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Abstract
The aim of the study was to explore adolescents’ perceptions of substance use as a contributing factor to community violence by employing a conceptual framework proposed by Goldstein. Data were collected from a sample of adolescents between the ages of 15 and 16 years by means of focus group interviews. Theoretical thematic analysis was used to analyse and interpret the findings. The participants’ perceptions indicated that substance use and withdrawal symptoms induce physiological and behavioural modifications resulting in aggression and violence. The findings also suggest that participants believed that substance users frequently commit property and violent interpersonal crimes such as theft, robbery, assault and murder to procure their substances. Further, the adolescents’ perceived violence to be rooted within gang culture as well as the involvement in shared markets for illicit substance trading.

Introduction
South Africa has among the highest rates of interpersonal violence in the world; with a homicide rate of 31 per 100,000, it ranks globally as the eighth most violent country. There is a large body of evidence that points to the causes of violence as being socio-historically located, with high rates of poverty and deprivation, social inequality, unemployment, patriarchal constructions of gendered roles and substance use identified as the key factors perpetuating violence (Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation 2008; Hawkins et al. 2000; Maldonado-Molina, Jennings, and Komro 2010; Seedat et al. 2009; Seekings and Thaler 2010) Substance use in particular is regarded as a critical factor associated with various forms of violence (Seedat et al. 2009; Seekings and Thaler 2010).

The use of substances such as alcohol, cannabis and methamphetamine is a major public health problem in South Africa (Dada et al. 2014). With regard to substance use in the Western Cape Province, the highest prevalence rates of binge drinking (i.e. four/ five or more alcoholic drinks on one occasion for females and males, respectively) were reported (Peltzer, Davids, and Njuho 2011). Binge drinking was found to be highest in males (31.9%) and females (10.4%) among the previously disenfranchised Coloured (mixed race) population compared to other race groups (Peltzer, Davids, and Njuho 2011). The widespread use of crystal methamphetamine compounds the problem of alcohol use in the
province. Treatment admissions depict that 34% of patients reported methamphetamine to be their primary substance of use (Dada et al. 2014). Other substances such as marijuana, cocaine and ecstasy are generally used in combination with primary substances (Dada et al. 2014). Alcohol continues to be associated with the perpetration of violence, and more specifically, heavy episodic drinking or hazardous drinking (Albers et al. 2015; Lightowlers 2011). With regard to illicit substances, Hamilton and Goeders (2010) show that violent perpetration is not only associated with the use of methamphetamine, but with the withdrawal symptoms of abstaining from the substance. Methamphetamine users are also more likely to experience interpersonal violence perpetrated against them (Meade et al. 2012). Similarly, high levels of hostility and violence were found among ecstasy and cocaine users (Reid, Elifson, and Sterk 2007; Vaughn et al. 2010). The violence-inducing effects of substance use may be attributed to neurobiological factors such as the inability to inhibit violent or aggressive behaviours or impulsivity and paranoia (Dawe et al. 2009).

Literature shows that alcohol use and regular methamphetamine use are associated with individuals committing violent interpersonal and predatory crimes such as physical or sexual assault and robbery; and that the chronic use of substances is further associated with property crimes, that is, home invasions, theft from stores, auto-motor theft or burglaries (Abbey 2011; Baltieri 2014; Darke et al. 2010; Popovici et al. 2012). Hence, the severity of substance use or dependence is related to the probability of committing property and or predatory crimes. The criminal behaviour by those who are dependent on substances may be explained by their engagement in money-orientated crimes to obtain funds to maintain their addiction (French et al. 2000; Oser et al. 2009).

Organised crime may further facilitate violent criminal behaviour in the context of the manufacturing, distribution and selling of substances (Cartier et al. 2006). For example, syndicates use robberies to threaten witnesses and homicides become mechanisms of conflict resolution. As weapons offer protection and money offer defense for substance traders, it serves as a motivation to commit a great amount of crimes (Zaluar 2001). Organised crime may be a result of competing for drug markets, territory and clients (Bjerregaard 2010). Gang membership appear to further contribute to the substance use-violence or crime nexus as gang members are more likely to report higher rates of substance use, physical fighting, more heavily involved in substance distribution in their neighbourhood as compared to non-gang members (Bjerregaard 2010; Swahn et al. 2010).

**Theoretical approach**

Goldstein’s Tripartite conceptual framework proposes that substances and violence are related in three ways. Goldstein thus proposed three theories of violence, resulting from different contexts of substance use, namely: psychopharmacological, economic-compulsive and systemic (1985).The psychopharmacological theory of violence postulates that violence stems from the psychoactive properties of using substances (De La Rosa, Lambert, and Gropper 1990). Some individuals may become irrational and exhibit violent behaviour due to their short- or long-term consumption of a specific substance. The
consumption of substances reduces individual’s inhibitions resulting in adverse effects ranging from neurochemical changes to impairment in cognitive functioning (Powell 2011). The second theory of violence, that is, economic-compulsive violence, results from substance users’ involvement in crimes such as robberies, burglary, shoplifting and prostitution to procure substances. Economic-compulsive violence is a result of social and contextual factors, for example, during a robbery the victim’s reaction may precipitate a violent reaction from the substance user (Goldstein 1985). The third, the systematic theory of violence, pertains to the traditional patterns of violence associated with the distribution, dealing or abuse of illicit substances (Goldstein 1985). This theory accounts for most of the violent substance-related criminal offending such as disputes over territory between rival dealers, assaults and murders committed within the dealing hierarchies occurring between substance bosses and dealers, robberies and murders of substances dealers and punishment for not paying debts (Affinnih 2005).

Given that substance use accounts for increased risks of violent exposure and considering the paucity of empirical data on the substance use-violence nexus within a South African context, there is a need for in-depth research on the nature of the association. The current study hopes to contribute in this regard. The study specifically aims to explore adolescents’ perceptions of substance use as a contributing factor to community violence using Goldstein’s (1985) tripartite conceptual framework of substance use and violence.

Method
Considering the aims and objectives of the study, an exploratory research design was followed, specifically using a qualitative methodological framework. Qualitative research has shown to be particularly useful when conducting exploratory studies on violence and substance use in impoverished communities (see Parkes 2007; Sexton et al. 2009). In the current study, the qualitative framework advanced a level of depth exploration wherein participants were able to express their views on the dynamics of the substance use-violence nexus within their community.

Research context
The study was conducted in an impoverished community in the Cape Flats region of the Western Cape. The Cape Flats is an extended area of flat land positioned on the periphery of Cape Town and was strategically constructed during the Apartheid era to house ‘Black’ and ‘Coloured’ people forcibly evicted from other areas. The terms ‘Coloured’ and ‘Black’ were employed as racial categories within the Apartheid era to reinforce a segregated society, and refer to those who were oppressed, disenfranchised, and denied access to resources (Savahl 2010). Communities on the Cape Flats are confronted with numerous challenges including poor infrastructure, low levels of skills and education, high levels of unemployment, poverty, substance use, crime and gangsterism (Savahl 2010). The specific community in which the study was conducted has a population of 19,576 and is located approximately 15 kilometres from the Cape Town Central Business District (Okecha 2011).
Participants and sampling
The sample consisted of 16 participants (9 females and 7 males) between the ages of 15 and 16 years attending a secondary school located in a Cape Flats community. The participants were purposively selected using age, knowledge of substance use and violence in the community as well as voluntary participation. Participants were accessed via a secondary school in the community, which formed part of a larger research and intervention programme between the school, community and university at which the principal researchers of the study are based. The participants were not requested to report their own use of substances and neither were they screened for substance use as this was not an inclusion criterion for participation in the study. Participation in the study was based on their knowledge and perceptions of substance use and its association to violence within their community.

Data collection
Data were collected by means of two focus group interviews. The focus group technique is a socially orientated research procedure that promotes self-disclosure. It is the preferred data collection technique for elucidating information from children as it creates a non-threatening environment where participants respond more easily (Savahl 2010; Smithson 2000) and enhances engagement between the researcher and the participants. Further, it generates multiple understandings and meanings owing to its unique element of interaction among participants (Krueger and Casey 2000).

Two focus groups of approximately 90 minutes each were conducted. The groups comprised of eight participants each. Group one consisted of four males and four females, and group two consisted of three males and five females. The research study employed a semi-structured interview format as the researchers was particularly interested in exploring and understanding themes from the participants’ perspective in relation to substance-related violence. The interview guide enabled the researcher to collect the necessary information such as participants’ accounts of violence and substance use witnessed in the community (Willig 2001). It comprised two focus areas, namely community violence and the ‘substance use-violence’ nexus. The former contained six introductory questions that focused on adolescents’ perceptions of violence in their community. The latter included eight main questions to elucidate information on the three models of Goldstein’s tripartite framework, that is, the pharmacological effects of substances and behaviour, the link between substance use and crimes, as well as the dynamics inherent to substance distribution within the community.

Procedure and ethics
Once ethics clearance was obtained from the University Higher Degrees Committee and the Western Cape Education Department, an initial appointment meeting was arranged with the school principal. The participants were selected with the assistance of the school principal and life-skills teacher. Information sheets and consent forms were distributed to participants and their parents or legal guardians explaining the aims of the study, ethics surrounding the research, and a request for participation. Those who expressed interest
were requested to provide signed consent as well as obtain signed consent from parents or legal guardians. The focus groups were conducted in a private office on the school premises after school hours. With the permission of the participants, the focus groups were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and independently verified. Counselling services were made available to participants.

Data analysis
Braun and Clarke’s (2006) theoretical thematic analysis technique was used to analyse the data. They recommend six phases namely: data familiarisation, initial coding generation, searching for themes based on initial coding, review of themes, theme definition and report writing (Braun and Clarke 2006). In keeping with aims and objectives of the study, a theory-driven approach to analysis was chosen. As such, the researchers were interested in particular features of the data set which was informed by the theoretical position of the researchers. The data were organised into meaningful groups of information resulting in the formation of codes. Once the codes were determined, they were grouped together to form three key themes.

Findings
The following themes were identified from the data: (a) the psychopharmacological influence of substances, (b) criminal behaviour of substance users’ and (c) substance distribution and violent patterns of interaction and trade.

The psychopharmacological influence of substances
This theme centred on participants’ discussions of the psychoactive effects of substance use in the community. Substances included alcohol, methamphetamine, marijuana, ecstasy, cocaine and unga (a new variant of methamphetamine). Most of the participants reflected on what they witnessed and experienced in the company of substance users. They blamed substances for the changes observed in individuals ‘then they change’ and ‘they don’t do it because they mean it … they do it because the drugs tell them to do it’. The effects of substance use were widely debated during the discussions. The following illustrates this contention:

Male Participant: Depends on what drug you using.
Male Participant: There is substances that mellows you.
Male Participant: Make you hyperactive like this.
Male Participant: Sometimes the drugs also let you talk to yourself

Participants suggested that substances fall within categories of stimulants, depressants and hallucinogens. They accurately mentioned that the main physiological effect of stimulants is to excite the central nervous system. One participant remarked ‘then you think you are strong’ which demonstrated the associated effects of stimulants. Depressants, on the other hand, impede the central nervous system. Alcohol was the most commonly discussed depressant and it was repeatedly attributed to violence ‘but the one substance that causes violence is alcohol’.
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The participants also referred to the impaired cognitive functioning and mood modifications associated with substance intoxication, this is demonstrated by the following excerpts:

Female Participant: You are silly drunk ... don’t know what is going on.
Female Participant: Then the guys will like take the level to the next step cos they are now tipsy.
Male Participant: If they like take that substance it gives them that ... that (facial expression and fists clenched) ... feeling ... and aggression ... ya and then they take it out on other people and ... just finished smoked or something and then he just attacked you.
Male Participant: What I’m trying to say is they give themselves up when they drunk.

Participants discussed how substance users consume alcohol to the point of intoxication, that is, a state of diminished consciousness. Participants believed that substances have an immediate effect on an individual’s mood due to the changes occurring. Consequently, behavioural changes lead to individuals acting impulsively or lashing out in violent rages. Similarly, Lightowlers (2011) found that frequent binge drinking was significantly related to violent behavioural outcomes and identified acute intoxication as a potential risk factor for interpersonal assault. Furthermore, participants explained that individuals are particularly vulnerable when they are intoxicated because they become victims of sexual violence. The findings concur with previous literature indicating that excessive alcohol consumption and intoxication inhibits female’s ability to exercise personal control to reduce risks in sexual situations (Wechsberg et al. 2008). The findings provide evidence that substances such as methamphetamine, cocaine, ecstasy and alcohol typically make individuals act irrationally, affects their behaviour to such an extent that it provokes violence, or makes individuals susceptible to victimisation.

Participants reported that aggression and violence were not only associated with the substance intoxication, but with the discontinued use of the substance, as indicated below:

Female Participant: No, they are more violent when they don’t have it.
Male Participant: You are frustrated because you feel the need for that drug and immediately you walk around frustrated because you need to satisfy that need.
Female Participant: No, only when they took a hit ... then they only hyper.

These participants are referring to the violent behaviour that occurs when users are unable to procure substances. This is a common occurrence in the community wherein the participants reside. Additionally, participants believed that substance users experience discomfort ‘immediately you’ll get tremors’ due to physical and psychological dependence. As a result, they exhibit withdrawal symptoms, to such an extent that they act violently towards others to cope with the symptoms. Further, the participants associated withdrawal symptoms with the desperate substance-seeking behaviour that contributes to a range of violent crimes in the community. This is further explored in the next theme.
**Criminal behaviour of substance users**

The second theme focused on crimes committed by substance users in pursuit of attaining their substances. Participants theorised that users’ criminality was based on the following ‘the thing that I would say influence the violence is the need for drugs’ and ‘it’s all just to take your frustrations out, breaking into other people’s houses and cars, steal certain things and then sell it for your selfish need’. Participants held the view that the primary motive for property crimes in the community was to secure money for the purchase of illicit substances.

Male Participant: People on these drugs … they have no money … they commit crimes like breaking into cars, stealing cd-players speakers, whatever they can get …. 

Female Participant: Like valuable items … say ma now that’s a phone … for example, then I now Tik (colloquial name of crystal methamphetamine) and I don’t have a packet of Tiks money and now I see your phone and I’m gona take your phone then I’m gona go to the merchant (dealer) … arrange something … So that he can give me a packet they normally call it ‘pun’.

Participants believed that, generally, substance users are not financially capable of maintaining their habit and therefore they purchase their supplies from proceeds of crime such as burglaries and violent robberies. Participants also emphasised that substance users have specified patterns of criminal activity where they steal unattended goods and sell it to their dealers. Furthermore, the participants believed that substance users live from ‘fix-to-fix’ and may need several per day to appease their addiction. One participant pointed to substance dependence being the driving force behind profit-orientated criminal activity such as theft. This finding is consistent with Faupel’s (1987) term ‘street junkie’ which is characterised by very little life structure and minimal availability of substances.

As a logical extension of their argument, the participants of the current study suggested that interpersonal violence may be a direct outcome of crimes committed by substance users. While participants initially discussed non-violent property crimes, as the discussion progressed, participants reported that robberies and murders are the leading outcomes of economically driven substance-seeking behaviours:

Female Participant: They rob someone for money and that person doesn’t want to give in, they will actually kill that person to get that money.

Female Participant: That drug that you bought now then I’m gonna take it cause I self wanna use it … but I’m going to stand up for my packet (of drugs), then I’ll tell you let us fight for it, something like that.

Participants believed that substance users will most likely attempt to attain funds or goods by robbing victims (non-users) before resorting to more violent acts such as murder. Also, participants explained that substance users would violently engage with other substance users to swindle them out of their substances. However, users will not merely hand over
their substances to other users even when they are threatened with violence. As such, economic violence occurs among users as well as between users and non-users.

Prostitution was also discussed under the category of the economic-compulsive crimes committed by substance users in particular:

Female Participant: Sometimes women become prostitutes ... then if they get that money then they give it back to the merchants and that merchants can then get their drugs.

The participant’s remark above indicates that it is common for female users to utilise sex work as a form of income to purchase substances as they can barter with drug dealers for their next fix. Mosedale, Kouimtsidis, and Reynolds (2009) detail the experiences of female substance using sex workers. The women in their study revealed that they were using highly addictive substances and out of desperation, entered into sex work to earn an income to support their own or partner's habit. In both Mosedale, Kouimtsidis, and Reynolds (2009) and the current study, participants alluded to violence experienced by sex workers resulting in further substance use as a coping mechanism for sex workers.

Substance distribution and violent patterns of interaction and trade
The final theme was related to the violence inherent in the substance users lifestyle, and the illegal substance trafficking and trading. Participants commented on the channels of substance distribution in their community ‘... drug dealers here ... they buy by wholesalers’ the dealers are those who directly distribute substances to users and the wholesalers are those responsible for supplying substances and making it available to distributors.

Participants instinctively linked substance distribution to gang violence. This is illustrated below:

Female Participant: The Americans and the Varkies have gang wars here in (name of community). See, because it is drug-related. The Americans get angry when the Varkies have more ‘work’ hey ... drugs now ... And then the Americans get angry and they shoot at the Varkies. And then the Varkies come back with a comeback. And then innocent people get killed.

The above extract suggests that gang violence ‘is drug-related’ and that substance-dealing practices are enmeshed in gang culture. Participants explained that the ‘work’ of gang members is substance distribution. Hence, involvement with illegal substances is not for recreational (consumption) purposes, but rather occupationally orientated. Gang wars was further perceived as a direct result of one gang having more “work” than the other. Participants also mentioned that the gang affiliations made use of a series of pervasive violent acts to retaliate or to resolve conflict with ‘innocent people often being caught in the crossfire’.
Participants believed that substance distribution is a lucrative business enterprise and those who are involved skilfully apply business principles in their ventures. Participants drew attention to the prevalence of drug marketing and how it constitutes a large part of the violence in the community ‘...here’s alota (many) merchants here so there is always violence’. They sketched scenarios that give rise to violence in the context of substance distribution. One participant held the view that violence erupts when there are interferences with routine business operations. When outsiders impede on business opportunities, violence is believed to be the outcome. Disturbances at a dealer’s place of trade results in customers being hesitant to purchase ‘because they want keep a low profile’ and this ‘makes the drug merchant upset’. Substance distributors develop tactics for reducing risk by adopting a tough street image and using retaliatory violence. Hence, violence serves as a mechanism to control situations (Jacobs and Wright 2006).

Like all commercial ventures, substance distribution involves a great deal of competition. The following depicts the participants’ perceptions of how the competitive nature of substance distribution results in violence:

Female Participant: I said that they fight over the territory.
Female Participant: The one merchant now takes the other merchants customers whatever.
Male Participant: Say, for example, I buy drugs from one merchant and then I go to another merchant who sells the same drug ... then they will be at war with each other.

Participants stated that distribution competition centres on clientele and distribution territory. They discussed how dealing increased the incidence of violence due to shared markets. Participants explained that when customers purchase from different distributors selling the same substance it translates into rivalry among distributors. A distributor will most likely retaliate against others, for example, ‘another merchant he now just organises a drug bust’ and make of use violence to keep his customers when they his clients. They described how substance dealers invade territory of others resulting in violent ‘drug wars’. A further confounding problem is that ‘some of the cops are with the merchants’ and it is not unusual for dealers to bribe or threaten law enforcement officials.

**Conclusion**

The study aimed to explore adolescents’ perceptions of substance use as a contributing factor to community violence using Goldstein’s (1985) tripartite conceptual framework of substance use and violence. The findings concur with the notion that the three dimensions of Goldstein’s (1985) theory should be seen as interrelated and mutually influencing and not in isolation. The participants provided a unique first-hand account of the reciprocal relationship between substance use and violence. Specifically, they highlighted the importance of understanding the individual level factors (e.g. the compulsive and ‘biological’ need to procure substances) in relation to the broader social context in which substance use becomes a precursor of violence. In Goldstein’s (1985) systemic model, violence is intrinsic to involvement with any illicit substances and is characterised by aggressive patterns of interaction within the system of substance distribution. Affinnih
(2005) notes that systemic violence has two dimensions; the one is linked to the system of distribution and the other to the system of substance use. Findings of the current study suggest that examples of both are readily available in the community. Substance distribution along with systemic violence occurs in contexts with high rates of interpersonal violence, economic disadvantage and social disorganisation where there is an absence of or ineffective social control (formal or informal). Goldstein (1985) states that substance users become involved in substance distribution as their substance using careers progress and, hence, are at increased risk of becoming a victim or perpetrator of systemic violence. Systemic violence often goes beyond those involved in the system of distribution and it affects the community members both directly through injury or death and indirectly by disrupting community life.

Future research should explore the etiological explanations of substances on violent behaviour by investigating separate linkages for violent behaviour preceded by intoxication, violent behaviour associated with the procurement of substances or funds to obtain them, and violence that stems from interpersonal interactions in drug selling activities.
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