted behavior would suggest that dealers would also make more effort to accumulate assets. However, the uncertainties of freedom and asset preservation (whether from the government or other participants) may limit even the farsighted dealer from asset accumulation.

TABLE 1: Education and Employment History (in percentages)

Characteristic	Age Category			
	18-24 (n = 69)	25-30 (n = 53)	31-40 (n = 64)	Full Sample (N = 186)
Education[a]				
Had not completed				
high school	43	28	25	33
High school diploma/GED	54	61	65	60
Associate's degree	3	2	8	5
Bachelor's degree	0	8	2	3
Legitimately employed	59	74	62	64
Median hourly wage (\$) [a]	5.00	6.00	8.00	7.00
If unemployed, ever held				
legitimate job?	89	100	100	95

a. Statistically significant association with age category, $p < .05$.

TABLE 2: Self-Reported ATtest and Conviction History

Legend for chart:

A - Ever Arrested (%)
 B - Mean Arrests
 C - Mean Age First Arrest
 D - Ever Convicted (%)
 E - Mean Convictions
 F - Current Probation (%)

Type of Offense	A	B	C	D	E	F
Drug crime	84	1.6	24.2	77	1.2	76
Possession	68	1.2	24.0	62	0.9	53
Sale/manufacture	27	0.4	25.0	23	0.3	30
Nondrug crime	64	2.6	20.3	50	1.4	27
Violent	27	0.5	21.7	17	0.3	5
Property	44	1.3	20.4	31	0.7	14
Other	36	0.8	22.2	20	0.4	8

TABLE 3: Sales Activity, by Major Drug

Legend for chart:

- A - All
- B - Crack
- C - Cocaine
- D - PCP
- E - Marijuana
- F - Heroin

Characteristic	Drug Sold					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Participation frequency (%)						
Daily	37	41	39	37	21	38
Several days/week	40	39	41	37	43	31
1 day/week or less	23	20	20	27	36	31
Median hours spent selling[a]	3	4	4	3	1	4
Median No. sales[a]	13	16	15	10	4	14
Median No. customers[a]	12	15	12	11	3	10
Manufacturers (%)	12	11	12	23	0	0
Kept drug for self (%)	41	39	33	36	56	69
Half or more	11	11	12	13	6	6
Less than half	30	28	21	23	50	63
Hire or hired (%)						
Work alone	48	46	45	57	75	25
Hired others	22	21	21	27	19	19
Middleman (both)	8	11	10	0	0	19
Hired by others	22	21	24	17	6	38
Number per column	182	61	59	30	16	16

a. On last day of selling.

TABLE 4: Monthly Income (in dollars)

Legend for chart:

A - Source
 B - 25th
 C - 50th
 D - 75th
 E - Mean
 F - Standard Deviation

	Percentile				
A	B	C	D	E	F
Nondrug criminal income	0	0	50	215	702
Gross income from drug-selling activity	300	1,333	3,733	3,558	5,901
Net income from drug-selling activity[a]	25	721	2,500	1,799	5,299
Total criminal income	33	833	2,617	2,015	5,363
Total legal income	237	715	1,000	849	1,060
Total income (legal and illegal sources)	836	1,647	3,830	2,863	5,733

a. Gross drug-selling income minus total drug-business expenses.

REFERENCES

Cuniff, Mark. 1986. A Sentencing Postscript: Felony Probationers Under Supervision in the Community. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

"Despite Its Promises of Riches, the Crack Track Seldom Pays." New York Times, November 26, 1989, p. A1.

Fagan, Jeffrey. 1992. "Drug Selling and Licit Income in Distressed Neighborhoods: The Economic Lives of Street-Level Drug Users and Dealers." In *Drugs, Crime, and Social Isolation*, edited by George Peterson and Adele Harrell. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Reuter, Peter, Robert MacCoun, and Patrick Murphy. 1990. *Money From Crime: A Study of the Economics of Drug Dealing in Washington, D.C. (R-3894-RF)*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Winer, Ben J. 1971. *Statistical Principles in Experimental Design*, 2nd ed New York: McGrawHill.

Copyright of **Crime & Delinquency** is the property of Sage Publications Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.