CRIME AND JUSTICE
Bulletin

NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research

Contemporary Issues in Crime and Justice | Number 49

March 2000

Drug Use Among Police Detainees

Toni Makkai[1], Jacqueline Fitzgerald and Peter Doak

The extent to which individuals who are detained by the police are drug users is a matter of policy significance as drug using offenders commit disproportionately more crime than their non-drug using colleagues. In this study the level and type of drug use amongst a sample of detainees from two Local Area Commands in Sydney are examined. This study improves upon prior work by validating self-reported drug use with urinalysis results. The urinalysis results indicate that cannabis and opiates are the most commonly used drugs with 53 per cent testing positive to the former and 43 per cent testing positive to the latter. Only 8 per cent tested positive to amphetamines. Just under one-third of those detained for a violent offence and 55 per cent of those charged with a property offence tested positive to opiates. In total 75 per cent tested positive to at least one drug. Promoting treatment diversion options should be a priority for governments keen to break the nexus between drugs and crime.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the 1990s, crime rates have climbed along with a number of drug indicators such as opioid overdoses. While illicit drug use is frequently cited as an antecedent to the rises in recorded crime statistics, further empirical evidence is required to support this claim. In order to determine the severity of the drug problem amongst the criminally active population, it is essential to measure the prevalence of illicit drug use amongst this group. This involves an understanding of issues related to both the extent and the nature of illicit drug use.

The Drug Use Monitoring in Australia (DUMA) project has been designed to complement existing national illicit drug use collections while providing data at a local level for local initiatives (Makkai 1999a). It seeks to measure drug use amongst people who have been detained and brought to a police station for charging, regardless of offence. More specifically, DUMA provides information from people closest to the streets – detainees yet to be incarcerated – who are of primary interest to law enforcement.

On a quarterly basis, voluntary confidential interviews and urine specimens are collected; these data are analysed to provide estimates of drug use in this high-risk sub-group. The program is designed to provide regular and timely data to fill a crucial gap in Australia's intelligence on the drug-crime nexus.

DUMA incorporates two data collection vehicles – a questionnaire and urinalysis testing. The interview component of the study is designed to elicit two sets of data: basic drug-use behaviour and demographic data. The urinalysis can determine objectively if the detainee has used drugs recently. The national project includes data collection at two NSW sites, Bankstown and Parramatta Local Area Commands (see Makkai 1999b for further details).

This report gives an overview of the results from the two NSW sites to date. There have been two periods of data collection in NSW. The first data collection extended from 7 June 1999 to 16 July 1999. The second NSW data collection was carried out from 11 October 1999 to 21 November 1999. The results of both collections are included in this report.

DUMA METHODOLOGY

All detainees brought to the facilities over the designated period are asked to participate in the study. Data are collected from both males and females.

Three conditions prevail in selecting the sample:

- Detainees must not have been held in custody for longer than 48 hours.
- Detainees who are unfit for interview due to alcohol/drugs/medication, or who are considered mentally disordered or potentially violent are excluded.
- Detainees deemed ineligible at the discretion of the custody sergeant or officer in charge are excluded.

Not all people arrested are brought to the police station. The police in each jurisdiction have the option to issue a notice to attend the court (or equivalent) instead of bringing the person to the station. Normally, these 'notices' would be for minor offending. For practical reasons, there is not a 24-hour coverage of the police station and only one interviewer is on site. The time of the collection is tailored to reflect local conditions and to maximise the number of interviewees by targeting periods

when the station is busy. As a result of these factors the sample may not be statistically representative of all persons detained.

To date there have been 379 persons interviewed for the DUMA study in NSW. Table 1 shows the number of respondents from each location in each collection period.

The interviews have been evenly distributed between the two sites (Parramatta 53.0%, Bankstown 47.0%) and over the two data collection periods (first 48.8%, second 51.2%).

Table 2 shows the number of persons interviewed who provided samples for urinalysis, those who refused to provide samples and those who agreed but were unable to produce a sample. Note that persons whose questionnaires were incomplete could not participate in the urinalysis.

The urinalysis component of the DUMA project is important as it enables verification of participants' self-reported drug use. Not all subjects, however, supplied a urine sample. The response rate to the urinalysis testing was 56.2 per cent of persons interviewed. Of those that did not supply a urine sample, 83.1 per cent refused, 13.9 per cent could not produce a sample and 3.0 per cent could not participate due to their questionnaire being incomplete. The Parramatta site had a slightly higher rate of urinalysis participation (58.2%) than did Bankstown (53.9%).

Table 1: Number of interviews conducted, by site and collection point

Site	*Jun/Jul 1999*	*Oct/Nov 1999*	*Total*
Bankstown	91	87	178
Parramatta	94	107	201
Total	**185**	**194**	**379**

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]

Table 2: Whether provided urine sample, by site

	Provided urine sample		*Refused*		*Unable to produce sample*		*Questionnaire incomplete*		*Total*	
Site	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*
Bankstown	96	53.9	73	41.0	8	4.5	1	0.6	178	100.0
Parramatta	117	58.2	65	32.3	15	7.5	4	2.0	201	100.0
Total	**213**	**56.2**	**138**	**36.4**	**23**	**6.1**	**5**	**1.3**	**379**	**100.0**

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Table 3 shows the age and gender of the interviewees. A small number of the questionnaires were incomplete and hence there is some missing data.

As can be seen from Table 3, those interviewed for the study were predominantly male (82.3% of the total sample). Participants in the study were also inclined to be from the younger age groups. This reflects the normal age and gender distribution of offenders in the NSW criminal justice system (NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research 1999). Almost half of the persons interviewed were aged between 20 and 29 (47.5% of subjects). Persons aged 30 to 39 years comprised 19.8 per cent of subjects and another sizeable proportion of participants, 20.8 per cent of subjects, were younger than 20 years old.

Table 3: Age and gender of persons interviewed

	Males		*Females*		*Missing*		*Total*	
Age	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*
10 - 13	1	0.3	3	0.8	-	-	**4**	**1.1**
14 - 17	25	6.6	8	2.1	-	-	**33**	**8.7**
18 - 19	34	9.0	7	1.8	1	0.3	**42**	**11.1**
20 - 29	147	38.8	32	8.4	1	0.3	**180**	**47.5**
30 - 39	67	17.7	8	2.1	-	-	**75**	**19.8**
40 - 49	28	7.4	5	1.3	-	-	**33**	**8.7**
Over 50	10	2.6	1	0.3	1	0.3	**12**	**3.2**
Total	**312**	**82.3**	**64**	**16.9**	**3**	**0.8**	**379**	**100.0**

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]

EDUCATION, RESIDENCE AND INCOME OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Table 4 shows some demographic characteristics of persons interviewed. Please note that, unless specified, the results reported below and in the remainder of this report combine both sites and both periods of data collection.

Slightly more than half of the participants (51.2%) had no formal education beyond secondary school. Those who had completed TAFE courses made up 23.2 per cent of participants while those who had commenced but failed to complete TAFE courses accounted for 14.5 per cent of participants. All other categories represented 4.0 per cent or less of the participants.

Table 4: Demographic characteristics of persons interviewed

Participant characteristics	*No.*	*%*
Educational level		
None beyond secondary	194	51.2
Still in school	8	2.1
Still in TAFE	7	1.8
Still in University	2	0.5
Incomplete TAFE	55	14.5
Complete TAFE	88	23.2
Incomplete University	7	1.8
Complete University	15	4.0
Missing	3	0.8
Total	**379**	**100.0**
Marital status		
Single/never married	230	60.7
De facto	55	14.5
Married	43	11.3
Separated/divorced	46	12.1
Widowed	4	1.1
Missing	1	0.3
Total	**379**	**100.0**
Prior month's residence		
Own house or apartment (rented or owned)	155	40.9
Another's house or apartment	175	46.2
Other location	10	2.6
Shelter	10	2.6
Prison	7	1.8
Halfwayhouse	1	0.3
Treatment program	1	0.3
Street/ no fixed address	20	5.3
Total	**379**	**100.0**
Sources of income [a]		
From welfare/ government benefit (n = 376)	217	57.7
From full-time job (n = 373)	93	24.9
From part-time job (n = 370)	70	18.5
From prostitution (n = 375)	8	2.1
From illegal drugs (n = 375)	23	6.1
From gambling [b] (n =184)	19	10.3
Income from other illegal means (n = 377)	75	19.9
Frequency of gambling [b]		
Not at all	126	64.9
Less than once a week	37	19.1
Once/twice weekly	21	10.8
3 or more times weekly	9	4.6
Total	**193**	**100.0**

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]

a Each question relating to income was asked seperately and respondents could nominate more than one income source, thus each income question had a different number of missing responses; the number of valid responses to each question is shown in brackets.

b Questions relating to gambling were asked only in the second round of the data collection

Only about one quarter of the subjects were currently married or in de facto relationships (married 11.3%, de facto 14.5%). By far the largest group were those who were single, making up 60.7 per cent of subjects. A further 12.1 per cent were separated or divorced.

In the month prior to arrest 40.9 per cent of subjects lived in houses or apartments which they owned or rented. A greater percentage (46.2%) lived in other people's houses or apartments. One in twenty participants lived on the streets or had no fixed address.

Welfare or government benefits provided income for 57.7 per cent of subjects. Almost one quarter (24.9%) had a full time job and a further 18.5 per cent had a part-time job. Only 6.1 per cent earned income from dealing in illicit drugs while 19.9 per cent of participants indicated other illegal activities as a source of income. Many respondents had more than one source of income and therefore the responses do not sum to 379 as in other categories.

Questions relating to gambling were only asked during the second round of data collection; the total number of responses is smaller than for other categories. Gambling does not appear to be a major factor with 84 per cent of participants gambling less than once a week or not at all.

ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Detainees were asked to describe their racial or ethnic background. While they could specify up to three ethnic backgrounds, Table 5 shows only the first ethnic background identified by the subjects, categorised into broad groups.

The most frequently identified ethnic grouping was European/Australian/ American (61.5%) of whom most specified Australian as their first ethnic background. The next most common ethnic grouping was Middle Eastern (16.1%) most of whom identified Lebanese as their first ethnic background. Each of the other ethnic groupings accounted for less than 10 per cent of respondents. The nature of the ethnic distribution of the sample precludes the drawing of conclusions as to the offending patterns of different ethnicities. Because two ethnicities make up a large majority of the sample, 77.6 per cent of all subjects, the characteristics of these groups are dominant. There is discussion below concerning the offence profile of all participants.

Table 5: First ethnic background of arrestees, by offence type

	Grouping of first ethnic background								
	ATSI	European/ Australian/ American	Asian	Middle Eastern	Latin/ South American	Pacific Islander	Other[a]	Missing	Total
Offence type	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Violent	5	28	5	11	-	7	-	3	59
Property	3	98	14	24	3	4	2	7	155
Drug	1	22	6	6	1	1	-	1	38
Drink driving	-	11	2	3	2	-	-	1	19
Other driving	-	24	1	6	-	2	-	-	33
Against public order	-	5	1	1	-	1	-	-	8
Against justice procedures	2	32	1	7	-	2	-	2	46
Other	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Missing	-	12	1	3	1	-	1	2	20
Total	**11**	**233**	**31**	**61**	**7**	**17**	**3**	16	**379**

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]
a the 'other' ethnicity category includes three Mauritian persons

DRUG USE AMONG DETAINEES

Table 6 shows the number of persons who admitted self-reported illegal drug use versus the results of the urinalysis for the same persons. Individuals could have used more than one drug so the percentages across the drugs will not sum to 100. The urinalysis results are based on the initial screens for the presence of cannabis, opiates, methadone, cocaine, amphetamines and benzodiazapines. Many of the drugs rapidly break down into a number of metabolites and the screens are designed to detect the major metabolites in question. For example, the opiate screen can detect monacetylmorphine (which indicates heroin use), morphine (which is a metabolite of heroin) and codeine (which can occur as an impurity from heroin or from using legal drugs such as cough medications). Drug testing is not an exact science and it is possible for trace amounts to be detected which are not defined under the Australian Standards as being a positive result (see Makkai, forthcoming, for further discussion).

As mentioned, some drugs metabolise very quickly and others do not. The extremes are cannabis where chronic use can be detected up to 30 days after use and cocaine that can only be detected up to 48 hours after use. Drug testing cannot determine if the drug has been used legally or illegally or the extent of use outside the detection times. This sort of information can only come from asking people about their use. The questionnaire asks detainees specifically about illegal use of the same drugs.

The commentary which follows refers only to the results of subjects who participated in the urinalysis, even when discussing the self-reported drug use results. Whilst there is not an exact correspondence between self-reported drug use and that shown in the urinalysis tests the results from the two data sources are broadly similar.

With the exception of cocaine, the urinalysis results showed more positive drug readings than were self-reported. For example, just over half of the urine specimens tested showed traces of

Table 6: Comparison between self-reported drug use and urinalysis among subjects who provided a urine sample

	Self-reported use in the last three days			Urinalysis results		
	Yes			Positive		
Drug	No.	%	Total	No.	%	Total
Cannabis	81	38.0	213	112	52.6	213
Cocaine	8	3.8	213	5	2.3	213
Heroin	67	31.5	213	91	42.7	213
Methadone	7	3.3	212[a]	34	16.0	213
Speed	11	5.3	209[a]	18	8.5	213
Benzodiazepines	13	6.2	211[a]	49	23.0	213

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]
a Responses to several of the self-report questions were missing

cannabis (52.6%), while only 38.0 per cent of participants reported using cannabis in the three days prior to the questionnaire. This discrepancy may be due to cannabis potentially staying in the urine for up to 10 days after casual use and for as long as 30 days in the case of chronic users (Makkai & Feather, 1999). Fifty per cent of those providing a urine sample admitted to using cannabis at least once in the past 30 days, a figure much closer to the urinalysis findings.

Only a very small proportion of the sample reported using cocaine and this was confirmed in the urinalysis test (3.8% and 2.3% respectively). The fact that there were more self-reports than positive tests may be due to the short time that cocaine metabolites can be detected in urine.

While a large proportion of the sample self-reported using heroin in the past three days (31.5%), the urinalysis results show a greater proportion of recent opiate users (42.7%). The urinalysis screen test, however, does not differentiate between different types of opiates. Additional tests can be performed which establish the individual opiates. An examination of these confirmatory tests indicated that there were only 3 cases where the primary metabolite was codeine and not morphine, indicating that the vast majority of positive screens were probably heroin.

The number of positive urinalysis screens for methadone is considerably higher than the number of persons who self-reported having taken the drug in the past three days (3.3% and 16.0% respectively). This is likely to be because the respondents were asked about their use of illegally obtained drugs. Twenty-one participants (9.9%) reported having taken prescribed methadone in the week prior to the survey and hence would be likely to have traces of methadone in their urine.

A similar situation applies to the benzodiazepine test results. Thirty-three of the participants (15.6%) report taking legally prescribed benzodiazepines in the past month. This may be the reason that the urinalysis results are considerably higher than the self-reported illegal use. It is also the case that urinalysis can detect benzodiazepines up to two weeks after use.

While 8.5 per cent of persons tested positive to amphetamines compared with only 5.3 per cent self-reported users of speed, the results from both sources are not inconsistent. Both show that the use of speed is not particularly common in this population. In the urinalysis testing, 18 of the sample were found to have traces of this drug, while 11 persons in the sample self-reported taking speed in the past three days. Some of the positive urinalysis results may be due to amphetamines other than speed.

There is always some doubt about the veracity of self-reporting. Given that subjects participated in the interviews voluntarily, it seems more likely that those who wished to conceal their drug taking would refuse to participate rather than agree to be interviewed and lie. This is especially true for those submitting to urinalysis. Self-reporting may be inaccurate due to faulty memory or genuine mistakes about which drugs were taken or the exact days on which they were taken rather than an intention to deceive. However, US research has shown that when self-reported use is very close to the time of detention by the police then detainees are more likely to under-report use (Wish, Hoffman & Nemes 1997). Closer concordance is observed when a wider window of self-reported use is requested, such as use in the past 30 days. The general correspondence between self-reporting and urinalysis results suggest that the survey vehicle is reliable. However the urinalysis results provide a more reliable indicator of opiate use in the past three days than self-reported drug use for this same period.

DRUG USE AMONG DETAINEES COMPARED WITH AUSTRALIAN POPULATION

The Australian Institute for Health and Welfare conducted the last National Drug Strategy Household Survey in 1998. This survey's purpose is to determine the prevalence of drug use in the Australian community. Table 8 shows the percentage of Australians who have used selected drugs at any time and in the previous 12 months. Comparing the results in Table 7 with those in Table 8 shows that the use of all illicit drugs is more common among detainees than among the general population. In considering use within the past 12 months, compared with the general community detainees were three times more likely to have used cannabis, 63 times more likely to have used heroin, 16 times more likely to have used cocaine and 48 times more likely to have used

Table 7: Summary of self-reported drug use by all DUMA participants

	Ever used	*Used in last 12 months*	*Used in the last 30 days*	*Used in the last three days*
Drug	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*
Cannabis	79.2	61.7	52.5	37.4
Heroin	55.4	44.0	36.5	29.4
Methadone[a]	19.3	9.6	4.5	2.4
Cocaine	43.7	23.3	11.9	4.0
Speed	52.0	25.0	12.6	4.6
Benzodiazepines[b]	27.4	14.4	10.1	4.5
Ecstasy	31.7	13.7	7.3	1.1
LSD	34.4	5.7	1.6	0.3

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]
Note: Missing data have been excluded in the calculation of percentages in this table.
a Non-maintenance / b For non-medical purposes

methadone outside maintenance treatment. The other drug types do not allow for a direct comparison, as the categories used in the household survey are broader than those used in the DUMA survey.

DRUG USE AND OFFENCE TYPE

Participants in the DUMA study can be charged with multiple offences, but of the participants who supplied a urine sample, 62.9 per cent had only one charge recorded against them. The discussion below relates only to a person's first listed charge regardless of the number of charges they face.

Table 9 shows the number of detainees with positive results in the urinalysis test by the first listed offence with which they were charged.

Property offences were the most commonly charged offence among detainees (40.4% of first charges). Violent offences (13.1%) and offences against justice procedures (11.7%) were the next most common charges, followed by drug offences (9.9%) and driving charges excluding drink driving (9.4%).

The drug use profile of offenders varies quite considerably when offence type is considered. It is worth noting that the number of detainees for some offence types is very small, as is the number of persons testing positive for some drugs such as cocaine and amphetamines regardless of offence type.

Table 8: Summary of drug use among the Australian population, 1998

Drug	Ever used %	Used in last 12 months %
Cannabis	39.3	17.9
Heroin	2.2	0.7
Methadone[a]	0.5	0.2
Cocaine	4.3	1.4
Amphetamines[b]	8.7	3.6
Tranquilisers[b]	6.2	3.0
Ecstacy, designer drugs	4.7	2.4

Source: AIHW, 1999.
a Non-maintenance / b For non-medical purposes

Among the 28 violent offenders the largest proportions tested positive to cannabis (46.4%), opiates (32.1%) and benzodiazepines (17.9%). Positive tests for methadone, cocaine and amphetamines were relatively uncommon in this group. A substantial proportion of violent offenders (39.3%) were not using any illegal drugs.

As mentioned above, property offences were the dominant charge in the DUMA sample. These detainees had the highest proportion of positive opiate results (54.7%) of all participants. Positive methadone readings were found in 22.1 per cent of property offenders, and 52.3 per cent tested positive for cannabis in this group. Four out of five property offenders tested positive to at least one illegal substance.

Among persons charged with drug offences, cannabis use was very high (76.2% tested positive). Opiate and benzodiazepine use was also found in a high proportion of such detainees (38.1% and 23.8% respectively). All drug offenders but one had a positive drug test.

Among the 20 persons charged with other driving offences, half tested positive for opiates. Methadone was found in 30.0 per cent of these persons and cannabis in 50.0 per cent.

Finally, of the respondents charged with offences against justice procedures, 64.0 per cent tested positive to cannabis and 32.0 per cent tested positive to opiates.

Table 9: Offenders' urinalysis results, by offence type

Offence type	No positive No.	Cannabis No.	Opiates No.	Methadone No.	Cocaine No.	Amphetamines No.	Benzodiazapines No.	Total No.
Violent	11	13	9	3	-	2	5	28
Property	18	45	47	19	3	7	25	86
Drug	1	16	8	3	1	1	5	21
Drink-driving	6	3	4	1	-	-	1	13
Other driving	5	10	10	6	-	2	3	20
Against public order	1	2	2	-	1	1	1	6
Against justice procedures	6	16	8	1	-	3	5	25
Other	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Missing	4	7	3	1	-	2	4	13
Total	**53**	**112**	**91**	**34**	**5**	**18**	**49**	**213**

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]

DRUG AND ALCOHOL ACTIVITY AT TIME OF ARREST

Respondents were asked whether they were under the influence of alcohol or other drugs at the time of offending and arrest. Table 10 shows that a much larger proportion reported using drugs (34.0%) than using alcohol (14.0%).

From Table 11 it can be seen that only a very small proportion of offenders (6.6%) were attempting to buy or sell drugs just prior to being arrested. The only offence type for which a sizeable percentage of offenders were seeking to buy or sell drugs was drug offences (21.1%).

Table 10: Alcohol and drug use when offending

	Used alcohol before arrest		*Used drugs before arrest*	
	No.	*%*	*No.*	*%*
Yes	53	14.0	129	34.0
No	319	84.2	242	63.9
Can't recall	-	-	1	0.3
Missing	7	1.8	7	1.8
Total	**379**	**100.0**	**379**	**100.0**

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]

DRUG MARKET GRID

In the second round of data collection, participants were questioned about the means they used to obtain drugs. Table 12 shows the results for cannabis and heroin, the most commonly used illicit drugs.

Nearly a third of respondents reported that they had purchased cannabis in the past month and slightly over a third reported purchasing heroin.

Of those persons who purchased cannabis in the past month, the most popular way to contact the drug seller was by telephone (55.9%). The next most common method was to visit the seller at a house or flat (25.4%). Respondents from Bankstown were much more likely to telephone the seller than were those from Parramatta.

A house or apartment was the most frequent location where respondents last purchased cannabis (54.2%) followed by a street or outdoor area (33.9%). The drug was usually purchased in the user's own suburb (59.3%) from a regular source (71.2%).

Of persons who purchased heroin in the past month the most common method of contacting the drug seller was again by telephone (58.2%). Visiting a house or apartment, or approaching the person in public were equally common second options for contacting dealers (16.4% for each).

Heroin was most frequently bought in a street or outdoor area (46.3%), or a house or apartment (40.3%). Heroin was most often bought from outside the user's suburb (74.6%) and from a regular source (68.7%).

CONCLUSION

The DUMA results show illicit drug use to be wide spread among detainees. Of the persons who provided a urine sample for the study, 75.1 per cent tested positive to a least one drug. Cannabis and opiates were the most commonly used substances. Participants were most frequently detained for property offences (40.9%) followed by violent offences (15.6%). The range of offences indicates that drug use is a factor for persons involved in a variety of crimes. It appears that a large number of detainees, regardless of offence, are drug users. The promotion of treatment diversion options should be a priority for governments interested in breaking the drugs and crime nexus.

Table 11: Persons attempting to buy or sell drugs just prior to arrest

	Seeking drugs prior to arrest							
	Yes		*No*		*Missing*		*Total*	
Offence type	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*	*No.*	*%*
Violent	1	1.7	57	96.6	1	1.7	59	100.0
Property	10	6.5	140	90.3	5	3.2	155	100.0
Drug	8	21.1	29	76.3	1	2.6	38	100.0
Drink driving		-	19	100.0		-	19	100.0
Other driving	2	6.1	31	93.9		-	33	100.0
Against public order	1	12.5	7	87.5		-	8	100.0
Against justice procedures	1	2.2	43	93.5	2	4.3	46	100.0
Other		-	1	100.0		-	1	100.0
Missing	2	10.0	18	90.0		-	20	100.0
Total	**25**	**6.6**	**345**	**91.0**	**9**	**2.4**	**379**	**100.0**

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]

Table 12: Drug supply details for participants who bought drugs in the past month, subjects in the second round data collection only

	Cannabis						Heroin					
	Bankstown		Parramatta		Total		Bankstown		Parramatta		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Participants who bought drugs in the past month	27	31.0	32	31.1	59	31.1	31	35.6	36	35.0	67	35.3
Means of contacting the person drug was bought from												
Called on phone	19	70.4	14	43.8	33	55.9	18	58.1	21	58.3	39	58.2
Visited house or flat	3	11.1	12	37.5	15	25.4	4	12.9	7	19.4	11	16.4
Paged on beeper		-		-		-		-	1	2.8	1	1.5
Approached in public	2	7.4	4	12.5	6	10.2	6	19.6	5	13.9	11	16.4
With them already at work or socially	2	7.4	1	3.1	3	5.1		-	1	2.8	1	1.5
Other	1	3.7	1	3.1	2	3.4	1	3.2		-	1	1.5
Type of place drug last bought in												
House or apartment	14	51.9	18	56.3	32	54.2	15	48.4	12	33.3	27	40.3
Public building	2	7.4	4	12.5	6	10.2		-	2	5.6	2	3.0
Abandoned building		-	1	3.1	1	1.7	2	6.5	3	8.3	5	7.5
Street, alley, other outdoor area	11	40.7	9	28.1	20	33.9	12	38.7	19	52.8	31	46.3
Drug bought in own suburb												
In own suburb	13	48.1	22	68.8	35	59.3	10	32.3	5	13.9	15	22.3
Outside own suburb	14	51.9	10	31.3	24	40.7	19	61.3	31	86.1	50	74.6
Familiarity with the drug source												
Regular source	20	74.1	22	68.8	42	71.2	20	64.5	26	72.2	46	68.7
Occasional source	5	18.5	9	28.1	14	23.7	3	9.7	4	11.1	7	10.4
New source	2	7.4	1	3.1	3	5.1	5	16.1	6	16.7	11	16.4

Source: Australian Institute of Criminology, DUMA Collection, 1999 [Computer File]
Note: Missing data have been excluded in the calculation of percentages in this table.

NOTES

1 Dr Toni Makkai is the national project manager for the Drug Use Monitoring in Australia (DUMA) project at the Australian Institute of Criminology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Drug Use Monitoring in Australia project is funded by the Commonwealth's National Illicit Drug Strategy. The data used in this publication were made available through the Australian Institute of Criminology. These data were originally collected by Forsythe Consulting Pty Ltd with the assistance of the NSW Police Service. Neither the collectors nor the AIC bear any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented herein.

REFERENCES

Australian Institute for Health and Welfare 1999, *1998 National Drug Strategy Household Survey: First Results*, Australian Institute for Health and Welfare, Canberra.

Makkai, T. 1999a, *Linking Drugs and Criminal Activity: Developing an Integrated Monitoring System*, Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice, No 109, December, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Makkai, T. 1999b, *Drug Use Monitoring in Australia (DUMA): A Brief Description*, Australian Institute of Criminology Research and Public Policy Series No. 21, Australian Institute of Criminology: Canberra.

Makkai, T. & Feather, M. 1999, *Drug Use Monitoring in Australia (DUMA): Preliminary Results from the Southport Site*, 1999, Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice, No 142, December, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Makkai, T. forthcoming, *Drug Use Monitoring in Australia (DUMA): Drug Detection Testing*, Research and Public Policy Series, No 25, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research 1999, *New South Wales Criminal Courts Statistics 1998*, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research: Sydney.

Wish, E., Hoffman, J. & Nemes, S. 1997, 'The validity of self-reports of drug use at treatment admission and at followup: Comparisons with urinalysis and hair assays', in *The Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use: Improving the Accuracy of Survey Estimates,* Research Monograph 167, eds L. Harrison & A. Hughes, NIDA, Rockville.