



Addict and non-addict drug dealers in Istanbul, Turkey: Profiles and differences

Ali Ünlü¹
Oğuzhan Ömer Demir²

Abstract

The objective of this study is to explore profiles of and differences between addict and non-addict street-level drug dealers. This is a cross-sectional study using the data of street-level drug dealers who were captured in 2008 by Istanbul Narcotics Police (N=486). Most of the street-level drug dealers were male, drug addict, had limited education and lower income, and more than half had past criminal records. Addict dealers and non-addict dealers are found significantly different from each other as far as the gender, income, amount of seized substance, type of seized substance, the number of arrested dealers in the same group, and past criminal records. The drug business usually works on people who know the underground drug world, but not the ones who have problems with substances. Addict dealers may play roles in this business for enjoyment and/or requirement. Addict dealers are also more likely to be arrested alone, which may indicate that they work for themselves and their ultimate aim is to afford drugs for their personal use and make money for their needs.

Keywords: drug dealers, drugs, addiction, Istanbul

Introduction

Drug use has been a serious issue for years. The enlargement of drug markets in different parts of the world affects millions of people, especially the youths. The increase and spread of drug use is normalized among the rising generation and young people (Pearson, 1999: 480). High demand for drugs also necessitates people who can meet this demand. This demand is met by drug dealers and smugglers at various levels.

¹ PhD, Head of Drug Prevention Unit of Narcotics Division, İstanbul Police Department, Turkey, aliunlu@gmail.com

² , PhD, Assistant Professor, Turkish National Police Academy, odemir@egm.gov.tr

At the bottom of drug sellers are street-level dealers. That is a popular career opportunity for those who want to make fast and easy money, and also for those who want to obtain drugs. The past research has examined different viewpoints of drug dealing and addiction. Scholars have studied gender and drug dealing (Aguilar and Jackson, 2009; Anderson, 2005; Tammy, 2005; Hutton, 2005; Maher and Daly, 2001; Pettitway, 1987), drug markets and their structures (Denton and O'Malley, 1999; Coomber and Turnbull, 2007; Fairlie, 2002; Adler & Adler, 1983; Maher and Dixon, 1999; Curtis, 2003), drug dealer profiles (Smart, Adlaf and Walsh, 1992; Little and Steinberg, 2006), drug dealer behaviors (Atkyns and Hanneman, 1974), issues on drug dealing and ethnicity (Lalander, 2008), addiction and crime (Nurco, Knlicok, and Hanlon, 2001; Inciardi and Pottieger, 2001; Goldstein, 2001), and addict drug dealers and their behaviors and motivational factors (Fairlie, 2002; Atkyns and Hanneman, 1974).

However, the profiles of addict and non-addict street-level drug dealers as well as their roles in the market have not well-founded. Studying the characteristics of and differences between these two groups will make significant contribution to the literature on offenders of world of drugs, especially in order to in order to develop better intervention strategies, to explain national and global trends, to understand how neighborhood level markets work, and by whom.

This study attempts to shed light on the profiles and characteristics of drug dealers and the differences between addict and non-addict drug dealers on street-level in the city of Istanbul, Turkey. The problem of drugs is not limited to the developed nations, but it spreads all over the world, from Europe to North America, and from Third World to Asia (Pearson, 1999). Turkey is no exception. Although Turkey is not a source country, it is a transit and destination country for drugs, and many organized groups in Turkey take place in drug trafficking (Grennan and Britz, 2006). There is a two-way drug traffic that took place in Turkey. One way of trafficking involves smuggling of opium and derivatives from east to west, while the second way includes smuggling of synthetic drugs from west to east (TUBIM, 2010).

In a survey conducted in 2007 in six metropolitan cities (including Istanbul) of Turkey, it was found that, in the last three months, 2.9 % of students reported that they used drugs at least once (TUBIM, 2010). It shows that Turkish youths are getting affected from the use of illicit drugs. Street-level drug dealers play a crucial role in this market. Understanding the characteristics of drug dealers as well as their addiction status, therefore, is of paramount importance in prevention and protection strategies. However, little is known about the profiles and their characteristics of street level drug dealers as far as Turkey is concerned. In an attempt to explore these concerns, we aim to answer the following questions in this study:

- 1- What is a street-level drug dealer profile in Istanbul?

- 2- Are there any differences between the characteristics of addict and non-addict street-level drug dealers?

Drug dealers

Drug dealing is a business carried out by various players in different levels and with different motivations. Adler and Adler (1983) claim that there are three career levels of drug dealing. In the first category, some drug users become dealers and along the time, some can achieve to step up to a higher level. Second, there are drug dealers coming from another occupation. A third group is comprised of people with special skills and professions and they get good positions in the field.

“The illicit drug market is best characterized as a web of social, financial and interpersonal relationships between men and women, focusing on the exchange of illicit goods” (Anderson, 2005: 393). They differ over time, space, and circumstance (Coomber and Turnbull, 2007). “Street-level markets are considerably smaller, less visible, and likely to be run by freelance individuals or by “franchise” operations” (Curtis, 2003: 61). Street-level drug dealers are well characterized as those who sell drugs in order to gain better access for their personal use (Smart et al., 1992).

Denton and O’Malley (1999:514) argue that illicit drug markets are populated by relatively small organizations. Usually the drug markets are structured in a hierarchy, ranging from owners to runners, pitchers, baggers, and many others (Curtis, 2003). Street-level drug dealers occupy the lower level status; however, this status may change over time if the dealer makes success on the job (Maher and Dixon, 1999). “The innermost core of the typical business consisted of family members or was characterized by long-term, close relationships (sister, mother, domestic partner, close friend, a support person...)” (Denton and O’Malley, 1999:517). Moreover, some scholars argue that building a trust relation with each other is a necessary step in associating with other drug dealers and customers. Being from the same ethnicity, citizenry, and/or tribe are important factors in these trust relationships (Kahya and Ozerkmen, 2007).

Fast money circulating in the drug markets and removals of dealers from streets by arrests attract youths for new dealer positions (Curtis, 2003: 53). “The nature of drug dealing makes it likely to be attractive to individuals who are less risk averse, have more entrepreneurial ability, and have a preference for autonomy” (Fairlie, 2002: 540). One young dealer had a marketing strategy in which he sold at different locations during different times of the day to “maximize his clientele while minimizing his exposure to arrest and competition” (Sullivan, 1989: 169, as cited in Fairlie, 2002: 543). The number of street-level drug dealers in Turkey has been increasing every year. It was 4,842 in 2007, 5271 in 2008, and 5,425 in 2009 (KOM, 2010).

Little and Steinberg found five factors that significantly increased adolescents' opportunity for drug selling: "low parental monitoring, poor neighborhood conditions, low neighborhood job opportunity, parental substance use or abuse, and high levels of peer group deviance" (Little and Steinberg, 2006: 357). On a different vein with respect to motivations behind drug selling, Lalander (2008: 65) has found that due to their perceived experience of being subordinated in society, [drug dealers] become involved in heroin as a means of gaining self-respect, dignity, and wealth (Lalander, 2008: 65).

Drug dealing is an extremely risky business. These risks can be categorized as risks of apprehension, risks of physical harm from outsiders and other dealers. "These dealers also faced substantial risks in terms of lost profits from having their merchandise confiscated by the police (sometimes due to community informants) or stolen by muggers, 'sneak thieves,' and potential customers who 'burn' them" (Fairlie, 2002: 542). It can be speculated that a drug dealer makes a rational calculation of being arrested (and loss of all the properties) and the advantages of fast lifestyle (Hutton, 2005). To avoid risks, some dealers argued about the role of family: "You can rely on family ties when things go bad, you can trust them to help you out" (Denton and O'Malley, 1999:519).

Even though it is a risky business, some factors prevent street-level drug dealers to leave their illicit world. According to Adler and Adler (1983) these factors include hedonistic and materialistic satisfactions, having been called as dealer in their communities, and difficulties in making money in a legitimate life.

Adler and Adler claim that, despite "material comfort, freedom, prestige, and power associated with their job", drug dealers at some point of their careers, decide to quit the business. As one interviewed dealer emphasized: "Nobody wants to be a drug dealer all their life." As their colleagues are arrested, imprisoned, and even killed, they become more and more exhausted in their risky careers (1983: 200-201).

As for the gender perspectives, it is well-founded that drug dealing is essentially a male occupation. Some scholars claim that "women occupy positions in subordinate roles in male selling networks" (Denton and O'Malley, 1999:513). Anderson discusses that "women's participation in the informal drug economy, in terms of drug sales and distribution, is contingent upon their link to men in their lives" (Anderson, 2005: 373).

"Men are more often sellers than women, and they typically occupy more economically lucrative or higher status roles in the illicit drug economy. As already stated, men therefore possess a disproportionate share of structural power in the illicit drug world. Fewer women (although more so

now than in earlier periods) participate directly in sales and distribution and when they do so, they are congregated in lower-status positions” (Anderson, 2005: 376).

Although “women’s roles in the drug economy are exclusively secondary, such as being ‘mules’ or the sex objects of male drug sellers and distributors...”, “some women are involved in many aspects of the drug trade, from street-based sales to wholesale distribution (Aguilar and Jackson, 2009: 370)

As far as the employment types of drug dealers are considered, Fairlie (2002) found that 47% of the drug-dealers were employees of a private company, 44% had no job, 7% were government employees and only 1% was self-employed. In terms of education, a study found that most dealers were young (20-25 years) with education of at least some college degree (82%), and unemployed (58%). As for criminal records, Atkyns and Hanneman (1974) found that drug dealers were arrested for drug related (20%) and non-drug related offenses (31%) before. Drug dealers also reported that they sold heroin (38%), cocaine (24%), crack (21%), and PCP (17%) (Reuter, MacCoun, and Murphy, 1990).

Addiction and drug dealing

Studies on drug use underline the fact that drug use is very likely to result in commission of or participation in a crime. The results of 2002-2004 National Survey on Drug Use and Health show that “an estimated 1.2 million adults aged 18 or older are arrested for serious violent and property offenses each year” (Siegel and Senna, 2008: 50). Results of a survey conducted in Turkey concluded that almost one fifth of the drug users commit crimes before incarceration in order to gain access to drugs. Drug dealers were involved in this job under the influence of their friends (28%), for making easy money (19%), and for gaining access to drugs (17%) (TUBIM, 2010).

Most studies on dealing and addiction largely affirm the correlation between drug use and drug selling. The most important reason for street-level drug dealers for selling drugs is to support their own habits (Preble & Casey, 1969; Mieczkowski, 1986). Reuter, MacCoun, and Murphy (1990) have found that their sample of drug dealers in Washington, DC, spent an average of one-fourth of their earnings on drugs. It has also been evidenced that “the pool of drug-abusing and addicted men is quite large, outpacing the group of non-using male sellers” (Anderson, 2005: 386). Atkyns and Hanneman’s (1974) study on drug dealers found that 80% of all drug users were at some time in the drug marketing network and 49% of drug dealers were in drug business to be able to obtain free drugs for personal use.

A drug dealer mentioned her goal of making money to support her own drug habit, and living the lifestyle she has chosen (Hutton, 2005: 553). Except for just making profit to obtain

drugs, addicted drug sellers are also in this business because accessing less expensive or more quality drugs (Fairlie, 2002: 551), and supplying drug to their friends (Atkyns & Hanneman, 1974) is possible when they are in the market. Findings of a research revealed that drug dealers are not simply occasional drug users, but they use drugs frequently (Fairlie, 2002: 551).

In addition, some drug dealers abuse other drug users as couriers and money collectors. “In return, addict dealers receive free supply of drugs and have their accommodation and meals paid for” (Denton and O’Malley, 1999: 524). Interestingly, a study on drug dealers found that drug dealers who make higher amounts of money are less likely to use drugs than those who make less money (Fairlie, 2002: 561).

Methods

This is a cross-sectional study which aims to address the characteristics and profiles of drug dealers, and to understand differences between addict and non-addict dealers. The population of this study is entire street-level drug dealers who were captured in 2008 and charged with drug offense by Istanbul Police Department’s Narcotics Division.

Geographically located between Asia and Europe, Istanbul is one of the most important cities transportation, industry, trade and culture. Out of 12 million people entered Turkey in 2007, 4.2 million visitors entered Turkey from Istanbul airports and seaports. Such a big city like Istanbul has various disadvantages, especially when crimes and criminals are considered. We have chosen Istanbul since it represents the best example of an environment that includes the largest drug market in Turkey. Being the fifth largest city in Europe with a population of about 13 million, drug use is an important problem of the settlers of the city.

The data was collected with content analysis of criminal case files. Content analysis is commonly used when collecting data is too costly, or too difficult to obtain using traditional quantitative methods from archival and financially oriented databases (Duriiau et al, 2007; Krippendorff, 1980). Accessing and collecting data from street level dealers is very difficult in real life situations because the nature of the job they occupy is illegal and needed to be operated secretly. One of the best available methods for data collection is accessing them after arrestments. Moreover, without criminal conviction, it is difficult to act someone as a drug dealer. Since face to face interview was not available for this study, the best option was to examine their case files with content analysis.

Since the goal of the study is to investigate ‘only’ street-level drug dealers in Istanbul, the criminal case files of drug possession, drug couriers, and international drug traffickers who import/export illegal drugs were excluded from database. Street-level dealers are conceptualized in

this study as people who are selling drugs in streets alone or with associates, regardless of selling purpose (consumption or financial benefits) with a varying amounts of drugs. Out of the 2009 suspects, 814 were street level dealers and 486 reported their drug usage status.

Law enforcement uses a structural form in order to get suspects' demographic information such as ID, address, income, occupation, past criminal records, associates, drug dealing environment and their addiction status. Police officers ask these questions to the suspects during taking and documenting statements. Information related to drug use and dependence to drugs was self-reported. However, kind of drug they use was not available to the researchers. Thus, collecting data from this type of structural forms and examining it for content analysis is also commonly used in criminal justice (Maguria et al, 2010).

Stemler (2001) defines content analysis as a “systematic, replicable technique for compressing many words of text into fewer content categories based on explicit rules of coding” (p.1). Coding is a “process of transforming raw data into a standardized form” (Kohlbacher, 2006:7). However to make valid inferences from the text, the coding/classification procedures need to be reliable in terms of being consistent (Weber, 1990). According to Weber (1990), ambiguity of the word meanings, category definitions, or other coding rules are common pitfalls of reliability problems in content analysis. To ensure this, the text is needed to be coded or broken down into manageable categories on a variety of levels such as word, word sense, phrase, sentence, and theme (Neuman and Wiegand, 2000; Palmquist, 2010). Moreover, explicit recording instructions strengthen the stability and reproducibility of the data (Stemler, 2001). Use of multiple coders also increases reliability (Duriiau et al, 2007).

Content analysis is used for two types of analysis: conceptual and relational (Neuman and Wiegand, 2000; Palmquist, 2010). Since we were not interested in relational analysis, we used conceptual content analysis for examination. The goal of the conceptual content analysis is to look at the occurrence of selected terms within a text or texts, although the terms may be implicit as well as explicit (Demirci & Koseli, 2009; Palmquist, 2010).

After studying the case files, we developed a coding sheet that enabled trained coders to read each case files and enter information about it directly into a database. The natural or intuitive border of the coding is defined as the structural forms of suspects' statements. We began the coding process by training 5 coders on the types of information we hoped to extract from each case files.

We also developed a coding protocol. First, we defined recording units syntactically to use separation such as words and numbers from the text (Duriiau et al, 2007). In other words, the variables and categories used in the research were identified explicitly and listed. Second, coders

were trained to record only data listed in the protocol. This procedure enable coders to collect certain numbers and set of explicit terms and concepts that fitted to coding sheet, which ensures reliability and comparability of results across texts (Duriau et al, 2007).

We made some descriptive analysis to explore the characteristics of addict and non-addict drug dealers, and then we performed bivariate analysis in order to find out possible differences between addict and non-addict drug dealers.

Findings

Characteristics of drug dealers in Istanbul

The mean age of street-level drug dealer is 33, and most of them are male (96.3%). Turkish nationals comprise the majority, while 6.4 % dealers are foreign nationals. Most of dealers are single (57.6 %), 37.3 % are married, and 5.1 % are widowed. Only 36.2 % of drug dealers were born in Istanbul and cities around Istanbul, while majority was born in other regions of Turkey; the major group came from east and southeast of Turkey (38.5 %). In other words, most drug dealers migrated into Istanbul from distant places of the country (Table-1).

Table-1 Demographic Variables of Drug Dealers (N=486)

Variables	Mean (SD) / Percentage
Age	33 (9.82)
Gender (male) %	96,3
Citizenship	
Turkish nationals	93,6
Foreign nationals	6,4
Marital status	
Married	37,3
Single	57,6
Widowed	5,1
Place of birth	
Northwest (Marmara)	36,2
East	20,2
Southeast	18,3
Abroad	9
North (Black sea)	8,4
Center	4,6
South (Mediterranean)	3
West (Aegean)	0,3
Monthly income (US Dollars)	6,000 (2,401)
Occupation	

Technical jobs	4,7
Administrative	2,1
Marketing	7,2
Logistics	1,6
Production, maintenance	36,7
Transportation	6,8
Worker	14,0
Domestic field	23,6
Others	3,3
Education	
Illiterate	6,8
Secondary School or less	78,5
High School or less	12,7
Some College or more	2,1

Their average annual income is around US\$ 6,000³. They are usually employed in production and maintenance jobs (36,7 %), domestic (23, 6%), and also in factories as workers (14%). Parallel with occupations, vast majority of dealers have low levels of education. Dealers with secondary school or less education are almost three-fourth of all dealers, and 6.8 % of dealers are illiterate. Only 14,8 % of dealers have high school or higher education.

Table-2 Drug Related Variables (N=486)

Variables	Mean (SD) / Percentage
Drug addiction	
Addict	56,8
Non-addict	43,2
Amount of substance captured (gram)	287 (1084)
Type of captured substance	
Cannabis	56,4
Heroin	18,9
Cocaine	11,5
Synthetic drugs	6,8
Combination of two or more	6,4
Number of drug dealers in the same group	1.74 (1.2)
Past Criminal Records	
Yes	53,3
No	46,7

³Turkey's GDP per capita is approximately US\$ 10,500 in 2008. Source: IMF World Economic Outlook Database, April 2010

As far as the information related to drug use and selling, 56.8 % of dealers reported they are addicted to at least one type of drug. They were captured by the police while they were selling in total 287 gram drug, ranging between 0.1 and 10.795 gram per seizure. They sell cannabis (56.4 %), heroin (18.9 %), cocaine (11.5 %), synthetic drugs (6.8 %), and a mix of two or more types of drugs. While most were selling drugs on their own (57 %), some of the dealers (43 %) were not alone in their drug dealing business. On average, 1.74 person, ranging from 2 to 8 persons, were selling drugs on the streets together. When the dealers' criminal justice histories were examined, it was found that slightly more than half of dealers have a past criminal record; most of these records are from drug use and drug dealing (Table-2).

In order to find out as to whether any differences exist between drug addict street-level dealers and non-addicts, we applied significance tests both for demographic variables and drug-related variables. We used independent sample t-test for ratio variables, and chi-square tests for categorical ones.

Differences between addict and non-addict dealers

The results affirmed that addict dealers and non-addict dealers are significantly different from each other as far as the gender, income, amount and type of captured substance, the number of arrested dealers in the same group, and past criminal records. On the other hand, marital status, education level, citizenship, and place of birth were not found significantly different.

Table-3 T-test results of age, income, captured drugs, and number of drug dealers in the same group differences of addict and non-addict dealers (N=486)

Variable	Addiction status	N	Mean	SD	t
Age	Addict dealers	276	32,94	9,87	.281
	Non-addict dealers	210	32,18	9,77	
Monthly income (US Dollars)	Addict dealers	205	479	306,25	12,337***
	Non-addict dealers	149	567	465,41	
Amount of drug seized (gram)	Addict dealers	266	164	782,47	25,496***
	Non-addict dealers	206	447	1.365,68	
Number of drug dealers in the same group	Addict dealers	276	1,51	0,88	20.683***
	Non-addict dealers	209	2,04	1,42	

*** $p < .001$

As tables 4 shows, gender is found statistically significantly different between addict and non-addict dealers ($X^2=18,954$, $Df=1$, $p<.001$). Addict dealers are more likely to be male (99.3 %). As Table 3 shows, income level is found statistically significantly different between addict dealers and non-addict dealers ($t=12,337$, $p<.001$). Non-addict dealers are more likely to have more income than addicts. In addition, amount of seized substance is significantly different ($t=25,496$, $p<.001$). Non-addict dealers are more likely to possess higher amounts of drugs than addict dealers. Number of drug dealers belonging to the same group is also significantly different ($t=20,683$, $p<.001$). Non-addict dealers are more likely to sell drugs with more people than addict dealers (Table-3).

Table-4 Chi-Square table of gender, marital status, education level, citizenship, and place of birth (N=486)

Addiction Status (%)	Addiction Status		X ² (DF)	Sig
	Addict Dealers (%)	Non-addict Dealer (%)		
Gender				
Male	99,3	92,4	18,894 (1)	.001
Female	0,7	7,6		
Marital Status				
Married	37,8	36,7	1.195 (2)	.550
Single	58,1	57		
Divorced	4,1	6,3		
Education Level				
Illiterate	7,1	6,3	3.141 (3)	.370
Secondary/ less	80,7	75,6		
High School	10,4	15,6		
College or more	1,9	2,4		
Citizenship				
Turkish	95,3	91,4	2,978 (1)	.084
Foreign national	4,7	8,6		
Place of birth				
Istanbul (Marmara)	57,4	42,6	5.088 (2)	.079
Other regions	59	41		
Abroad	59,1	40,9		

Dealers with past criminal records were also found statistically significantly different ($X^2=14,758$, $Df=1$, $p<.001$). Addicts are less likely to have past criminal records than non-addicts. The type of substance that dealers were selling is also found statistically different ($X^2=12,683$, $Df=4$, $p<.05$). Addicts are more likely to sell cannabis (61.6%) and heroin (19.2%), while non-addicts are more likely to sell cocaine (15.7%) and synthetic drugs (9.5%) (Table-5).

Table-5 Chi-Square table of past criminal records and substance type (N=486)

Addiction Status	Addiction Status		X ² (DF)	Sig
	Addict Dealers (%)	Non-addict Dealers (%)		
Past Criminal Records				
Yes	39,1	56,9	14,758(1)	.001
No	60,9	43,1		
Substance Type				
Cannabis	61,6	49,5	12,683(4)	.012
Heroin	19,2	18,6		
Cocaine	8,3	15,7		
Synthetic Drugs	4,7	9,5		
More than one type together	6,2	6,7		

The study shows that selling drug is a professional occupation for non-addicts. As the literature suggests, drug trafficking is a hierarchically structured market and drugs are delivered from wholesalers to street level dealers (Kahya and Özerkmen, 2007; Grennan and Britz: 2006). Wholesalers design the market by choosing the players, determining the amount of drugs and price in the streets. The business usually works on people who know the underground drug world, but not the ones who have problems with substances.

Addict dealers were arrested with a smaller amount of drugs compared to non-addicts. As stated in the findings, addicts have a lower income level than non-addict dealers; therefore, it seems that they are in the business to afford drugs for their personal use.

The type of drugs sold by addicts and non-addicts varies; non-addicts sell more expensive drugs such as cocaine and synthetic drugs in Istanbul streets. Moreover, both drugs are known as party drugs, which are commonly consumed for recreational purposes. However, addict dealers are more likely to sell cannabis and heroin. While cannabis is a cheaper drug and more likely preferred for enjoyment, heroin is a highly addictive drug that its abstinence is risky for its users. Either enjoyment or requirement, both drugs are more likely to be sold by their users in the streets.

There seems also a trend difference among drug dealers: non-addict dealers are more likely to sell drugs with someone else. Since this is a business in a risky environment, dealers may form a team to make a secure transaction. Although organized criminal activities were not included in our data, it is still clear that drug marketing needs cooperation and division of labor if it is run by professionals. It is more likely that other people who are arrested in an operation may have different roles in the drug market such as owners, runners, pitchers, and baggers (Curtis, 2003).

However, addict dealers were more likely to be arrested alone, which may indicate that they work for themselves and their ultimate aim is to make money for their needs.

Potential policy implications from this study refer to two groups: Addicts who sell drugs to obtain drugs and satisfy their addiction, and non-addicts who sell drugs to make a profit. Law enforcement agencies have to make a difference between these two groups of dealers. For the latter group, criminal justice interventions can be developed by examining their profiles and examining their relations with larger trafficking organizations. For the former, on the other hand, obviously necessitates social and physical treatments. Addict dealers need protection even if their action will result in prosecution and arrest. From this prospect, for those who deal drugs in streets since they do not have too many alternatives other than selling drugs to obtain drugs, criminal justice relationship with dealers should not be limited to incapacitation. Rather, they should be subject to treatment programs and re-entry programs in and out of prisons with follow-ups.

This study can be developed in further studies by eliminating existing limitations. First of all, the data represent the dealers who were arrested. Therefore, the dealers who run their business successfully are not included in the sample. Moreover, police operations have special structure and sometimes focus on some priorities such as importance of geographical areas, type of drugs, and other policy issues. For that reason, arrests might not be random and may pose limitations for generalizability. In future studies, better analyses can be made by studying drug addict dealers attitudes and behaviors, the relationship between duration of the substance use and type of drug trafficking, the geographical place of arrestments and type of drugs, type of criminal records, drug types and amount of drugs.

References

- Adler, P. A., Adler P. (1983). Shifts and oscillations in deviant careers: The case of upper-level drug dealers and smugglers. *Social Problems*, 31, 195–199.
- Aguilar, J.P., Jackson, A.K. (2009). From the Streets to Institutions: Female Adolescent Drug Sellers' Perceptions of their power, *Affilia*, 24, pp.369-381.
- Atkyns, R.L., Hanneman, G.J. (1974). Illicit drug distribution and dealer communication behavior, *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 15, 1, pp. 36-43.
- Benning, J.F. (2002). Following the dirty money: does bank reporting of suspicious activity pose a threat to drug dealers? *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 13, pp.337-355.
- Curtis, R. (2003). Crack, cocaine and heroin: drug eras in Williamsburg, Brooklyn, 1960-2000, *Addiction Research and Theory*, 11 (1), pp. 47-63

Ünlü, A., & Demir, O. Ö. (2012). Addict and non-addict drug dealers in Istanbul, Turkey: Profiles and differences. *International Journal of Human Sciences* [Online]. (9)2, 1- 5.

- Demirci, S., Koseli, M. (2009). Secondary data and content analysis, in (eds.) Boke, K. *Research methods in social sciences*, Alfa Publishing: Istanbul.
- Denton, B., O'Malley, P. (1999). Gender, trust and business: women drug dealers in the illicit economy. *British Journal of Criminology*, 39 (4), pp. 513-530.
- Duriau, V.J., Reger, R.K., Pfarrer, M.D. (2007). A content analysis of the content analysis literature in organizational studies: Research themes, data sources, and methodological refinements. *Organizational Research Methods*. 10(1), 5-34.
- Fairlie, R.W. (2002). Drug Dealing and Legitimate Self-Employment, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20 (3), pp.538-567.
- Goldstein, P.J. (2001). The drugs/violence Nexus: A tripartite conceptual framework, in (eds.) Inciardi, J. and McElrath, K., *The American drug scene: An anthology*. Roxbury Publishing Company: Los Angeles.
- Grennan, S., Brtiz, M.T. (2006). *Organized crime: A worldwide perspective*. Pearson Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Hutton, F. (2005). Risky business: gender, drug dealing and risk. *Addiction Research and Theory*, 13(6), pp.545-554.
- Inciardi and Pottieger (2001). Drug use and street-crime in Miami, in (eds.) Inciardi, J. and McElrath, K., *The American drug scene: An anthology*. Roxbury Publishing Company: Los Angeles.
- Kahya, Y., Özerkmen, N. (2007). *Organize suç örgütleri ve mafya (Translated by the authors as 'Organized crime groups and the mafia')*, Ankara: Adalet Yayınları.
- Kohlbacher, F (2006). The use of qualitative content analysis in case study research. Forum: Qualitative Social Research. 7(1), Art. 21. Retrieved on the 4th of January 2011 from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/75/153>
- KOM. (2010). *Turkish Report on Drugs and Organized Crime 2009*. Department of Anti-Smuggling and Organized Crime: Ankara.
- Krippendorff, F. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Lalander, P. (2008). The role of ethnicity in a local drug dealer network, *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 9, pp 65-84.
- Little, M., Steinberg, L. (2006). Psychosocial correlates of adolescent drug dealing in the inner city: potential roles of opportunity, conventional commitments, and maturity. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 43, pp. 357-386.
- Maguire, E., Uchida, C.D., Hassell, K.D. (2010). Problem-oriented policing in Colorado Springs: A content analysis of 753 cases. *Crime & Delinquency*, 20 (10), pp.1-25.

- Maher L., Dixon, D. (1999). Policing and public health: Law enforcement and harm minimization in a street-level drug market. *British Journal of Criminology*, 39 (4), pp. 488-512.
- Maher, L., Daly, K. (2001). Women in the street-level drug economy: Continuity or change?, in (eds.) Inciardi, J. and McElrath, K., *The American drug scene: An anthology*. Roxbury Publishing Company: Los Angeles.
- Mieczkowski, T. (1986) Geeking up and throwing down: heroin user's life in Detroit, *Criminology*, 24, pp. 645-666.
- Neuman, L., Wiegand, B. (2000). *Criminal justice research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Nurco, D. N., Kinlock, T.W., Hanlon, T.E. (2001). The drugs-crime connection, in (eds.) Inciardi, J. and McElrath, K., *The American drug scene: An anthology*. Roxbury Publishing Company: Los Angeles.
- Palmquist, M. (2010). Writing Guide: Content Analysis. *Department of English at Colorado State University*. Retrieved from <http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/research/content/index.cfm> on 25 June 2010.
- Pearson, G. (1999). Drugs at the end of the century, *The British Journal of Criminology*, 39, (4), pp. 477-487.
- Pettway, L. (1987). Participation in crime partnerships by female drug users: the effects of domestic arrangements, drug use, and criminal involvement, *Criminology*, 25 (3), pp.741-766.
- Preble, E., Casey, J.J. (1969) Taking care of business: the heroin user's life on the street. *International Journal of the Addictions*, 4, pp. 1-24.
- Reuter, P., MacCoun, R., Murphy, P. (1990). Money from Crime: A Study of the Economics of Drug Dealing in Washington, D.C. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Siegel, L.J., Senna, J.J. (2008). *Introduction to Criminal Justice*, Eleventh Edition, Thomson-Wadsworth: Belmont.
- Smart, R.G., Adlaf, E.M., Walsh, G.W. (1992). Adolescent drug sellers: trends, characteristics and profiles, *British Journal of Addiction* 87, 1561-1570.
- Stemler, S. (2001). An overview of content analysis. Practical Assessment. *Research & Evaluation*. 7(17). Retrieved January 4, 2011 from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=17>
- Tammy L. A. (2005). Dimensions of women's power in the illicit drug economy, *Theoretical Criminology* 9; 371-400.
- TUBIM. (2010). *2009 national report to the EMCDDA by the Reitox National Focal Point*, TUBIM: Ankara.
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic Content Analysis, 2nd edition*. Newbury Park, CA.