

**“Before drugs it’s almost like I didn’t exist”
Contextualized drug narratives: Structure, stories and identity**

by

Jacob H. Erickson

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Sociology

Program of Study Committee:
Andy Hochstetler, Major Professor
Matt DeLisi
Susan Stewart
Kyle Burgason
Alex Tuckness

The student author, whose presentation of the scholarship herein was approved by the program of study committee, is solely responsible for the content of this dissertation. The Graduate College will ensure this dissertation is globally accessible and will not permit alterations after a degree is conferred.

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2020

Copyright © Jacob H. Erickson, 2020. All rights reserved.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my mother who has always supported me and my goals. She has provided me unwavering support and I cannot thank her enough. Without her I would not be in the position I am today. I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to my participants who graciously let me into their world for an hour or more. They were engaging, vulnerable, and funny. They made this research possible and I am indebted to those who gave up their time so I could learn from them. I hope I do them justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION: DRUG USE, TRADE AND WHY THEY DO IT.....	1
CHAPTER 2. PREVIOUS LITERATURE: DRUG USE, TRADE AND IDENTITY.....	8
Drug Use, Motivation and Identity.....	8
Drug Trade, Motivation and Identity.....	16
Race/Ethnicity and Drug Use.....	21
Race/Ethnicity and Drug Trade.....	24
Gender and Drug Use.....	26
Gender and Drug Trade.....	28
Class and Drug Use.....	32
Class and Drug Trade.....	33
Residential Location and Drug Use.....	35
Residential Location and Drug Trade.....	38
Intersectionality, Identity and Drugs.....	40
CHAPTER 3. THERORIZING DRUG INVOLVEMENT: BOURDIEU, NARRATIVES, AND NARRATIVE HABITUS.....	45
The General Theory of Crime.....	46
Social Boundary Theory.....	48
General Strain Theory.....	50
Social Disorganization Theory.....	52
Self-Derogation Theory.....	54
Learning Theory.....	56
Techniques of Neutralization.....	57
Subcultural Theories.....	59
Identity Theory and Boundary Work.....	61
Reconciling Background and Foreground Theories of Crime.....	62
Identity as Causality.....	66
Bourdieu's Theory of Practice.....	68
Narrative Criminology.....	72
Narrative Habitus.....	75
CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGY: NARRATIVE AS METHOD.....	78
Research Sites.....	78
Sampling.....	79
Sample Characteristics.....	80
Analytic Procedure.....	81

CHAPTER 5. FINDINGS.....	87
Drug Use and Context.....	87
Physical Context.....	88
Family, Lovers, Peers.....	93
Cultural Context.....	103
Drug Use and Motivation.....	107
Curiosity.....	108
Rebellion.....	110
Hedonism.....	115
Coping.....	121
Fitting In.....	124
Motivations Evolve.....	126
Drug Use and Identity.....	128
Drug Trade and Context.....	139
Physical Context.....	139
Family.....	141
Drug Trade and Motivation.....	147
Lifestyle.....	148
Survival.....	153
Drug Trade and Identity.....	156
CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	168
REFERENCES.....	183
APPENDIX. IRB APPROVAL MEMO	212

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge all of the members of the Department of Sociology at Iowa State University. I have enjoyed my time here and that has been made by the people here. The graduate student colleagues I have shared the 4th floor with have made much of my education here a fun and collaborative experience. The support staff have been knowledgeable and nice. Rachel Burlingame in particular has been a fantastic resource and a pleasant person to talk with. I would like to acknowledge my committee members who were willing to sit on my committee and provide helpful feedback throughout the process. Specifically, I would like to thank Dr. Matt DeLisi who has provided me significant practical and professional advice. He has been a regular source of encouragement. I would also like to thank Dr. Susan Stewart whose support and insight has been invaluable for this dissertation research. Since the inception of the project she has been a sounding board, from IRB considerations to questionnaire items she has provided valuable guidance and feedback. Specifically, her encouragement to pursue analyzing the influence of gender and family were integral to the findings presented here. I also acknowledge Dr. Kyle Burgason for his continued professional and academic support and advice. In particular, his advice for pursuing a tenure-track job was honest, practical, and helpful. Last, I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Andy Hochstetler. He has shepherded me through much of my time here. He provided me my first opportunities for publication and secured the data I used for an article of which I am quite proud. He has spent significant energies fostering my abilities the past several years while also being a constant source of funny stories and I have enjoyed working with him as much as I have learned while working with him. I am lucky he became my major professor. I hope I do him justice.

ABSTRACT

Relatively little research has examined what motivates people to make the choice to become involved with drugs, how drug involvement becomes a salient feature of those individuals' lives, the consequence for their identity, and how these vary by race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location. Inspired by Bourdieu and emerging criminological research utilizing his framework, and in concert with insights from narrative criminology, I fill a gap in the literature I provide a nuanced examination of the intersecting influences of race/ethnicity, class, gender, and residential location on the development of a drug using or dealing identity. Sixty current or former users and dealers were interviewed across two research sites. Semi-structured life-history interviews were used to elicit narratives from participants.

I find participants pull from multiple subculturally available identities to construct their own personal narrative identities and that these identities vary by user, dealer, race/ethnicity, class, gender, and residential location. Drug users could call on a variety of identities and the most commonly presented ones among my sample included "party", "responsible drug user", "super mom", or "failing mom" identities. Those from Two Rivers more commonly constructed a party identity, while it was more common for those from Winterton City to construct one of the later identities. Dealers often called on one of three identities. Those from Two Rivers could be considered "good time dealers" while those from Winterton City were more apt to construct a "hustler" or "survivor" identity in relation to their dealing. I provide evidence that deviant identities are not situationally constructed and enacted. Instead, deviant behaviors are incorporated into an individual's pre-existing identity and are shaped by important markers of social identity. I suggest this identification with drug

involvement becomes important for an individual's sense of identity with effects for deviant and no-deviant spheres of life.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION: DRUG USE, TRADE AND WHY THEY DO IT

Despite years of the “war on drugs” and various drug reduction programs, rates of cannabis, cocaine, ecstasy, heroin, methamphetamine, and hallucinogen use among high school students have stayed relatively stable between 1991 and 2017 (CDC 2017), and similar stability exists among the general population (NIDA 2015). Between 2002 and 2013, the percentage of Americans using illicit drugs at least monthly had increased from 8.2% to 9.4%, equating to approximately 24.6 million adults who used drugs semi-regularly or regularly (NIDA 2015). Cannabis is the most commonly used illicit drug among adults with nearly 32% of young adults (18-25) having used cannabis one or more times in the past year (Salas-Wright et al. 2015). Perhaps most urgent, a “crises” or “epidemic” around the use of opioids has become a national health concern and roughly 115 people in the U.S. die each day from opioid overdose (CDC 2016). In addition, the total societal cost of prescription opioid abuse in 2013 was estimated at 78.5 billion dollars (Florence et al. 2016). Moreover, there are numerous negative health consequences associated with drug dependence, such as emotional difficulties (Altschuler and Brounstein 1991; Centers and Weist 1998), psychological disorders, disease, and overdose (Degenhardt and Hall 2012).

Drug use and addiction can have significant personal and societal costs associated with it. Drug use is associated with contact with the criminal justice system (Walters 2014), violent crime (Krug et al. 2002; DeLisi et al. 2015), non-violent crime (White et al. 2002), fighting with a group (DeLisi, Vaughn and Salas-Wright 2015), intimate partner violence (Moore et al. 2008), prostitution (Yacoubian et al. 2001), participation in gangs (Hill et al. 1999; Olate, Salas-Wright and Vaughn 2012), as well as shoplifting and armed robbery (Bennett, Holloway and Farrington 2008). These associations are sometimes referred to as

the “drugs/crime nexus” and reveal the pervasive association between drugs and crime.

Indeed, it is estimated between medical costs and lost quality of life drug-tangled crimes cost over 200 billion dollars each year (Miller et al. 2006).

There is significant variability in adult drug users, both in terms of demographic characteristics and forms of use. Some use drugs early in adulthood occasionally before their usage drops off entirely, others can be considered occasional users, but their use persists into middle age, and some can be considered frequent users in early adulthood, but as they age their usage generally declines (Kertesz et al. 2012).¹ Among adults, drug use is most commonly engaged in by young adults (18-25), and rates of use decline as people age (Chen and Kandel 1995). Drug use rates are lowest among Black young adults and highest among White young adults (18-25) (Vaughn et al. 2017). However, this difference flips at approximately 35 when Black individuals become more likely to use drugs than their White counterparts (French, Finkbiner and Duhamel 2002).

Despite noticeable differences in dealers regarding dealing types and rates as well as demographic characteristics (Shook et al. 2011; Shook, Vaughn, and Salas-Wright 2013; Vaughn et al. 2015), those engaged in selling drugs tend to be male, engage in crime including violence, and smoke cannabis (Steinman 2005). Men are significantly more likely to sell drugs than their female counterparts (Denton and O’Malley 1999; Semple et al. 2011; Vuolo et al. 2014; Stanforth, Kostiuk and Garriot 2016), however, increasing attention has been allocated to women’s roles in drug dealing in recent years (Denton and O’Malley 1999). While Black and White adolescent males are more likely to sell drugs than Asian or Latinx

¹ Trajectory analysis such as the one used by Kertesz et al. sacrifice individual variation in drug use to group individuals into trajectories. These are useful heuristics, but not meant to be representative of the drug using trajectory of a single drug user.

individuals (Steinman 2005), by adulthood there is no statistical difference in rates of dealing between people of different race or ethnic backgrounds when controlling for other relevant factors (Stanforth, Kostiuk and Garriott 2016). Participation in drug trade is associated with increased substance use, exposure to violence, weapon use, offending versatility, gang participation, delinquency, crime, and even death (Dembo et al. 1990; Fagan and Chin 1990; Moore 1990; Altschuler and Brounstein 1991; Black and Ricardo 1994; Stanton and Galbraith 1994; Li et al. 1994; Van Kammen and Loeber 1994; Li and Feigelman 1999; McCurley and Snyder 2008; Shook et al. 2011). Despite lack of clarity in the correlates of drug use and dealing, extant research on drug dealers has focused largely on urban people of color with attention to the structure and practice of dealing to the detriment of examining why people sell drugs and how it effects their conception of self (for examples see, Fagan 1989; Jacobs, Topalli and Wright 2000, for exceptions see Bourgeois 2003; Jacques and Wright 2016). Indeed, some have called for research on drug dealers that more specifically examines the influence of race and ethnicity in efforts to address this gap (Maher and Hudson 2007; Floyd et al. 2010).

A large body of research examines the social organization and mechanics of drug use and dealing (Adler and Adler 1983; Skolnick et al. 1990; Adler 1993; Dunlap and Johnson 1996; Maher and Daly 1996; Jacobs and Miller 1998; Curtis and Wendel 2000; Jacobs, Topalli and Wright 2000; Topalli, Wright and Fornango 2002; Maher and Hudson 2007; Jacques 2010; Sandberg 2012; Fleetwood 2014; Jacques and Wright 2011; Hammersvik, Sandberg and Pedersen 2012; Jacques and Wright 2014; Hammersvik 2015). Comparatively less research has examined what motivates people to make the choice to become involved with drugs, how drug involvement becomes a salient feature of those individuals' lives, and

to what consequence for their identity. Indeed, after reviewing findings from a commissioned study on drug use, a Canadian senate committee noted their report had not, “answered the fundamental question of why people consume psychoactive substances, such as alcohol, drugs or medication”, and further noted they were, “surprised, given the quantity of studies conducted every year on drugs, that this area has not been researched adequately. It is almost as if the quest for answers to technical questions has caused science to lose sight of the basic issue!” (Nolin and Kenny 2003:17). This is an odd oversight as the criminological question, “Why did they do it?” has been a central focus since the field’s genesis (Maruna and Copes 2005; Katz 1988). Additionally, criminological research on drug involvement suffers from a lack of comparisons to similarly offending persons from different racial and class backgrounds. Furthermore, research on deviant identity and decision making has tended to treat these processes as products of situated actions and motives, with heavy emphasis on structural context, and with little attention to how identities take shape over the life course as well as effect choice situationally and temporally adjacent to offending.

As a result of these research oversights, suggestions as to the ways in which lived experience translates into deviant identity and decision making processes, specifically as they relate to beginning and sustaining long-term drug careers, are likely oversimplified. Such information will provide avenues of insight into drug prevention and rehabilitation efforts. Indeed, understanding motivations of individuals who use or sell drugs will allow practitioners to address the types of attitudes and beliefs that lend themselves to drug involvement (Pomazal and Brown 1977). The cost of not engaging in such research that can adequately address the antecedents of drug involvement not only negatively effects drug users themselves, but also extends to society in both social and economic burdens. Thus, it

seems of central importance to go to the source and discuss with those who “do it” what their motivations are and what they get out of the choice to use or sell drugs. As Tutenges (2015:173) notes, “Drug users are exhaustively written and spoken about, yet they are rarely allowed to speak for themselves”. Consequently, it seems important to study the decision to become drug involved, how individuals incorporate their involvement into their identity and to what consequence.

In sociology and criminology, there is ongoing interest in disentangling the way social structure and culture combine to inform identity and choice. Perhaps the most prominent sociologist to write in an attempt to reconcile structural and subjective approaches to understanding human action and interaction is Pierre Bourdieu. In this study, I draw on the work of Bourdieu (1977; 1984; 1986; 1989; 1990; 1993) to provide a theoretically framed explication of the motives and rationales for initiation and persistence in drug involvement through the examination of narratives of drug involvement. Second, and relatedly, I examine the differential influence of place and space, as well as interactions with significant others, on drug involvement as perceived by those involved. Third, I provide insight into how people construct a narrative identity in relation to drug involvement and how such an identity informs their choices regarding drug involvement, to some degree recasting Bourdieu’s ideas with insights from narrative criminology. Finally, I detail the ways in which drug involvement modifies individual dispositions and attitudes and how these changes persist temporally.

Sandberg and Fleetwood (2016), narrative criminologists, note deviants construct identities that reflect early socialization and background, but have not adequately detailed the process through which socialization and social background inform the development of

deviant identities via their habitus. Fleetwood (2016) taking direction from Bourdieu (1977; 1990) develops the concept of “narrative habitus” suggesting a link between people’s narrative identity and their habitus. “Narratives” are cultural resources, they are stories that orient actors in social space and contextualize thought, action, and construct a “narrative identity” (Presser and Sandberg 2015). Bourdieu’s (1977; 1990) concept of “habitus” calls attention to beliefs, dispositions and actions of individuals that are inculcated on them throughout life and are durable across time and transposable across situations. Inspired by Bourdieu and emerging criminological research utilizing this framework (Sandberg 2008), and in concert with insights from narrative criminology (Presser and Sandberg 2015; Sandberg and Fleetwood 2016), I detail some of the attitudes and beliefs which lend themselves to drug involvement, the ways in which people interpret their social context and background and how they believe it informs their drug involvement, the degree to which they embody a drug related identity, and how drug involvement modifies previously held attitudes and perceptions of self. By focusing attention to the ways in which people construct coherent narrative identities across the lifecourse, I show the choice to use drugs is initially motivated by previously held conceptions of self and attitudes towards drug use and how drug involvement acts as a resource to display and affirm such previously held perceptions of self. I discuss the various ways in which people interpret their objective conditions in influencing their drug involvement. Filling a gap in the literature, I provide a nuanced examination of the intersecting influences of race/ethnicity, class, gender, and residential location on the development of a drug using or dealing identity and the degree to which such identities are durable and situationally transposable. The fundamental aim of this research is to show how

drug using identities are constitutively constructed, actively produced, and have real effects in deviant and non-deviant spheres of life.

CHAPTER 2. PREVIOUS LITERATURE: DRUG USE, TRADE AND IDENTITY

Generally speaking, empirical research on substance use and abuse can be broken into three categories on the basis of level of analysis. Individual risk factors are idiosyncrasies of the individual such as personality, temperament or genetic predisposition. Interpersonal risk factors relate to the influences of others on an individual's willingness to use drugs.

Contextual risk factors relate to physical influences such as the availability of drugs, neighborhood disorganization, or less tangible environmental variables such as cultural norms (Wallace 1999; Sampson and Bean 2006). The following review of literature will touch on each of these three domains, how they may relate to motivations for drug use, and the meaning they bring to drug use and the development of a drug using identity.

Drug Use, Motivations and Identity

Relatively little research has examined expressed motivations for using drugs (Nolin and Kenney 2003), with research tending to focus on disadvantage or psychological co-morbidity. Existing research concerning foreground and subjective motivations for drug use has noted that users find drug use as a way to unwind, enhance leisure activities, make normally boring chores such as yardwork more enjoyable, and to achieve desired goals (Hathaway 1997; Pearson 2001; Osbourne and Fogel 2008; Kerley, Copes and Griffin 2015). Yet, the question remains as to how these motivations become salient, and some would suggest individuals learn such motivations and rationales (Becker 1953, 1963; Sutherland 1973; Akers et al. 1979; Akers and Lee 1996). Dembo et al. (1986) finds support for social learning theory and suggests young people's drug use is most notably influenced by the frequency of parental drug use, while others have noted peer behavior and attitudes are among the most important predictors of drug use (Adler and Adler 1978; Petriatis, Flay and

Miller 1995; Ford 2008). Support for the link between social learning theory and drug use has been echoed by other researchers (Marcos, Bahr and Johnson 1986; Ellickson, Collins and Bell 2009), while many have noted having drug using peers predict drug use after controlling for temperamental influences such as self-control (Svensson 2003; Bohnert, Bradshaw and Latkin 2009). Moreover, scholars have noted the connection between thoughts and action. Indeed, neutralization theory posits people not only learn to use drugs from peers, friends, family and others, but they learn the motivations and neutralizations that allow for persistence in the behavior (Sykes and Matza 1957. Maruna and Copes 2005).

Techniques of neutralization allow deviants to neutralize the guilt that may be associated with their deviance (Sykes and Matza 1957), and are seen as constitutive of motivation. Indeed, Cressey (1953:94) suggests “the rationalization is his motivation”. Furthermore, neutralizations allow individuals to maintain a positive self-concept despite their misdeeds, which in turn makes the continuation of their deviance more likely (Maruna and Copes 2005). Research has found the use of drugs and the utilization of neutralizations to be linked (Priest and McGrath 1970; Akers and Cochran 1985; Shiner and Newburn 1997; Sandberg 2012; Cutler 2014). However, in statistical analysis, the relationship between acceptance of neutralization techniques is only moderately related to criminality including drug use (Ball 1966; Minor 1981; Agnew and Peters 1986; Mitchell, Doddler and Norris 1990). Moreover, while Sykes and Matza (1957) argued that neutralizations precede deviance, research has found offenders tend to only accept neutralizations for crimes in which they have already participated (Minor 1981; Wortley 1986; McCarthy and Stewart 1998). Thus, while neutralizations are important for understanding individuals’ motivations and justifications for continued use (Maruna and Copes 2005), they do not explain why

people initially begin using drugs or the meaning that their drug use has for them as individuals.

Subcultural theorists argue subcultural participants reject normative society (Cohen 1955; Cloward and Ohlin 1960). They argue individuals steeped in subcultures fashion their own “codes” of conduct (Wolfgang and Ferracutti 1967; Anderson 1999), as a product of their “focal concerns”, including “smartness”, “autonomy” and “excitement” (Miller 1958), and the experience of, “similar problems of adjustment” (Cohen 1955:59), producing a desire for belonging, status, and respect (Miller 1958; Anderson 1999), (for a review of subcultures see Brake 1980; Blackman 2005, 2014; Williams 2007). Cloward and Ohlin (1960) were among the first to discuss drug using subcultures (retreatist subculture), but research on drug subcultures has waxed and waned within criminological discourse (see Brake 1980). Currently little research examines drug use within the context of subcultures (for exceptions see Sanders 2006; Sandberg 2012). However, scholars argue that subcultural studies still have import for understanding motivations to use drugs (Pederson 2009; Shiner 2009; Sandberg 2012; Holm, Sandberg, Kolind and Hesse 2014), and the ability of subcultural orientations to influence identity construction (Copes and Williams 2007). Subcultures can be thought of as “fields” of action (Bourdieu 1977, 1990), which present people with locally salient narratives they can draw from and are important for understanding both choice and identity. However, while subcultural studies provide insight into how drug users may contextualize their motivations to use drugs and bring meaning to their drug using behaviors, it does not adequately answer how users construct their drug-using identities and to what consequence. People do not passively receive culture. On the contrary, people create and modify culture through interaction. Bourdieu’s (1977; 1990) theory of practice elucidates

how people enact and reproduce culture through interaction and by extension reproduce their sense of self-identity.

It is important to understand drug user's identity construction because identity and action are fundamentally linked (Presser 2009; 2012). Thus, to understand drug user's motivations, it is necessary to understand individual's identities as drug users and the meaning their use has for them. Research on drug users suggests they tend to be less conventionally oriented, less attached and less integrated into society and their family (Buckhalt et al. 1992; Friedman et al. 1995; Friedman, Terras, and Glassman 2000; Johnson et al. 2000; Koeppel and Chism 2018). These findings are important as they relate to embodied dispositions and attitudes (Bourdieu 1977; 1990), which inform peoples' behavior. For some, the association between drug use and attachment to conventional parents, peers and school (Marcos, Bahr and Johnson 1986; LeGrande and Shoemaker 1989; Ellickson, Collins, and Bell 2009) are important sources of cultural narratives that individuals use to craft their identity and bring meaning to their actions. Thus, addressing drug user's subjective interpretations of their experiences with parents, peers and school, and how they relate to their drug use will give insight into how drug users contextualize their behaviors and construct their identities.

Self-derogation theory (Kaplan 1975), posits that some, or all of drug user's unconventionality is a product of rejection from conventional institutions and that for some drug use is perceived as a way to increase their self-esteem (Kaplan 1975, 1976, 1978; Kaplan, Martin and Robbins 1982). However, Lee et al. (2018) find that self-esteem predicts adolescent drug use, but fails to predict drug use by age 21, thus self-derogation may not adequately explain the motivations or describe identities of adult drug users.

Qualitative work on drug users' identities has largely focused on how drug users construct their identities through boundary work (Copes 2016). Through moral boundary work people construct drug using identities that allow them to distinguish themselves from people they view as morally or socially inferior (Copes et al. 2016). These boundaries are delimited by the social space in which people exist and are attempts to relay the contextually appropriate attitudes and dispositions of a drug using identity. The most commonly noted way for users to engage in moral boundary work is through the construction of conceptions of "functional" and "dysfunctional" users with functionality often relating to keeping up with the most basic of everyday tasks (e.g. maintaining employment, feeding children, bathing, etc.) (Webb, Deitzer and Copes 2017). Thus, such symbolic boundary work is rarely done through comparisons upward, only downward. Individuals who do not abide by such prescribed norms are considered "addicts" and are considered "weak", "unattractive" and "worthless" by comparison (Copes, Hochstetler and Williams 2008; 2016). Engaging in symbolic boundaries also has the effect of creating social solidarity among similar individuals by establishing aspects of character that mark insiders from outsiders (Lamont and Molnar 2002), and are often products of subcultural norms and prescriptions.

Copes (2016) notes that symbolic boundaries are generally formed using one or more of six key distinctions: physical appearance, mental health, maintaining obligations, route of administration, motivations for use, and avenues of procurement. These boundaries are used by drug users to allow for positive identity construction in the face of stigmatization (Copes et al. 2014). Such boundary work is important for understanding persistence in drug use. They allow the user to view themselves as in control, and as a person who is making a choice of their own free will, rather than someone who has lost themselves to the influence of drugs.

Among drug users, boundaries are drawn to distinguish between people who use certain drugs but not others, and to differentiate between types of users of the same drug (Copes 2016). Some drug users argue that their own drug use is different and less problematic than the use of other drugs (Foster and Spencer 2013; Jarvinen and Demant 2011). Examples include portrayal of cannabis as preferable to hard drug use (Soller and Lee 2010), prescription opioids as better than heroin (Mars et al. 2014), and party drugs (e.g. ecstasy and MDMA) as superior to heroin or methamphetamine (Pennay and Moore 2010). It is argued by users their drug of choice does not control them and they possess a greater level of agency and self-control than the “dope-fiend” or “crackhead” from which they set themselves apart.

Boundaries are also created amongst those using the same drug. Boeri (2004) shows some heroin addicts conceive of themselves as “addicts”, but not “junkies”, while Rodner (2005) suggests drug users like to consider themselves “users”, not “abusers”. Boundaries may be drawn between occasional use and persistent use (Foster and Spencer 2013), between those who use a drug illicitly for “legitimate” purposes (e.g. work) instead of for intoxicating effects (Pedersen, Sandberg and Copes 2015), between “functional” meth users and “meth heads” (Copes et al. 2016), between those ensconced in rave culture and those attending raves simply for drugs (Moloney and Hunt 2012), and between those who smoke or sniff meth and those who inject the drug (Copes et al. 2016). Even amongst those who inject drugs, boundaries are formed between “responsible” and “less responsible” forms of injection (Rhodes et al. 2007).

Ravn (2012) provides five dimensions of a “responsible recreational drug user” as constituted by users themselves. The first relates to the ability to make good decisions about

when and where to take drugs as well as while intoxicated. The second dimension relates to general knowledge of drugs and their effects. The third dimension of a responsible recreational drug user identity relates to situationally specific knowledge of a drug one is imminently about to consume. The fourth involves checking drugs for safety reasons and so as to assure one was not “scammed” or “ripped off”. The final dimension of a responsible recreational drug user is age as it is considered irresponsible for minors to use drugs irrespective of the other dimensions.

The dimensions around which drug users build boundaries to construct their identities provide valuable insight, but does not adequately explain why it is those specific boundaries which are salient, nor do they capture all of the influences which play into a drug user’s identity. Likely, the reason certain boundaries are formed over others emerges from the interplay between socialization and the temperaments and personalities of drug users. Indeed, there are an abundance of studies linking low self-control (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990), to drug use of various kinds and among various populations (Arneklev 1993; Winfree Jr. and Bernat 1998; Lagrange and Silverman 1999; Wright et al. 1999; Willis and Stoolmiller 2002; Baron 2003; Sussman, McCuller and Dent 2003; de Wit 2008; Verdejo-Garcia, Lawrence and Clark 2008; Malouf, Stuewig and Tagney 2012; Shaefer et al. 2015). Moreover, low self-control not only effects drug use directly, but indirectly, by increasing the likelihood an individual will associate with deviant peers (Donohew et al. 1999; Longshore et al. 2004; Yanovitzky 2005; McGloin and Shermer 2008; Malouf, Stuewig and Tagney 2012). It is also noteworthy that some have noted only certain aspects of self-control are predictive of substance use, specifically impulsivity, risk seeking, orientation to the present and temper (Arneklev 1993; Lagrange and Silverman 1999; de Wit 2008). Perhaps individuals who are

impulsive, risk seekers, and oriented toward the present are able to use drugs as a resource to both enjoy and express that impulsivity and risk taking orientation. Being a risk taker and impulsive are not only trait-like characteristics affecting discrete choices, but are also characteristics people may incorporate into their narrative identity which can encourage further participation in risky behaviors like drug use. Risk taking, for example, is not just a reflection of temperament, but also can be a sought-after attribute indicative of being adventuresome, fearless or brave. Such characteristics can constitute personality features that people use to form identities and character.

Drug use is undoubtedly important for identity construction and some have noted that drug consumption can be important for an individual's sense of self such that it functions as, "sources of credibility and respect" (Collison 1996:433). Using drugs certainly puts an individual "where the action is" (Goffman 1967), and the risk taking, or edgework (Lyng 1990), inherent in drug involvement can mark an individual as having a particular identity, maturity, and independence (Collison 1996). For those that use drugs regularly they are constantly involved in a carousel of drug deals, buying and selling drugs for themselves and friends. Indeed, Katz (1988:206) notes, "even the hustling heroin addict may experience his drug use as a part of a larger fascination to test his mettle." Despite this "hustle", their suggestion that they are just "helping out a friend" draws a sharp boundary between drug dealing and "hooking up a friend" that is common in drug networks. Despite protestations that they only engage in "social supply" (Coomber and Moyle 2014), drug users readily admit to being involved in a dynamic world of buying, selling and trading that is important for how they conceive of themselves. This type of action, boundary work and identity construction is only possible by learning and internalizing the narratives of the subculture of

which they are a part – one that suggests unless profit or “weight” is exchanged, or the exchange is among strangers, one is not truly a dealer. Thus, drug use may be a mechanism through which an individual understands who they are as tough, individualistic, and rebellious, but at the same time draws boundaries and constructs identities that construe their behaviors as non-deviant or acceptable under the circumstance. Yet, just as with symbolic boundaries, there is some question as to why these fascinations with participation in drug networks exist, how they are incorporated into a person’s identity, and to what consequence.

Drug Trade, Motivation and Identity

Statistically speaking, those who sell drugs tend to be male, engage in crime including violence, and smoke cannabis (Steinman 2005). However, there is considerable heterogeneity in drug dealers, both in terms of demographic characteristics and dealing rates and types (Shook et al. 2011; Shook, Vaughn, and Salas-Wright 2013; Vaughn et al. 2015). Indeed, some have argued the stereotypical “street tough” dealer is not an accurate portrayal of many who sell drugs (Coomber 2010). Qualitative research on drug dealers has focused almost exclusively on urban people of color with attention to the structure and practice of dealing to the detriment of examining why people sell drugs (for examples see, Fagan 1989; Jacobs, Topalli and Wright 2000) (for an exception see Jacques and Wright 2015). While there is work on what motivates drug dealers, more attention is warranted on the process by which those motivations become salient and rationalized, the meaning ascribed to dealing, the process through which individuals construct an identity as a drug dealer and how this influences the way they practice the trade.

There is considerably more research on the motivations of drug dealers than of users and it suggests those that sell drugs are motivated for a variety of reasons: to feed their own

drug habit (Cross et al. 2001; Stanforth, Kostiuk and Garriott 2015), to supply friends (Taylor and Potter 2013; Jacques and Wright 2015), and of course, to make money (Buchanan 1993). It has been suggested Black individuals from disadvantaged circumstances believe opportunities for conventional success are limited and perceive drug dealing as an alternative route for improving their economic position (Mieckowski 1994; Ricardo 1994; Denton and O'Malley 2001; Campbell and Hanson 2012). Indeed, it is said that drug trade has become an important "counter economy" (Davis 1988:49), and some perceive dealing drugs as work (Manning and Redlinger 1983). However, it is worth noting that money is not the only motivating factor. In fact, for many dealers, dealing drugs is often a fairly insignificant compliment financially to other more legitimate earnings (MacCoun and Reuter 1992). This certainly prompts the question of why such individuals sell drugs and what they get from it beyond economic remuneration.

Those that sell drugs enjoy more than just a pay day, but an appreciation for the lifestyle that accompanies dealing drugs (VanNostrand and Tewksbury 1999; Campbell and Hansen 2012). Such a lifestyle affords them the ability to help their families economically, improve their social status and perception of self, as well as gain respect and reputation amongst their peers (Weismann 1993; Whitehead, Peterson and Kaljee 1994; Bourgois 2003; Jacques and Wright 2015; Erickson, Hochstetler and Copes In Press). The question is how these motivations and rewards become salient to individuals and how the choice to deal drugs becomes incorporated into their identity.

Murphy, Waldorf and Reinerman (1990) argue that people learn to deal drugs through their experiences in drug using networks and, in doing so, learn the motivations and rationales for dealing. These attitudes and perceptions are likely learned from parents or

peers with accepting or encouraging attitudes towards drug dealing (Flom et al. 2001; Stanforth, Kostiuk, and Garriott 2015). Additionally, it has been shown that many dealers start selling as a way to assist their friends in drug procurement before drifting into “real dealing” (Taylor and Potter 2013). Thus, individuals may learn through peer or parental interaction that drug dealing is a viable and fruitful option, especially for those “born into it” (Campbell and Hansen 2012). Thus, mechanisms of socialization such as parents, peers and neighborhoods are apt to exert a strong influence on the why individuals sell drugs and the symbolic meaning they bring to their dealing.

Drug dealing can be considered a behavior that is integral to the maintenance of drug subcultures and the lifestyles associated with them. An appreciation for a particular hedonistic lifestyle is common amongst persistent criminals (Collison 1996; Shover 1996; Morgan and Joe 1996), and Sandberg (2008:613) noted for most, drug dealing is, “best described as hedonism, and money earned went to conspicuous consumption.” Thus, within their subcultural networks dealers are key players in the “life as party” mentality (Shover 1996). Sandberg (2008) argues drug subcultures provide the context in which such a mentality is valorized and allows for distinction (Bourdieu 1984), between the subcultural opposition of those in the subculture and those outside of it (Sandberg 2013). He also notes drug culture is important for understanding the structure of drug markets and the ways in which dealers practice their trade (Sandberg 2012). Some have suggested understanding the lifestyle or culture of which drug dealing is a part allows researchers to make sense of the choice to sell drugs (Morgan and Joe 1996). While drug dealing and drug subcultures certainly go hand-in-hand, and subcultures provide the social context in which individuals

learn the motivations for dealing and the ways to negotiate the meaning of their behavior, it does not fully articulate what seduces people into the crime of drug dealing (Katz 1988).

Weisheit (1991) finds that those involved in cannabis cultivation draw “intangible rewards”, such as improved self-concept, by finding the work rewarding and satisfying in its own right. Similarly, others have found men and women operating successful drug enterprises enjoy increased respect, control over other people, and empowerment (Denton and O’Malley 1999; Bourgois 2003; Campbell and Hansen 2012; Lindegaard and Jacques 2014; Grundetjern and Miller 2018). Morgan and Joe (1996) suggest women involved in methamphetamine markets perceive their participation positively and view it as a mechanism for economic independence, improved self-esteem, and professional pride. Such rewards provide increased self-efficacy and can be considered powerful motivators for persistence in drug dealing (Grundetjern and Miller 2018). Such rewards relay what people are trying to do with their criminal participation by providing insight into the seductions of dealing drugs (Katz 1988), and further how dealing drugs is incorporated into one’s identity.

Research indicates self-centeredness, low tolerance for frustration, and a preference for immediate gratification are positively associated with drug dealing (Schreiber 1992; Cross et al. 2001; Semple et al. 2011; Stanforth, Kostiuk, and Garriott 2015). Furthermore, those with low self-control are more criminally successful “market offenders” such as drug dealers (Morselli and Temblay 2004). The co-occurrence of drug use (immediate gratification), and drug dealing are well documented (Cross et al. 2001; Semple et al. 2011, Seffrin and Domahidi 2014), and participation in drug trade is considered a way that some users maintain their habit (Cross et al. 2001; Stanforth, Kostiuk and Garriott 2015). Additionally, research suggests those who sell drugs possess personalities characterized by

fearlessness and risk taking (Weinfurt and Bush 1995). Such risk taking and impulsivity fits well with the “life as party” (Shover 1996), orientation of many drug offenders, and can be incorporated into an offender’s narrative as someone who is brave, daring or fun.

Several studies have noted most individuals who sell drugs lack prosocial bonds relative to non-dealing peers (Uribe and Ostrov 1989; Black and Ricard 1994; Steinman 2005). These unconventional attitudes and beliefs are in part a product of chaotic and disorganized family lives (Schreiber 1992), or lacking parental supervision (Peeples and Loeber 1994). Attachment and involvement in prosocial institutions are inversely related to participation in drug dealing (Bourdun et al. 1986; Buckhalt et al. 1992; Friedman et al. 1995; Friedman, Terras, and Glassman 2000; Johnson et al. 2000). Research has noted adolescents and young adults are more likely to sell drugs if they deem a college education or living a long life as an unreasonable expectation (Harris, Duncan and Boisjoly 2002). Thus, some of the reasons individuals deal drugs likely have to do with their personality, attitudes, and beliefs. While such attitudes and beliefs provide insight into why some individuals make the choice to sell drugs they do not articulate how individuals that sell drugs bring meaning to their activity and construct a sense of self around the deviant occupation.

Much like those that use drugs, those engaged in drug dealing construct identities consonant with their activity. Those who participate in drug dealing are often forced to construct a positive identity as a dealer, while juxtaposing an identity as a drug dealer against other aspects of their identity (Murphy, Waldorf and Reinerman 1990). Dealers work to construct positive identities as drug dealers, which is fostered by dealers’ suggestions that participation in drug trade fosters increased perception of self and improved self-efficacy (Geiger and Fischer 2005; Maher and Hudson 2007; Grundetjern and Miller 2018). Indeed,

dealers' experience increased respect and appreciation within their subculture networks of which they are key players (Denton and O'Malley 1999). As with drug use, much of the work on how drug dealers construct identities focuses on how they engage in boundary work.

Boundary work among drug dealers is similar to that of drug users, except the boundaries that drug dealers draw often are designed to relay a particular identity as a successful, smart and skilled dealer and draw comparison against dealers or users they view as inferior (Erickson, Hochstetler and Copes In Press). Copes, Hochstetler, and Williams (2008) show how crack dealers construct a hustler identity by creating boundaries between themselves and those they view as "crackheads" through various markers of identification, including cleanliness, coolness and heart. It is clear from extant research that being a drug dealer is important for an individual's identity and informs their attitudes and behaviors. What is not clear is why and how drug dealing provides individual's such intangible rewards (Weisheit 1991), and the process through which individuals are drawn to dealing drugs and learn to construct identities, even if research provides insights into the archetypal forms those identities take. Indeed, scholars in this line of research suggest boundaries are constructed from "sub-culturally constructed criteria" (Copes, Hochstetler and Williams 2008), and advocate for more focused attention on the process through which boundaries and identities are formed.

Race/Ethnicity and Drug Use

In the public mind, race is related to drug use. Indeed, much of the historical response to illicit drug use has been the result of racism and racialized politics (Anguelov and McCarthy 2018). When asked, "Would you close your eyes for a second, envision a drug user, and describe that person for me?", over 95% of participants noted they pictured a Black

person (Burston, Jones and Roberson-Saunders 1995). This is due in part to the understanding that Black individuals experience a host of strains that may predispose them to drug use (Brunswick 1999). However, despite this White and Latinx adults are significantly more likely to use drugs including prescription drugs, cannabis, and hard drugs when compared to Black and Asian adults (French, Finkbiner and Duhmael 2002; Merline et al. 2004). Similarly, young White and Latinx adults use more illicit drugs more frequently prior to and during college than their Asian or Black peers (McCabe et al. 2007), and this difference largely remains stable until rates of illicit drug use among Black people surpass that of White individuals at approximately age 35 (Herd 1990; Kandel 1995). Yet even then, White males are more likely to use drugs than Black or Latinx males after accounting for other influences (Watt 2008). Importantly, while Maddahain et al. (1986) found availability and ease of acquisition were the strongest predictors of cannabis and hard drug use, they could not entirely explain race/ethnicity differences in rates of usage. Thus, while prevalence and access are important they cannot explain why, generally speaking, White individuals use drugs more frequently than do persons of color.

Race and ethnicity is certainly important for understanding the motivations and meaning drug users ascribe to their use and themselves. Research on substance abuse suggests Black individuals with less salient racial or ethnic identities are more likely to be heavy drinkers or use drugs (Caetano 1990; Grube 1996; Brook and Pahl 2005; Pugh and Bry 2007). Alternatively, Black individuals with increased levels of positive self-identity and racial-identity are significantly less likely than their peers to use drugs (Townsend and Belgrave 2000). Similarly, increased identification with an ethnic identity decreases the likelihood of drug use among ethnic minority individuals (Brook et al. 1998; Nieri et al.

2019). Even particularly racialized experiences, such as those of racial discrimination are associated with past year drug use and frequent drug use among Black individuals (Carliner et al. 2016). Sandberg and Fleetwood (2016) note that ethnic immigrants in Norway describe narratives of drug use and abuse which intersect with stories of crime, violence and living a “hard life”, all of which can be considered important resources for crafting an identity as a drug user. For those living the hard life, drug use, and for many drug trade, are associated with cultural and racialized systems of oppression and rebellion (Bourgois 2003). Yet, it has been noted that some specifically work to avoid the trappings of drug involvement, specifically because of the personal and legal risks involved which would derail their lives (MacLeod 2009). Thus, it would seem a racialized social identity is important for understanding drug use and abuse among people of color.

On the other hand, no research addresses associations between racial identity and drug use among White people. White individuals seem to conceive of drugs and their use in a way that differs from people of color, both in terms of motivation and consequence. Indeed, for White adults neither chronic or current cannabis use negatively effects occupational status net of other factors (White, Aidala and Zablocki 1988). White drug users often use middle class norms of hard work and moderation to justify and contextualize their drug using behaviors (Kerley, Copes and Griffin 2015). Drug use engaged in by White young adults often is considered, fun, experimentation, or even a resource to achieve desired ends and rarely along the lines of addiction (Hathaway 1997; Pearson 2001; Osbourne and Fogel 2008; Kerley, Copes and Griffin 2015), while older White adults, particularly men, note their drug use as an aid for dealing with family stress (Nicholson et al. 2001). Thus, while some sort of a racialized identity has little import for understanding White drug users’ identities, race is

undoubtedly important for understanding drug involvement and associated identities. The motivations and meaning brought to drug use and peoples' drug using identities are certainly shaped by race/ethnicity, and include informing the decision to deal drugs.

Race/Ethnicity and Drug Trade

As with drug users the stereotypical urban, Black drug dealer is more a societal archetype than reality. While there are certainly people of color who sell drugs, research indicates that Black and Latinx individuals do not sell drugs at rates significantly greater than those of White individuals (Stanforth, Kostiuk and Garriott 2016). While research does not suggest an association between race or ethnicity and drug dealing in adulthood, some have noted different ways in which people of color and White people make the decision to become involved in drug dealing and the effect it has on their identity.

There is an abundance of literature concerning race/ethnicity and drug dealing (Adler and Adler 1983; Skolnick et al. 1990; Adler 1993; Dunlap and Johnson 1996; Maher and Daly 1996; Jacobs and Miller 1998; Curtis and Wendel 2000; Jacobs, Topalli and Wright 2000; Topalli, Wright and Fornango 2002; Maher and Hudson 2007; Jacques 2010; Jacques and Wright 2011; Hammersvik, Sandberg and Pedersen 2012; Sandberg 2012; Fleetwood 2014; Jacques and Wright 2014; Hammersvik 2015), but the majority of this literature concerns the practice of dealing and the structure of drug networks and how these vary by race/ethnicity. Less research has focused on how race/ethnicity informs the construction of identities in relation to drug dealing behaviors. This may be due in part to a lack of studies that can adequately compare drug dealers from different racial backgrounds as many researchers tend to focus on disadvantaged people of color, or more affluent drug dealers.

Middle class White individuals learn to view drug dealing as “fun” and a way to look “cool” (Jacques and Wright 2015), while disadvantaged people are more likely to find drug dealing as mechanism for economic gain (Buchanan 1993). However, disadvantaged Black individuals are more likely to deal drugs if they have a positive perception of dealers they know and consider them “fun”, or if they neutralize the behavior by suggesting “everyone is doing it” (Li and Feigelman 1994; Li et al. 1996). Moreover, some have suggested that selling drugs is a part of a particular racialized identity for Black males (Ricardo 1994).

Sandberg and Fleetwood (2016) argues that drug dealers and their identities are largely informed by a “global street culture” (Ilan 2014), and are largely motivated by money, conspicuous consumption, respect and status amongst their peers. Sandberg and colleagues (2008; 2016) have highlighted how Black and ethnic minority immigrants use such culture to construct identities consonant with a street orientation and use drug dealing as a way to garner “street capital”. Indeed, existing research does seem to suggest that people of color are more apt to pull from a “street” ethos or a “code of the street” (Anderson 1999), to construct an all-encompassing “street identity” in which being criminally able is a key marker of distinction (Sandberg 2016) and acts as a form of racialized symbolic capital. Some have noted that simply being a person of color acts as form of “street capital” (Sandberg 2008). White dealers, even affluent ones, seem to pull from the same or similar cultural narratives in some respects to bring meaning to their drug dealing, often enjoying conspicuous consumption and a reputation as someone of import; yet, they do not rely on violent retaliation to settle disputes as readily and often do not embrace the more menacing aspects of drug-related gangster life (Jacques and Wright 2016).

Gender and Drug Use

It has long been the case that males use more drugs and use them more frequently than do females (Merline et al. 2004). However, in recent years, female usage rates are becoming more comparable to those of their male counterparts (World Drug Report 2018). Still, the increase in female usage rates should not be overstated. Men use almost all forms of drugs at greater rates than women (Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality 2018). These differences suggest gender informs drug use and likely the motivations for use as well as the meaning individuals bring to their drug use.

Gender shapes drug use and drug user's identities in unique ways. Gender is one of the most important facets around which people construct their identity (West and Zimmerman 1987), and an individual's experience as a drug user cannot be detached from their gender and the influence of gendered cultural norms. Despite members of some drug subcultures suggestion they are more progressive and more egalitarian than the wider society of which they are a part (Dahl and Sandberg 2014),² women still exist in a subordinated position. In part because of their disadvantaged place in society, and within drug circles, women are more apt than men to consider their drug use as a response to victimization, deleterious relationships with older persons and coping with the stresses of parenthood (Carbone-Lopez and Miller 2012). "Street drugs" in particular are associated with extreme oppression and degradation of women, perhaps coarsely but succinctly characterized by the "dope whore" (Copes et al 2014). While some had traumatic experiences surrounding their

² Dahl and Sandberg (2104) were specifically talking about cannabis culture and specifically in Norway. Despite this they suggest female cannabis users still engage in traditional gender normative behavior when using cannabis. Thus, despite the possibility of progressive gender norms in a subculture these intersect with the more traditional, patriarchal gender norms of the wider society.

drug use, others maintain a drug habit without experiencing such abuse, and this is important for their identity construction as female drug users. They are able to engage in symbolic boundary work to distance themselves from those they feel are stigmatized and in doing so protect from such stigma being attached to their own identity (Copes et al 2014).

Mother is a particularly important social identity and mothers who use drugs are viewed particularly harshly by society (Boyd 2015). Social categorizations of “mother” and “drug user” intersect and drug using mothers are especially stigmatized as they are viewed to have abdicated their responsibilities as mothers in favor of drugs (Campbell 2000; Linnemann 2010). Women of low socioeconomic status and women of color in particular have been characterized as incapable, unfit, and unable to properly parent or socialize their children (Collins 1991; Hooks 1992; Gupta 1995). Women drug users are held to gendered expectations of femininity which emanate from a middle class, White, heteronormative perspective (Nakano, Chang and Forcey 1994; McMahon 1995; Hays 1996). Drug using mothers thus work to construct an image consonant with these cultural narratives of motherhood despite their drug use. Holt and French (2019) show that mothers using methamphetamines worked to construct boundaries that allowed them to distance themselves from negative depictions of mother-addicts, in part by suggesting they were “functional” drug users and whose use did not interfere with their familial obligations. While some women consider their drug use simply to be fun, wild experimentation of an adventurous spirit, others view their use enables them to be “supermoms” (Boeri 2013; Copes et al. 2016). In this way women drug users are able to construct identities as drug users other than those who are “mad, sad, or bad” (Measham 2002), and more in line with the sentiments of men who use drugs.

Men are in an advantaged position in society and this is true in drug subcultures as well (Dahl and Sandberg 2014), and such advantage protects them from being viewed or perceiving themselves as low as the “dope whore”. However, men do occasionally trade sex for drugs and men who engage in prostitution for drugs often are viewed in street-life as laughable and pathetic (Haines 2009). Yet for many, men are able to use drug use as culturally salient touchstones around which to build a particular type of masculine identity (Collison 1996), particularly so if they couple their use with readily masculine activities, such as outdoor sports like snow-boarding, skiing or other outdoor leisure activity with male companions (Moffat, Johnson and Shoveller 2008). Thus, men are more apt to bring meaning to their drug use in a way that allows them to construct an identity as masculine, tough, or cool (Collison 1996; Geiger and Fischer 2005; Jacques and Wright 2016). Male drug users also construct positive identities by casting themselves against people they view to be inferior in much the same way women engage in boundary work to avoid identification as the “dope whore”. Similar to females, male drug users also engage in boundary work by casting themselves against others they consider to be “dysfunctional”, but also those who refuse to use, either at all or at similar rates as they do, sometimes labeling such people “bitches” (Haines et al. 2009). The clearly gendered nature of such a categorization reinforces men’s superior position within drug using subcultures. Gender is thus an important aspect of understanding how drug users construct their identity and make decisions in relation to drug involvement.

Gender and Drug Trade

Women are significantly less likely to sell drugs than their male counterparts (Denton and O’Malley 1999; Semple et al. 2011; Vuolo et al. 2014; Stanforth, Kostiuk and Garriot

2016). Despite this, increasing attention has been paid to women's roles in drug dealing (Denton and O'Malley 1999; Grundetjern and Sandberg 2012), and research on women drug dealers note that while female drug dealers are as diverse as their male counterparts (Denton and O'Malley 1999), they often share experiences of disadvantage. Indeed, female drug dealers are more apt to report low levels of emotional support (Semple et al. 2012), and experience higher levels of addiction and dependence than their female peers who exclusively use drugs (Hutton 2005; Fitzgerald 2009). Males engaged in drug dealing are more likely to engage in crime, including violent crime and possess lower levels of self-control than their more conventional counterparts (Steinman 2005; Semple et al 2011).

Some have noted men and women negotiate their identities in relation to drug dealing differently, but both attempt to construct a positive self-concept in relation to the behavior, and suggest dealing enhances participant's self-efficacy (Geiger and Fischer 2005; Maher and Hudson 2007). While women are less likely to engage in drug dealing, they may still incorporate the behavior into their conception of self. Research suggests some female dealers are engaged in such pursuits to increase income or feed their habit (Mieczkowski 1994; Fagan 1994), to help support their family economically (Ludwick Murphy and Sales 2015), because they were forced into it by a romantic partner (Mieczkowski 1994; Holloway and Bennet 2007), or to avoid entering the sex trade to subsist (Denton and O'Malley 1999). Thus, women are less likely to view the participation in drug markets as something fun or exciting but something that is fraught with danger and a temporary fix (Ludwick, Murphy and Sale 2015). Despite this, research suggests women operating successful drug enterprises enjoy increased respect, control over other people, and empowerment (Denton and O'Malley 1999; Bourgois 2003; Campbell and Hansen 2012; Lindegaard and Jacques 2014;

Grundetjern and Miller 2018). Others have noted that female levels of involvement and identification with participation in illegal economies is informed by gendered norms and the specific drug market of which they are a part (Deitzer, Leban and Copes 2017). Morgan and Joe (1996) suggest women involved in methamphetamine markets perceive their participation positively and view it as a mechanism for economic independence, improved self-esteem, and professional pride. These rewards provide increased self-efficacy and can be considered powerful motivators for persistence in drug dealing (Grundetjern and Miller 2018). Grundetjern (2015) points out the negotiation of a drug dealer identity among women is conditioned by culturally available narratives mediated by age, time of initiation into dealing, education and professional experiences. Indeed, women dealers import femininity into their identity as dealers to varying degrees, with some expressing overt femininity and others a more masculine tone, while some vacillate in the degree to which they rely on traditional femininity per the situation (Ludwick, Murphy and Sales 2015). Many female drug dealers must also navigate the obligations of parenthood alongside their roles as dealers and work to live up to the norms of each (Grundetjern 2018). Some have noted female dealers do this, in part, by working to keep their participations in drug activities separate from their role as mother (Morgan and Joe 1996). Some female dealers' identity as mothers and dealers intersect in ways that inform their dealing. These mother-dealers rely on a "feminine business model" in which dealing responsibilities were structured around care of children and sociality (Grundetjern 2015). Indeed, some mother-dealers leverage their position in drug market hierarchies to look after their children by paying for their child's drug debts, for instance (Grundetjern 2018). Still others consider their drug use as conducive to their improved mothering, making them "supermoms" (Boeri 2013; Copes et al. 2016).

However, mothering and addiction cannot be reconciled for some and they may lose their children, while others become detached from their children and motherhood becomes a peripheral part of their identities (Grundejern 2018). Despite these considerations, it is common for female dealers to emphasize the importance of appearing as “one of the guys” in order to be successful (Miller 2001).

Men on the other hand, exist in a masculine dominated field and in which one of the most important attributes of a successful dealer is relaying a particular masculine tone (Dunlap et al. 1997). Male drug market participants often do consider their participation as “fun”, “exciting” or part of a “hustle” (Preble and Casey 1969; Collison 1996; Geiger and Fischer 2005). Research suggests men who deal drugs engage in some form of “doing gender” (West and Zimmerman 1987), in which dealing drugs acts as a form of boundary work which allows a male dealer to construct an identity as “a man” (Mullins 2006). Thus, dealing drugs is one mechanism through which males can prove their masculinity, and may be particularly attractive to individuals with limited alternative means to prove their worth (Sandberg 2008). Additionally, some have noted male drug dealers attempt to construct an identity consonant with an orientation towards the code of the street (Anderson 1999), and use neutralization techniques to rationalize their prosocial behavior as a mechanism to protect their street identity (Topalli 2005; Sandberg 2009). Similarly, others note participation in drug economies allows individuals to project a particular street persona. Copes, Hochstetler, and Williams (2008) find participants in the crack cocaine economy often develop a “hustler” identity in contrast to that of a “crackhead”, and discuss how such an identity has import for understanding their interactions on the street.

Paternal identities do not seem as salient for men involved in illegal economies as they are for women. Grundetjern, Copes and Sandberg (2019) note that men who deal generally fall into two camps – “struggling fathers” and “absent fathers”. While the former had affective connections to their children, they had little, if any, contact with their children, whereas the latter had little emotive connections to their children and were largely uninvolved with the lives of their children. For absent fathers, their identities as dealers are more encompassing and motivating than their identity as a father which they had put to the periphery. This “role engulfment” led to greater involvement with drugs and crime as compared to “struggling fathers” who were devoting relatively more time and energy to fatherhood. Grundetjern, Copes and Sandberg (2019) suggest these identities form out of circumstances of structural conditions which provide them little access to improve their position conventionally and existing in the hyper-masculine field of drug markets. The result, particularly for absent fathers, is an acceptance and veneration of street life and experiences and increased empowerment associated with a particular masculine, deviant identity.

Class and Drug Use

Class shapes drug use in one obvious way: drugs cost money. While it could be said drugs have, in a Marxian sense, high use-value, they also have high cost-value. Thus, only those with money, or the ability to “hustle” (Preble and Casey 1969), can maintain a serious, long-term drug habit. Class also shapes drug use and drug user’s identities in more subtle ways, including the types of drugs people use. Indeed, individuals of low socioeconomic status are less likely to use drugs like cannabis than those that are more affluent (Patrick et al. 2012). Alternatively, more affluent individuals are less likely to illicitly use prescription opioids than are their less moneyed peers (Han et al. 2017). Although extant research is

inconclusive, the experience of growing up economically disadvantaged may also play a role in who uses drugs. Some have suggested that growing up economically disadvantaged increases the likelihood of substance use in later adulthood (Gilman et al. 2003; Patrick et al. 2012), while others have proposed the opposite (Schulenberg et al. 2005; Kestila et al. 2008; Humensky 2010), and still others have found no association (Reine et al. 2004).

Class is also important for understanding how drug user's construct identities regardless of the drugs they use. Middle class individuals who use drugs are able to call on middle class beliefs about hard work and enjoyment to rationalize their use (Kerley, Copes and Griffin 2015). They conceive of their drug use as a tool for increased performance and draw boundaries between their use and others who they believe use drugs recklessly or the use of drugs they consider significantly more harmful or addictive (Kerley, Copes and Griffin 2015). On the other hand, individuals from more disadvantaged circumstances are more apt to view their drug use as problematic and draw on narratives highlighting their disadvantaged and oppressed place in society (Sandberg 2009). However, individuals of all social classes may conceive of their drug use as the pursuit of momentary leisure or fun (Hathaway 1997), or part of an ongoing pursuit for a "life as party" existence (Shover 1996). Socioeconomic position alone cannot explain how and why people use drugs or the meaning they ascribe to their use, but is bound up in a web of intersecting influences that include the historical and cultural logics as part of where a person lives and grows.

Class and Drug Trade

As has been noted there is significant variation in persons who sell drugs, including social class background. Most research has suggested that those from economically disadvantaged circumstances are more likely to engage in drug trade than their more affluent

peers (Paoli 2001; Fleetwood et al. 2011), however others have found no association between income and likelihood of engaging in drug trade (Stanforth, Kostiuk and Garriott 2016).

While social class may not be the strongest predictor of drug dealing behaviors, for those that sell drugs it is likely class background which informs how they engage in the trade and how they view themselves as drug dealers.

Much about the differences between individuals of different social classes and the way they ascribe meaning to their participation in drug trade and themselves by extension has already been noted in discussions of differences in regards to race/ethnicity. Perhaps this is because, particularly in America, class and race are so closely linked. Additionally, research in this area often breaks its subjects into White-affluent dealers and disadvantaged people of color who deal without adequately being able to compare them. This has likely led to an overly reductive understanding of the ways in which economic position translates into the motivations for and meaning ascribed to dealing drugs.

What research does exist on the subject suggests middle class drug dealers are more likely to consider their dealing behavior as something for fun, and to make a little extra pocket money (Jacques and Wright 2016), whereas those from less affluent backgrounds are more apt to see dealing drugs as a way to improve their position economically and socially (Whitehead, Peterson and Kaljee 1994; Li et al. 1996; Floyd et al. 2010; Vuolo 2014). Yet research suggests they are both apt to bring meaning to their participation in drug trade in much the same way. Drug dealers regardless of class background consider their participation to provide them with increased power, status, and respect (Bourgois 2003; Sandberg 2008; Jacques and Wright 2016). Still the connections between class background, drug use and dealing have not been fully fleshed out. How do varied class backgrounds and context

contribute to users' and dealers' presumably varying self-conceptions and understandings of drug dealing in ways that make class relevant?

Residential Location and Drug Use

Residential location shapes drug use and drug users' identities in much the same way as class. Where a person lives, be it a rural country town, quaint suburban area, or a bustling metropolis shapes access to drugs. While it may be true that if one is determined enough to seek them out one can find a wide assortment of illicit drugs, this is likely not the experience of many drug users as many people are first introduced to drugs through peer networks. Indeed, peer networks and availability are among the strongest predictors of drug use (Maddahian, Newcomb and Bentler 1986). Thus, for an individual to realistically use a drug regularly, and for some, become addicted to it, they need a reliable and steady supply of the drug in their area.

Neighborhoods can provide resources for residents that are positive and beneficial, but the structure of neighborhoods can also produce strain in its residents (Cohen et al 2003), and degrade social cohesion and control leading to crime (Wilson 1987; Sampson and Grove 1989). Living in impoverished areas increases the odds of being exposed to overt, "open-air" drug markets (Kadushin et al. 1998; Bradizza and Stasiewicz 2003; Lambert et al. 2004). Living in low-income, socially disorganized neighborhoods presents individuals with a host of stressors that may encourage their drug use as well (Brunswick 1999). Indeed, research relying on Shaw and McKay's ([1952] 1969) social disorganization theory has found individuals living in such neighborhoods are more likely to use a variety of different drugs (Currie 1993; Baumer 1994; Baumer et al. 1998; Jacobs 1999). Similarly, Agnew's (1992) general strain theory (GST) has received a good deal of empirical support when examining

the link between strain and different forms of substance use (Browne and Finkelhor 1986; Dembo et al. 1987; Agnew and White 1992; Chassin et al. 1993; Duncan et al. 1996; Hoffman and Su 1997; Kilpatrick et al. 1997; Aseltine and Gore 2000; Cerbone and Larison 2000; Kilpatrick et al. 2000; Slocum 2000; Drapela 2006; Lo, Kim, and Church 2008; Sharp, Peck, and Hartsfield 2012; Menard, Covey, and Franzese 2013). Sharp, Peck, and Hartsfield (2012) suggest that both individual and cumulative strain predict substance use, while others have noted the association of adolescent exposure to violence (Menard, Covey, and Franzese 2013), and various forms of victimization (Lo, Kim, and Church 2008), to drug use.

Alternatively, Wallace (1999) has suggested exposure to the adverse conditions associated with highly disorganized, low income neighborhoods may actually decrease the likelihood an individual uses drugs. In any case, exposure to the physical conditions and specifically the negative effects of drug use on individuals, families, and communities almost certainly informs the meaning residents of such areas have of the drug use and themselves. The same can be said for living in more affluent communities. Using and acquiring drugs in a small suburban community likely shapes the ways in which an individual contextualizes their drug use and brings meaning to the behavior. Indeed, simply residing in more affluent areas is associated with living healthier lifestyles generally (Ross 2000). In a review, Karriker-Jaffe (2011) noted consistent associations between neighborhood disadvantage and substance use across samples of adults. Residing in a disadvantaged neighborhood increases the odds of women doing hard drugs relative to their peers in middle class neighborhoods (Karriker-Jaffe 2013). Indeed, living in a middle class neighborhood makes it less likely a woman will use cannabis than if she was living in a disadvantaged area (Karriker-Jaffe 2013).

Extant research on drug user's subjective interpretations of the objective realities of the everyday influence of place and space on their drug use is lacking (for exceptions see Fiddle 1967; Rhodes et al. 2007; Parkin 2016), and what research does exist tends to address using sites (e.g. crack houses, shooting galleries), rather than conditions that may motivate and inform drug use. More common are accounts of how the life in different residential locales influences the identities of drug users (Preble and Casey 1969; Agar 1973; Jacques and Wright 2015), and how such influences inform their behaviors as drug users. Thus, there is a need to examine how drug users understand the influence of their community and neighborhood conditions to fully understand the choice to use drugs, as well as the extent and ways in which people identify with their drug use and to what consequence.

Sampson and Bean (2006) have provided among the most prominent criminological analysis to the influence of place and space on crime. They note that historical changes in neighborhood landscapes condition the availability of legal and illegal pursuits for money, status and stability. Sampson and Bean (2006) suggested these structural changes also condition and alter the cultural landscape and the interactional norms of those areas which can promote violence. Anderson (1999) elaborates the "code of the street" as a culturally defined dispositional and behavioral code of conduct that predominated in the sorts of neighborhoods described by Sampson and Bean (2006). However, these theoretical advances, and the research which has sprung up to test their propositions, are focused on violent crime and explaining why low socioeconomic people of color violently offend at greater rates than their comparatively more affluent White counterparts. They are intentionally narrow perspectives that cannot address nuances in race/ethnicity, class, gender, or neighborhood location as they relate to drug involvement. What is missing from the

literature on drug using motivations and identities is a coherent explanation of why and how some people are motivated to do drugs, how individuals interpret the objective conditions of their everyday lives and how these are informed by important markers of identity like race/ethnicity, gender, class, and residential location. Focused attention should be granted to how those influences inform the choice to use drugs, the degree to which people develop deviant identities around their use and ultimately how these identities effect choice and action.

Residential Location and Drug Trade

While drugs are bought and sold everywhere, they are commonly associated with major metropolitan areas with large populations of socially disadvantaged people. Social disorganization theory (Shaw and McKay [1942] 1969), suggests that neighborhoods can experience social deterioration to such an extent that informal social control is depressed and local norms are tolerant or accepting of deviance. Research suggests drug dealing is more prominent in socially disorganized neighborhoods (Sullivan 1989; Currie 1993; Jacobs 1999; Ousey and Lee 2002; Martinez Jr., Rosenfeld and Mares 2008). Some have noted specifically the presence of gangs in neighborhoods increases the likelihood of drug dealing, as well as “open-air” drug markets (Fagan 1989; Decker and Van Winkle 1994; Valdez and Sifaneck 2004). Little and Steinberg (2006) examine the role of opportunity in relation to drug dealing. They find low parental supervision, adverse neighborhood conditions, joblessness, parental drug use, and peer delinquency increased opportunities to sell drugs. However, frequency of dealing was mediated by attachment to conventional goals and school. Thus, while neighborhood disorganization plays a part, it does not exclusively explain why an individual would make the choice to participate in drug dealing. The experience of strain that may arise

from such social disadvantage (Merton 1938; Agnew 1992), is also important for understanding the choice to sell drugs. Research suggests that drug dealing may be a product of economic and social disadvantages that block more legitimate avenues for success (Whitehead, Peterson and Kaljee 1994; Li et al. 1996; Floyd et al. 2010; Vuolo 2014). However, it does not explain why individuals from more affluent areas sell drugs, even if not at the same rates.

While it is true that many drug dealers reside and sell their wares in concentrated urban centers, many dealers “sling” in suburban and rural communities as well. Where these dealers practice their trade may influence both how they conceive of their trade and how they practice it. Suburban drug dealers do not peddle their drugs on street corners or clubs. Rather they answer a steady stream of calls and texts while driving to meet individuals at their home, places of work, and parking lots of big box stores (Jacques and Wright 2016). They know their clientele, and often vet prospective clients through older, trusted clientele. This stands in stark contrast to “open-air” markets where dealers sell five dollar vials to people on foot, or leaned out of car windows. These drastic differences in where and how the drugs are sold almost certainly effects how dealers conceive of themselves as dealers. Indeed, research suggests that suburban drug dealers are apt to engage in boundary work by casting themselves against street drug dealers they consider criminal. Rather they consider themselves along the lines of a friend helping out others (Coomber and Moyle 2014), or a businessmen who has seen a void in the market, instead of “gangbangers”, or “thugs” (Jacques and Wright). However, Sandberg (2016) has suggested among all drug dealers there is some level of self-presentation that is consonant with a “street” persona. Alternatively, those living and selling drugs in disadvantaged communities draw sharp boundaries between

those who sell drugs and those that are addicted to the drug (Copes, Hochstetler and Williams 2008). The meaning brought to the practice of drug dealing and the way individuals impute such meaning to their identity varies by the subcultural interactional orders that predominate in the places where dealers live and work (Venkatesh 1997; Duck and Rawls 2012; Duck 2016). Such ethnographic work often places its subjects into objective space noting the ways they are pushed and pulled by social forces, but does not adequately address dealer's subjective interpretations of how those forces impinge on their identity and decision making processes. Anderson (1999) elaborates the importance of status or "juice" for some living in high poverty, high crime areas and notes that drug dealing is one avenue through which one can improve their positions economically while acquiring "juice". Scholars have noted that living in areas with few legitimate or conventional options to improve one's position economically or socially promotes a redefinition of the cultural landscape that can promote criminal behavior (Anderson 1999; Sampson and Bean 2006). However, even Anderson (1999) notes that many more people in such areas can be thought of as "decent", law-abiding citizens who do not ascribe to criminal code and do not engage in crime. What Anderson (1999) struggles to explain is why some embody a street identity and behave in consonant ways while others do not, *despite experiencing similar neighborhood conditions*.

Intersectionality, Identity, and Drugs

Race/ethnicity, gender, class, residential location and drug use all intersect to inform a person's identity and in turn their behaviors. Intersectionality is a conceptual framework used to understand the multiplicative attributes of a person that make up their social identity (Crenshaw 1993; Cole 2009). It is in these intersections that individuals carve out and construct their identity, understand who they are, and contextualize and motivate their

actions. Thus, the incorporation of an intersectional understanding to drug user's identity and decision making processes is warranted. There are a multitude of ways in which social identities can intersect and the varying degree of import of each intersecting identity may vary person to person. For instance, the influence of a racialized social identity may not work in the same way for all and may work entirely different when other social identities are taken into account.

Race and discrimination are notable predictors of drug use among people of color, however, this association is stronger for more affluent Black people (Carliner et al. 2016). In other words, the effect of racial discrimination on people of color is such that those who are more socioeconomically advantaged use *more* drugs. Residential location and the strain of living in a low-income, high crime area certainly effect why people use drugs and the meaning brought to their drug use, but such influences are moderated by individual psychological stresses and income (Boardment et al. 2001), as well as individual initial motivations for use and the physical environment in which they use (Esbensen and Huizinga 1990). These results seem to suggest that research sensitive to both the objective conditions people experience and their own subjective experience is important for understanding drugs use. Indeed, others have noted that while neighborhood context and family influence are important they are less relevant than individual attitudes toward drug use (Black and Ricardo 1994; Wright, Bobashev and Folsom 2007).

The degree to which people desire, "achieve" or reject certain social identities is conditioned by their background and prior life experiences. For instance, methamphetamine is commonly considered a "White drug", and while the majority of users are White, there exists a growing number of Black users (Carbone-Lopez & Miller 2012). Yet Black, female

meth users generally tend to have drug using careers that differ in distinct ways from that of White, female meth users, from the way they were introduced to the drug, to the way they experienced the high (Kerley et al. 2014). Thus, just being socially identifiable as a “meth head” does negate the import of other social identities. In any case, understanding the intersecting influences of multiple social identities will strengthen scholars understanding of deviant identity and decision making processes.

Taken together, this body of research does not adequately address why people make the choice to become a drug dealer or the consequence of such behavior for their overall identity and perception of self. Many people desire more money, increased self-esteem, to feel “cool” and respected, but most people do not engage in selling drugs. The majority of men, people of color, and economically and structurally disadvantaged people do not participate in drug trade. What is currently missing from the literature is a study that examines why people engage in drug use or trade in a way that is sensitive to both structural background factors and subjective foreground factors which make drug involvement a viable course of action and its rewards salient, as well as how such choices become important for and incorporated into a person’s identity and to what consequence. Indeed, an exclusive focus on the influence of subcultural values and the rewards produced by drug involvement obfuscates the realization that drug participants who are completely committed to their activity and an associated subcultural value system are the exception, not the rule (Hagedorn 1994). Accordingly, the goals of the study proposed here are to examine,

- 1.) the motivations for initiation and continuation in drug involvement for those currently or previously drug involved,

- 1a.) narrative similarities and differences between users and dealers which relate to motivations for initiation and continuation and how these vary by race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location,
- 2.) the ways in which people perceive social context and significant others to allow for, or encourage, their drug involvement,
 - 2a.) the narrative similarities and differences of those within and between residential locations which relate to perceptions of how such locations influence drug involvement,
- 3.) the ways in which people come to identify with drug involvement and incorporate it into their identity,
 - 3a.) narratives which are conducive to considering oneself as a deviant and how, or if, these vary from user to dealer, within and between social context and across race/ethnicity, class, gender, and residential location,
- 4.) the extent to which drug involvement modifies previously held attitudes and beliefs and the extent to which these new perceptions and attitudes developed through drug involvement, persist situationally and temporally away from drug involvement.
 - 4a.) narratives which relay the importance of drug involvement to identity and how such an identity effects future attitudes and behaviors.

Ultimately, the goals of this study are to understand the choice to become drug involved, how it is conditioned by participant's perceptions, the extent to which drug involvement informs identity construction and the subsequent consequences for attitudes and behaviors. The following examination is framed by Bourdieu's (1977; 1990) Theory of Practice and insights from Narrative Criminology. Both are relatively new to criminology and both are attempts at

overcoming theoretical concerns of previous theorizing on deviant behavior and drug involvement.

CHAPTER 3. THEORIZING DRUG INVOLVEMENT: BOURDIEU, NARRATIVES AND NARRATIVE HABITUS

There is no shortage of theoretical perspectives trained towards or developed specifically with attention to drug involvement. Petraitis, Flay, and Miller (1995) review 14 theories of drug use, while Lettieri, Sayers, and Pearson (1980) catalog over 40 theories of drug use, and these do not speak to the various biological and neurological explanations of drug involvement (Tiffany 1990; Baler and Volkow 2006). Despite this smorgasbord of theoretical options, no single theory adequately provides a coherent and appropriately complex explanation of why people choose to involve themselves with drugs, and there is little agreement on the most powerful influences on motivation or the mechanisms translating correlates into crime. There remains an ongoing debate on the relative importance of background factors and foreground factors in understanding criminal etiology (Groves and Lynch 1990; LeBel et al. 2008). This is despite suggestions deviant decision making must be understood as a product of subjective motivation and socio-structural context (Cornish and Clark 1986; Fagan 2000). Background factors are those influences considered to *predispose* individuals to commit crime. However, some have suggested while background factors may predispose individuals to crime, it does not explain why those with similar predispositions do not offend similarly (Jacobs and Wright 1999). Thus, some have called on criminology to take seriously subjective foreground factors (Katz 1988). Bieren (1983:386) argues criminological investigations, “are incomplete if they do not refer to the reasons, motives, and intentions of those agents whose behavior is the object of study”. Foreground factors are more situational and inspired by interaction, often incorporating subjective meanings of the actor and sequential nature of decisions. Despite years of criticism of overly structural and

background approaches, and failure to integrate across theoretical levels, much of the discipline's empirical work is beset by problems of relying on narrow theories or using theories narrowly. Below I note some of the most commonly cited background and foreground theoretical explanations for drug involvement, the extent of their empirical support and why they are inadequate for understanding the choice and consequence of drug participation.

The General Theory of Crime

Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime (1990) is a control theory of crime which asks not why people commit crime, but why they *do not* commit crime. They suggest those with increased levels of self-control are less likely to engage in deviant and criminal behavior than their counterparts with relatively lower self-control. Suggested to be a product of improper or inattentive parenting practices, low self-control makes conventional living and rule following harder for persons inherently predisposed to commit crime. Individuals lacking self-control exhibit impulsivity, a proclivity for risk, an orientation to physicality, and a lack of concern for the future. Moreover, individuals with lowered self-control are argued to be less capable for accurately weighing the costs and benefits associated with an act.

Since Gottfredson and Hirschi's development of self-control theory (1990), a substantial body of literature has sprung up testing its propositions in relation to drug use. Self-control theory has found significant support in predicting drug use (Arneklev 1993; Winfree Jr. and Bernat 1998; Lagrange and Silverman 1999; Wright et al. 1999; Willis and Stoolmiller 2002; Baron 2003; Sussman, McCuller and Dent 2003; de Wit 2008; Verdejo-Garcia, Lawrence and Clark 2008; Malouf, Stuewig and Tagney 2012; Shaefer et al. 2015).

Moreover, low self-control not only effects drug use directly, but indirectly, by increasing the likelihood an individual will associate with deviant peers (Donohew et al. 1999; Longshore et al. 2004; Yanovitzky 2005; McGloin and Shermer 2008; Malouf, Stuewig and Tagney 2012). However, some have noted only certain aspects of self-control are predictive of substance use, specifically impulsivity, risk seeking, an orientation to the present and temper (Arneklev 1993; Lagrange and Silverman 1999; de Wit 2008). Additionally, researchers have noted that low self-control cannot be considered an exclusive explanation of drug use (Winfrey Jr. and Bernat 1998; Shaefer et al. 2015), and the theory is not without its critics (Geiss 2000). However, findings for self-control theory are interesting if viewed in light of a narrative framework. Being a risk taker and impulsive are personality characteristics people may incorporate into their identity, which can encourage further participation in risky behaviors like drug use. Additionally, the theory's focus on early socialization is echoed by the theory of practice (Bourdieu 1990), used here.

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argue their General Theory of Crime explains all types of offending, and thus should explain drug dealing as well. Research indicates theft, lacking empathy, participation in violence, and drug use, variables that could proxy self-centeredness, low tolerance for frustration, and a preference for immediate gratification are positively associated with drug dealing (Schreiber 1992; Cross et al. 2001; Semple et al. 2011; Stanforth, Kostiuk, and Garriott 2015). The co-occurrence of drug use (immediate gratification), and drug dealing are well documented (Cross et al. 2001; Semple et al. 2011, Seffrin and Domahidi 2014), and is considered a way that some users maintain their habit (Cross et al. 2001; Stanforth, Kostiuk and Garriott 2015). Additionally, research suggests those who sell drugs possess personalities characterized by fearlessness and risk taking

(Weinfurt and Bush 1995). Furthermore, those with low self-control are more criminally successful “market offenders” such as drug dealers (Morselli and Temblay 2004). Such risk taking and impulsivity fits well with the “life as party” (Shover 1996), orientation of many drug offenders, and can be incorporated into an offender’s narrative as someone who is brave, daring, and helps keep the party going.

The most resounding and well-founded criticism of the General Theory of Crime is Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) suggestion that self-control develops early in childhood, becomes set before the age of ten and remains largely stable across the lifecourse. Such a contention makes understanding desistance from crime hard to fathom. Additionally, self-control theorists’ treatment of crime leaves little room for agency or choice, but rather points to a subpopulation of individuals with little control over their impulses and actions who are swayed to commit crime by circumstance. While there almost always is error unaccounted for by theory, self-control theorists cannot make sense of why some people commit crime who by all other accounts possess fairly high levels of self-control. Thus, the General Theory of Crime is lacking in its ability to understand choice beyond a few attributes of criminal choice that attract the ill-tempered, angry and impulsive, and discounts subjective motivation, agency and creativity on the part of the actor.

Social Bonding Theory

Before Gottfredson and Hirschi developed the General Theory of Crime (1990), Hirschi outlined Social Bonding Theory (1969). A control theory with four components which it is argued informs an individual’s willingness to engage in crime on the basis of an individual’s “bond to society”. *Attachment* is concerned with an individual’s affective connection with prosocial individuals and institutions. *Commitment* relates to an individual’s

willingness to engage in normative lines of action to achieve socially conventional goals.

Involvement focused on an individual's (lack of) participation in prosocial activities. Finally, *belief* relates to an individual's acceptance of the moral precepts behind social norms and laws. Hirschi (1969) argued that scoring low on any one or all of the four components of the "social bond" increased an individual's odds of engaging in deviance.

Social Bonding Theory (Hirschi 1969), is commonly used to examine drug use and empirical work finds support for the suggestion that attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief are important predictors of drug use (Buckhalt et al. 1992; Friedman et al. 1995; Friedman, Terras, and Glassman 2000; Johnson et al. 2000; Koeppel and Chism 2018). These findings are important as the components of the social bond can be considered embodied dispositions and attitudes (Bourdieu 1977; 1990), which are important for the work presented here. Moreover, the association between attachment to conventional parents, peers and school (Marcos, Bahr and Johnson 1986; LeGrande and Shoemaker 1989; Ellickson, Collins, and Bell 2009), are important for understanding drug use in other perspectives as well.

Social Bonding Theory (Hirschi 1969), is not specifically called on in literature of drug dealers, but research has found most individuals who sell drugs lack prosocial bonds (Uribe and Ostrov 1989; Black and Ricard 1994; Steinman 2005). Adolescents and young adults are more likely to sell drugs if they deem a college education or living a long life as an unreasonable expectation (Harris, Duncan and Boisjoly 2002), have chaotic and disorganized family lives (Schreiber 1992), or lack parental supervision (Peeples and Loeber 1994). Indeed, components of Hirschi's (1969) social bond, specifically academic achievement (attachment), extracurricular participation, church attendance, and family involvement (involvement), have been found to be inversely related to drug dealing (Bourdiun et al. 1986;

Buckhalt et al. 1992; Friedman et al. 1995; Friedman, Terras, and Glassman 2000; Johnson et al. 2000).

While social bonding theory has received a good deal of empirical support it has been criticized for its lack of attention to the importance of deviant peers (Andrews and Bonta 1994). It has also been suggested that social bonding theory does not appear to predict adult criminality as well as childhood delinquency (Agnew 1985). Social Bonding Theory leaves little room for agency or identity from which to understand why individuals choose to become involved with drugs and to what consequence and as such is inadequate for the present analysis.

General Strain Theory

Agnew (1992) built from the work of Merton (1938), to develop his General Strain Theory in which he proposes that crime is a product of experiencing various forms of strain. The meaning associated with the strain people experience are socio-culturally defined and produce emotions like anger, resentment, fear, frustration and disappointment. It is argued these emotions act as catalysts for crime as individuals work to dispel the negative emotionality brought on by the experience of strain.

Agnew's (1992) General Strain Theory has received a good deal of empirical support when studying the association between strain and drug use (Browne and Finkelhor 1986; Dembo et al. 1987; Agnew and White 1992; Chassin et al. 1993; Duncan et al. 1996; Hoffman and Su 1997; Kilpatrick et al. 1997; Aseltine and Gore 2000; Cerbone and Larison 2000; Kilpatrick et al. 2000; Slocum 2000; Drapela 2006; Lo, Kim, and Church 2008; Sharp, Peck, and Hartsfield 2012; Menard, Covey, and Franzese 2013). Strain of various kinds have been noted to predict different forms of drug use (Sharp, Peck, and Hartsfield 2012). Others

have noted specific experiences of strain that are positively associated with drug use and abuse, including exposure to violence in adolescence (Menard, Covey, and Franzese 2013), and victimization (Lo, Kim, and Church 2008). Strain can manifest emotionally or psychologically as a product of experiencing negative material or social experiences. However, people must learn to associate drug use with the cessation of that strain for the two to be truly connected. Strain theory does not provide a way to understand how the experience of strain leads to specific behavioral adaptations to deal with that strain. Thus, while objective conditions are important they must be tempered with subjective appreciations to fully understand the decision to use drugs.

The experience of strain that may arise from economic disadvantage (Merton 1938; Agnew 1992), is also important for understanding why someone may choose to engage in drug trade. Several scholars have noted that drug dealing becomes viewed as a viable option for subsistence when more conventional routes to economic and social success are perceived as blocked or unreasonable (Whitehead, Peterson and Kaljee 1994; Li et al. 1996; Floyd et al. 2010; Vuolo 2014). Yet, MacCoun and Reuter (1992) noted some time ago that for most dealers, drug trade is a supplement to their more conventional paycheck. Thus, it seems that strain as a product of poor employment opportunities cannot be considered a solitary cause for drug dealing, and attention should be paid to the symbolic rewards derived from dealing.

As with all background theories, General Strain Theory cannot provide an explanation for why some people commit crime while others do not despite experiencing similar amounts and types of strain. Indeed, empirical work addressing this concern has found General Strain Theory and Agnew's propositions wanting (Cullen, Agnew and Wilcox 2006). Indeed, crime often is not a response to strain or a loss of control under pressure.

Some enjoy and draw thrills from their participation in crime and seek it out for that purpose (Katz 1988).

Social Disorganization Theory

Social Disorganization Theory (Shaw and McKay [1942] 1969), points to the contextual influences of place and space on crime commission. The perspective suggests little differences exist between deviants and non-deviants, rather people are more likely to commit crime when normal social controls are absent, deviance is approved of or accepted by the community, there are adequate opportunities for crime and little access to quality education or employment is available. Under these conditions neighborhoods are considered “socially disorganized” leading individuals to become detached from prosocial institutions and groups and more likely to commit crime.

The propositions behind Social Disorganization Theory (Shaw and McKay [1942] 1969), have received significant empirical support. Researchers have suggested neighborhood social disorganization as well as specific instances of disorganization, like high rates of joblessness are associated with increased rates of drug use (Currie 1993; Baumer 1994; Baumer et al. 1998; Jacobs 1999; Pratt and Cullen 2005). While community-level economic disadvantage is associated with increased levels of drug use, individual levels of use are also informed by specific experiences of strain and economic solvency (Boardman et al. 2001). Moreover, in comparative studies scholars have noted individual attitudes about drug use are more powerful predictors of use than are the influences of neighborhood context (Black and Ricardo 1994; Wright, Bobashev, and Folsom 2007). Thus, subjective factors influencing the choice to use drugs are important to incorporate with background influences like community disorganization.

Social Disorganization Theory (Shaw and McKay [1942] 1969), has also been fruitfully applied to understanding drug trade (Sullivan 1989; Currie 1993; Jacobs 1999; Ousey and Lee 2002; Martinez Jr., Rosenfeld and Mares 2008). Various instances of social disorganization are associated with drug dealing, including experiencing adverse neighborhood conditions, exposure to drug use, delinquent peer associations and lack of formal and informal control mechanisms (Little and Steinberg 2006). Specifically related to drug trade, some have noted the prevalence of street corner drug markets are associated with increased odds of individual participation in drug trade (Fagan 1989; Decker and Van Winkle 1994; Valdez and Sifaneck 2004). Yet despite these influences, the regularity of participation in drug trade is conditioned by levels of attachment to conventional values and norms. However, frequency of dealing was mediated by attachment to conventional goals and school (Little and Steinberg 2006). Once again, the importance of individual subjectivity and the meaning ascribed to drug involvement are important variables in understanding drug trade.

Social Disorganization Theory has been criticized for its suggestion that socially disorganized neighborhoods lead to detached citizenry who are more apt to commit crime. Indeed, the inverse may be true and neighborhoods become socially disorganized because the citizenry are not attached to prosocial institutions and groups. Some (Anderson 1999) have noted that despite living in impoverished neighborhoods a significant majority of residents are conventional, law-abiding citizens. Still others may suggest that urban neighborhoods are not “disorganized”, and such assertions are ethnocentric and biased. The biggest problem of Social Disorganization Theory is its inability to explain why some people commit crime in those areas, but many more do not, while still others commit crime in communities not considered socially disorganized.

Self-Derogation Theory

Self-derogation Theory (Kaplan 1975), is among the few perspectives focused on drug involvement which explicitly incorporate background and foreground influences. It focuses on how rejection from family, peers, and society can predispose individuals to crime (background) and that for some drug use is perceived as a way to increase their self-esteem (foreground) (Kaplan 1975; 1976; 1978). Kaplan, Martin, and Robbins (1982) suggest drug use is the result of self-derogation derived from negative social experiences causing an individual to look for alternative ways to increase their self-esteem, including the use of drugs. However, self-derogation is mediated and moderated by family, school, and peer influences (Kaplan, Martin and Robbins 1984). These primary agents of socialization are important for the theory of practice (Bourdieu 1977; 1990), as they influence subjective interpretations. However, Self-derogation Theory was specifically developed to understand drug use among adolescents. Empirical tests suggest that while self-derogation may have import for understanding juvenile drug use, it has less explanatory power for adults (Lee et al. 2018).

In total, the influence of self-control, social disorganization, strain, social bonding, and self-derogation on drug involvement are important background influences that predispose people to use drugs. However, they fall short at explaining *why* people become involved with drugs, and thus the *cause* of drug involvement. In order to address this shortcoming, Katz (1988) has advocated for more focused attention of the subjective foreground of crime. Attention to the foreground of crime provides researchers with subjectively defined, interactionally inspired insights into the motivations and meanings people ascribe to their criminal behavior. Thus, foreground explanations of crime tend to

center on the individual and the influence of subjectivity and meaning making on criminal decision making. Theoretical explanations aimed at the foreground of crime attempt to answer questions of motivations, meaning, and identity and how they condition each other. Thus, foreground explanations of drug involvement attempt to make sense of seemingly non-rational choices to be involved with drugs.

In understanding how structural forces can condition the meaning and choice to deal drugs some have suggested that drug trade has become an important “counter economy” (Davis 1988), which allows those with otherwise little access to economic solvency a viable alternative. Indeed, multiple scholars have noted that dealing drugs becomes a seemingly logical option when more conventional avenues for success are either blocked by structural disadvantage or knifed off by the consequences of addiction (Manning and Redlinger 1983; Mieckowski 1994; Ricardo 1994; Denton and O’Malley 2001; Campbell and Hanson 2012; Erickson, Hochstetler and Copes In Press). While dealers are motivated to deal drugs for economic benefits, specifically to support their families, dealers also enjoy various intangible and symbolic benefits from their dealings including improved social status and perception of self (Weismann 1993; Whitehead, Peterson and Kaljee 1994; Bourgois 2003; Erickson, Hochstetler and Copes, In Press). Scholars have routinely noted one of the main draws to drug trade is the lifestyle that is popularly associated with it, one of fast cars, fast women, and fast lives. (Shover 1996; VanNostrand and Tewksbury 1999; Campbell and Hansen 2012). The question is how these motivations and rewards become salient to individuals and how the choice to deal drugs become incorporated into their identity.

Learning Theory

Learning Theory is an amalgamation of the works of several criminologists. Most notable among them is Sutherland's theory of Differential Association (Sutherland and Cressey 1974) which set the stage for theorists such as Akers (1985) who included principles of operant conditioning into his version of Learning Theory. The overriding principle behind Learning Theory is that crime, including drug involvement, is a learned behavior, most often learned in intimate groups of significant others who provide motives, rationales and meanings to the learner.

Significant research exists which tests propositions from learning theories for the ability to explain drug use. A large body of research finds support for various components of Social Learning Theory to predict drug usage (Marcos, Bahr and Johnson 1986; Svensson 2003; Bohnert, Bradshaw and Latkin 2009; Ellickson, Collins and Bell 2009). Specifically, important sources of learning seem to relate to parental drug use (Dembo et al. 1986), and peer associations which include peer behavior and attitudes conducive to drug involvement (Adler and Adler 1978; Petriatis, Flay and Miller 1995; Ford 2008). It is from these significant others that people learn the motivations, justifications and meanings afforded to drug use that provide resources for constructing a deviant identity encouraging continued use.

It has been suggested people learn that dealing drugs is a viable and fruitful course of action through their experiences as drug users (Murphy, Waldorf and Reinerman 1990; Taylor and Potter 2013), and specifically from parents and peers that encourage their participation (Flom et al. 2001; Stanforth, Kostiuik, and Garriott 2015). While dealers of all demographic backgrounds tend to perceive dealing drugs as an activity they can draw

enjoyment and status from (Li and Feigelman 1994; Li et al. 1996; Jacques and Wright 2015), people of economic disadvantage are more apt to consider drug dealing as an instrumental act to achieve and sustain economic independence (Buchanan 1993). Learning Theory provides researchers with a way to understand why people can choose to engage in the seemingly irrational practice of drug dealing and how they learn to construct an identity consonant with their surroundings and behaviors.

Learning Theory has been criticized for difficulty in testing its key hypotheses, possibilities of spuriousness between deviant peer associations and crime commission, and a lack of ability to explain crime done by people who are isolated, antisocial or otherwise reclusive (Curran and Renzetti 1994; Akers and Sellers 2004). Others criticize the overly psychological additions of Akers (1985) and note that research on the criminal justice policies designed to reduce recidivism and repeat offending inspired by Learning Theory do not appropriately incorporate its insights to be effective (Wilson and Hernstein 1985).

Techniques of Neutralization

Techniques of neutralization (Sykes and Matza 1957), allow offenders to free themselves of the guilt associated with their misdeeds and maintain a positive sense of identity. Techniques of neutralization include “denial of responsibility”, “denial of injury”, “denial of victim”, “condemnation of the condemners” and “appeal to higher loyalties”. These neutralizations provide persons with justifications to their crimes that are deemed as morally acceptable and appropriate. It is argued that such neutralizations proceed the deviant act and function as both rationalization and motivation.

Sykes and Matza (1957) argued deviants were able to persist in their behaviors and maintain a positive sense of identity by “neutralizing” the guilt associated with their deviance

They contended that such neutralizations were considered prior to the act of deviance, not after it as a rationalization, and in that way neutralizations are suggested to partially explain the motivation to offend. Of specific import for understanding persistence in crime is the understanding that the use of neutralizations allows for individuals to construct a positive sense of identity despite their various misdeeds. In a review, Maruna and Copes (2005) discuss numerous studies which elaborate the ways in which neutralizations are used to neutralize guilt, maintain and positive sense of identity, and justify continuation in deviant activity (Maruna and Copes 2005). While a significant number of qualitative accounts provide evidence that those involved with drugs rely on various neutralizations to justify their involvement (Priest and McGrath 1970; Akers and Cochran 1985; Shiner and Newburn 1997; Sandberg 2012; Cutler 2014), quantitative research suggests only a moderate association between the use of neutralizations and various forms of crime (Ball 1966; Minor 1981; Agnew and Peters 1986; Mitchell, Doddler and Norris 1990).

Techniques of neutralization have been criticized on several grounds. Some have taken issue with the assumption that deviants are largely conventional and use neutralizations to protect their sense of identity as a good, moral person. Indeed, some have shown various forms of rhetorical neutralizations can emerge from subcultural commitments which require neutralizations of prosocial behavior (Topalli 2005). Finally, while Sykes and Matza (1957) have argued that neutralizations precede deviance, research has found offenders tend to only accept neutralizations for crimes in which they have already participated (Minor 1981; Wortley 1986; McCarthy and Stewart 1998). Thus, while neutralizations are important for understanding the accounts or narratives of deviant behavior (Scott and Lyman 1968; Maruna and Copes 2005), the perspective leaves open the question of the etiology of drug

involvement. This concern over temporal ordering may be a blow to the theory's ability to speak to causation, but it still provides insight into the ways in which individuals can construct and maintain a positive identity in the face of, or in concert with, their criminal behavior. The main shortcoming of neutralization theory is the narrow bounds it places on the connections between talk and crime, limiting inquiry into the most obvious types of common excuses.

Subcultural Theories

Subcultural theorists suggest subcultures exist within the dominant culture while having their own rules, morals and norms. Subcultures emerge among similarly situated people, either through choice or by circumstance. Subcultures fashion normative moral orders for their participants who draw from the subculture cues about how to contextualize and understand their experiences and behaviors. Subcultural theorists like Cohen (1955), Cloward and Ohlin (1960), and Wolfgang and Ferracutti (1967) contend persistent criminals ensconced in a criminal subculture have in part, or wholly rejected the norms, values, and goals of conventional society. In their place, subcultural participants construct and enact their own dispositional and behavioral norms. They produce and reproduce subculturally specific interactional "codes" (Anderson 1999), with specific "focal concerns" (Miller 1958), as informed by experiencing similar structural and social conditions (Cohen 1955) (for a review of subcultures see Brake 1980; Blackman 2005; 2014; Williams 2007).

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) were among the first to discuss drug using subcultures (retreatist subculture), but research on drug subcultures have waxed and waned within criminological discourse (see Brake 1980). Currently little research examines drug use within the context of subcultures (for exceptions see Sanders 2006; Sandberg 2012). However,

scholars argue that subcultural studies still have import for understanding drug use (Pederson 2009; Shiner 2009; Sandberg 2012; Holm, Sandberg, Kolind and Hesse 2014), and the ability of subcultural orientations to influence identity construction (Copes and Williams 2007). Subcultures can be thought of as “fields” of action (Bourdieu 1977; 1990), and are important for understanding both identity and choice. However, while subcultural studies provide insight into how offenders may negotiate meaning around their drug use it only provide pieces to the puzzle of how drug users make the choice to use drugs, construct their identity and to what consequence.

For many dealers, the motivation to deal drugs is wrapped up in the lifestyle associated with being in which doing drugs is central concern and organizing activity (Erickson, Hochstetler and Copes In Press). Sandberg (2008) argues for many of the dealers their aim was “hedonism” and living lifestyles they could not otherwise afford. Dealers engage in boundary work that marks distinction between themselves others they contend are less worthy of respect and subcultures provide a context where such boundaries are respected and appreciated. Sandberg (2012) has also provided evidence of the import of drug subcultures for understanding the nature of individual drug markets including how they are hierarchically structured and enacted. While drug subcultures provide resources participants can use to bring meaning to their behaviors and construct their identities, perspectives exclusively attuned to the influence of subcultures do not address what draws people to those behaviors and subcultures to begin.

Subcultural theories alone are untenable for understanding drug participation for several reasons. It seems obvious that not all crime is a product of embodying a particular subcultural ideology and leaves little room for nuance in understanding the behaviors of

people of the same subculture. Subcultural theories are also devised with the working and lower classes in mind and as such do not explain socioeconomically depressed people who do not commit crime and affluent people who do. The values and concerns considered a part of subcultures are not inherently deviant even if they lend themselves to deviance and little research finds that subcultural participants engage in wholesale rejection of the dominant culture (Ryan 1976; Kornhauser 1978).

Identity Theory and Boundary Work

Identity Theory, brought to its fullest explication by Burke and Stets (2009) who suggest individuals have social (group), role (positions within a group) and person (individual's unique self-concept), identities that inform who they are and how they act. Thus, in relation to drug use an individual may conceive of themselves as a drug user (social identity), a "crackhead" (role identity) and a person who has experienced marginalization but is really a good person in spite of their crack addiction (person identity). Researchers of crime and deviance have used the propositions of identity theory to understand criminal behavior, including drug use (Athens 1974; Keimer and Matsueda 1994; Geiger and Fischer 2005; Landolt 2013).

The issue with identity theory to understand drug use (or trade for that matter), is its focus on subjectivity and lack of attention to social structure. Additionally, identity theorist's suggestion of the process of identity negotiation is either so highly agential as to approach absurdity, or is so deeply subconscious as to strip agency from the actor. Moreover, behavior as a product of identity is treated tautologically in identity theory, "District managers do the things that district managers are supposed to do." (Burke and Stets 2009:12). Finally, while structural symbolic interactionism is sensitive to social structure it does not adequately

explain how social structure can force the hand of individuals propelling them into certain identities and not others, or how similarly socially situated individuals can end up with drastically different identities (e.g. “decent” vs. “street”, Anderson 1999). Bourdieu’s (1990) theory of practice can explain how people’s dispositions and behaviors are conditioned by social structure and narrative sociology (an extension of identity theory), better explains how people negotiate their identities. Despite these theoretical concerns, research on identity has important insights for the work proposed here including the concepts of salience hierarchy (Stryker 1968; Callero 1985; Stryker and Burke 2000), role performance and commitment (Burke and Reitzes 1981; Stryker and Burke 2000; Burke and Stets 2009), identity verification (Burke and Stets 2009), and their links to self-esteem and self-consistency which motivate socially situated action (Foote 1951; Elliot 1986; Stryker and Burke 2000; Vryan, Adler and Adler 2003; Burke and Stets 2009), and are invaluable for understanding initiation and persistence in drug use.

Reconciling Background and Foreground Theories of Crime

The theoretical perspectives enumerated above are valuable for understanding drug use and trade but treat these phenomenon one-sidedly. Background theories address the influences that inform an individual’s propensity to use or sell drugs, while foreground theories address the meaning and decision making processes of those that use and sell drugs. Increasingly, there has been attention turned to the bridging background and foreground explanations of crime.

In recent years, social theorists have worked to bridge the structure-subjectivity divide (Bourdieu 1977; 1990; Giddens 1984; Thornberry 1987; Groves and Lynch 1990; Henry and Milovanovic 1996; Farral and Bowling 1999). Some of the earliest attempts at

reconciling background, structural approaches and foreground, subjective approaches to crime were done by Sampson and Wilson in an attempt to understand disparate violent crime rates by people of color (Sampson and Wilson 1995). Following earlier work on criminal subcultures, they suggested neighborhood-level patterns of inequality gives rise to social and ecological concentrations of the “truly disadvantaged”, which encourages social disorganization, social isolation and cultural adaptations that transform the meaning of crime, specifically violence, to something culturally sanctioned and valorized. Indeed, concentrated disadvantage has been found to be among the most powerful and consistent predictors of violent crime (Pratt and Cullen 2005). Sampson and Wilson (1995) argued such ecological segregation and social disorganization produced a community context that informed the “cognitive landscape”, or the availability of community norms informing behavior and codes of conduct. Anderson (1999) provides a detailed discussion of the various manifestations of such cultural adaptations and their relation to crime. In line with Sampson and Grove (1989), Anderson (1999), suggests deindustrialization, discrimination and distrust in the police and other social institutions lead to systemic disadvantage that encourages the emergence of a dispositional set of norms he terms the “code of the street”. This code informs how people in these areas think, walk, and talk and is the product of both structural conditions and culturally informed meaning.

While cognitive landscapes and street codes are of significant utility for understanding how structure and culture can intersect to inform criminal behavior, they are purposely narrow as they were developed to understand why violent crime rates were higher in disadvantaged communities of color. It is true neighborhoods with comparable levels of structural disadvantage have similar amounts of crime but these perspectives have limited

utility for understanding why more affluent people, engage in drug use or trade, and leaves open the role of culture that informs the choice to be involved with drugs specifically.

Indeed, Boardman et al. (2001) find when controlling for neighborhood disadvantage, strain, social and psychological resources Black people are less likely to use drugs than are their White counterparts. Thus, using a perspective developed to understanding differential violent offending on the part of Black people does not follow logically.

Sampson and Bean (2006) noted the thorniest of issues in the study of race and crime is the influence of culture. Criminologists have worked to understand the importance of criminal subcultures as a causal force or “culture in action”. Particularly valuable is the concept of “cultural toolkit” (Swidler 1986), which calls attention to notion that people pull from culture variably based on available “tools” and preference, which provide people with a toolkit of culturally informed scripts, cognitive schemas and value orientations. People use these cultural tools as symbolic resources they can rely on to make sense of their surroundings and negotiate interactions with others. Despite this turn towards understanding culture as emergent, dynamic, and causal in recent years, “there has not yet been a decisive theoretical reformulation of the old culture/structure debate” (Sampson and Bean 2006:23). Some of this resistance is certainly associated with anachronistic views of culture as an emergent causal force. Sampson and Bean (2006) noted criminologists have historically taken one of three positions on the import of culture for understanding criminal offending. The first view is that criminal subcultures are not actually truly cultures with its own set of casual forces, but are rather a loose set of ad hoc justifications for deviant behavior (Kornhauser 1978). The second perspective views deviant subcultural norms as an adaption to structural or social constraints that would evaporate or change under different conditions

(Massey 1995; Sampson and Wilson 1995; Wilson 1996). The third perspective suggests, even if criminal subcultures spring from structural conditions, they are emergent independent social forces with internal norms, rules, and logics that inform people's attitudes and behaviors (Wolfgang and Ferracutti 1967; Anderson 1999). Perhaps it is most accurate to say causal forces of subcultures emerge within the bounds of broader structural and cultural constraints and take on an independent character when people *internalize and reproduce subcultural values and norms through their own actions*. This process of internalization, action and reproduction is what criminologists have struggled to theorize and what the theory of practice provides (Bourdieu, 1990). It seems important for criminologists to understand culture as a resource people use to structure and constrain social interaction. Individuals are centers of intersubjectivity and culture is the byproduct of social interaction in which people work towards subjectively defined goals. People rely on a repertoire of culturally informed values and meanings to create symbolic boundaries, make note of and create group differences, and motivate personal or social change (Lamont and Molnar 2002). With this in mind, it is important to consider culture, specifically criminal subcultures, as something that is "acted out" or produced and reproduced through social interaction. Thus, subcultures are performative and people are motivated to perform in certain ways, or follow certain lines of action over others, due to the influence of subculture values. Taken in this way, it would be erroneous to suggest criminal subcultures or identities are simply post-hoc rationalizations, but rather subcultures provide scripts for action that actors rely on to make social interactions work in their subjectively defined favor. Criminologists have already pulled from Bourdieu's work, specifically the concept of "cultural capital", but, as it is used, the concept lacks its full explanatory ability because it has been detached from the theoretical orientation from which

it originated. The theory of practice (Bourdieu 1990), provides a theoretical perspective that can bridge the structure versus culture debate by theorizing an internal generative structure which is informed by social structure and culture that informs action. Through this action and interaction people actively produce, reproduce, and modify existing cultural orders, including criminal subcultures. Such a perspective provides an understanding of how people *both produce and are products of culture*. Ultimately, understanding how structure and culture interact and inform decision making and identity construction among drug users and dealers are key to the present analysis.

Identity as Causality

Individuals are determining and determined by culture. Thus, to understand the choice to become drug involved and how that behavior is enacted it is important to have a theoretical perspective that incorporates an understanding of persons as active agents consuming cultural resources from which they can use to construct and contextualize a sense of self-identity and motivate and rationalize their behaviors. Agency can be understood as purposeful action contextualized by social interaction and influenced by the past, but oriented towards the future (Emirbayer and Mische 1998). Identities do not pop into existence, however, rather identity is an emergent phenomenon of personhood. To appreciate how individuals construct their identity, develop motivations and make decisions, it is necessary to have an ontological understanding of personhood. If a person is to have agency and make choices then such a definition would need to incorporate a social, and not merely biological or psychological, understanding of personhood. Smith (2010:61) provides this definition of personhood,

“By *person* I mean a conscious, reflexive, embodied, self-transcending center of subjective experience, durable identity, moral commitment, and

social communication who—as the efficient cause of his or her own responsible actions and interactions—exercises complex capacities for agency and intersubjective in order to develop and sustain his or her own incommunicable self.”

Key to identity is reflexive (re)appreciation of symbols and meaning making capacities of individuals. Yet people do not draw their appreciations or understandings from air, rather they often reflect on “socially normative and evaluative dispositions” (Smith 2003:18) which orient their perceptions and behaviors. Thus, to understand why an individual does what they do, we must first understand who they are as a person. Yet, this begs the questions, what is a person, how do they construct a sense of self, and how do these affect behavior? People have affective desires born of their understandings of themselves and the world in which they act. People are not passive and determined, they are agential with the ability to choose from a variety courses of actions and self-representations. These choices are not rational in the sense of a “universal rational actor”, more akin to the products of “bounded rationality” (Copes and Vieratis 2009), people make choices with of what they view to be appropriate, logical and consequential from views of what *people like them do and do not do*. Who a person becomes is reliant on the “reconstructive endeavors” they engage in with the “fundamental aim of building/rebuilding a coherent and rewarding sense of identity” (Giddens 1991:75). Thus, an individual’s sense of their identity is a reflexive project in which people use their own experiences to develop organized and coherent assumptions about the future (Giddens 1991). They work to construct an expression of self that is coherent with their internal identity and a large part of a person’s identity is a product of local and cultural histories and logics that predominate in their lives and inform who they think they are and how they think they should act. Bourdieu’s theory of practice (1977; 1990) provide a way to understand individuals as determined and determining, how agency is encouraged and constrained, and how identity is

continually produced and reproduced through a synthesis of an actor's lived experience, available cultural narratives, and perceptual understanding.

Bourdieu's Theory of Practice

The current study will eschew the false dichotomy between background (structure), and foreground (subjectivity) factors, and instead rely on a theoretical perspective that bridges them. In this study, I utilize Bourdieusian and narrative frameworks that are sensitive to the dialectical relationship between social structure and subjectivity that produces agency. I argue social context influences subjective understandings of self with import for understanding decision making and identity in relation to drug involvement. I examine how an individual's dispositions and perceptions (*habitus*), social location (*field*), and available resources (*capital*), interplay to influence their behaviors and attitudes toward drug involvement.

Only recently have criminologists begun using Bourdieu's concepts of *habitus*, *capital*, and *field* which make up his theory of practice (1977; 1990). While only a handful of criminologists have utilized his theoretical framework (Sandberg 2008; McNeill et al. 2011; Caputo-Levine 2013; Ilan 2013; Fraser and Atkinson 2014; Shammass and Sandberg 2016), and applied it specifically to drug trade (Sandberg 2008; Grundetjern and Sandberg 2012; Fleetwood 2014), it would be a mistake to ignore his theory. It artfully bridges structure and subjectivity in a way that does not reduce practice to either. Important for criminology, it provides criminologists with tools for understanding agency and criminal etiology, or "primary deviations" (Lemert 1951).

Bourdieu uses the concept of *habitus* to emphasize how social structure becomes embodied as internal dispositions that inform action. Specifically, Bourdieu argues *habitus* is,

“embodied history, internalized as a second nature” (Bourdieu 1990:56), which, “designates a way of being, a *habitual state* (especially of the body), and in particular, a *predisposition, tendency, propensity or inclination*. (Bourdieu 1977:214, original emphasis), and provides a “generative principle of regulated improvisations” (Bourdieu 1990:57). The habitus then is a set of dispositions structured by socialization and, “weight[ed] to early experiences” (Bourdieu 1977:78), that provide, “schemes of perception, conception and action” (Bourdieu 1990:60). The habitus then can be considered something akin to a “cognitive schema” (Crocker, Fiske, and Taylor 1984). Bourdieu (1977;1990) makes the assertion a person’s habitus is *durable* and *transposable*, though not immutable. It is important to keep in mind habitus does not *necessitate* certain actions, but rather is a generative structure that produces dispositions, “inculcated by the possibilities and impossibilities... inscribed in objective conditions” (Bourdieu 1990:54), that *inform*, “the sequence of ordered and oriented actions that constitute objective strategies [and] appear to be determined by anticipation of the future” (Bourdieu 1990:62). Ultimately then, habitus is a generative structure informing the choices people make and is a product of the objective conditions within fields (social context), individuals occupy. This is how Bourdieu transcends the structure-subjectivity argument and minimizes or ignores neither while making sense of agential action.

Fields can be considered metaphorical social spaces. A field “is a veritable social universe where, in accordance with its particular laws, there accumulates a particular form of capital... [and] is a universe of belief.” (Bourdieu 1993:164). Bourdieu refers to fields because they conjure up the image of a sports field. As with fields for sport, social fields have individuals with distinct positions, internal points of demarcation, boundaries, and rules that must be learned by the “players”. Similar to cognitive fields, Bourdieusian fields can be

conditioned by structural characteristics of neighborhoods and social realities like discrimination, but exist symbolically and take their shape through interaction. These components of fields set what Bourdieu calls the “logic of practice” within fields (Bourdieu 1990), and provide “a set of beliefs and assumptions that undergird the game” (Hanks 2005:73). Each field has its own “logic of practice” that sets the “rules of the game”, and notably drug dealing is sometimes referred to simply as “the game” with rules learned through parents and peers (Campbell and Hansen 2015). Such rules are naturalized parts of the games and can be explained using “doxa”, or the taken for granted assumptions of the field which are inscribed on a person’s habitus through inculcation. Within fields, which are hierarchically organized, agents compete for positioning and the “stakes” of the competition are forms of capital. Members of each of the fields struggle for position within the field, however, the “strategies” people use to improve their position will be conditioned by their “feel for the game” (habitus) and their available capitals. Thus, fields and their semi-autonomous logics, mediate what individuals do within particular social spaces. This is how Bourdieu avoids the problematic conception of a universal rational actor.

Bourdieu argues capital exists in multiple forms: economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1986). Economic capital relates to economic resources. Social capital, “is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network... of mutual acquaintance” (Bourdieu 1986:251). Cultural capital most often refers to “dominant” cultural capital is more complex than other forms of capital and exists in embodied, objectified and institutionalized states (Bourdieu 1986). Symbolic is similar to cultural capital in that it can take on three forms but is particularly relevant here because it is field specific and important for understanding choice and action. The

importance lays in what can be referred to as the “logic of association and differences” (Moore 2012:103). The logic of association suggests people present themselves (embodied symbolic capital), engage in consumption (objectified symbolic capital), and seek qualifications marking competence (institutionalized symbolic capital). In short, they make choices and desire capital they perceive similar others would also make and desire. On the other hand, the “logic of differences” (Moore 2012), suggests a person who belongs to one group will make certain choices because they are *not* the choices that a person from another group would make. These two things are connected by what is culturally salient within the various fields people inhabit throughout their life and this is so because the “logic of selection” (Moore 2012), is produced by the generative structure of the habitus which provides strategies to improve one’s position in the field through the use and accumulation of capital. The “strategies” individuals use to improve their position in a field are conditioned by their habitus and their volumes and forms of capital.

Bourdieu summarizes the interplay between his three key concepts in the equation $[(\text{habitus})(\text{capital})] + \text{field} = \text{practice}$ (Bourdieu 1986:101). This equation can be understood such that practice is the product of one’s dispositions (habitus) conditioned by their resources (capital) and contextualized by the logics of the social space (field) inhabited by the individual. Thus, Bourdieu (1977; 1990) provides a bridge between social structure and subjectivity through the complex interplay of these three concepts which allow for agency, or “strategy”, within the bounds of what agents view to be possible. Such concepts provide criminologists with the tools to understand why some offend and others do not offend, despite similar risk factors. Analyzing crime within a Bourdieusian framework is best accomplished through qualitative inquiry and narrative criminology provides an

advantageous framework from which to understand data relating to agential practice and identity.

Narrative Criminology

Presser and Sandberg (2015:1) sum up the goals of narrative criminology and its analytic gaze this way,

“Narrative criminology is an inquiry based on the view of stories as instigating, sustaining, or effecting desistance from harmful action. We study how narratives inspire and motivate harmful action, and how they are used to make sense of harm.”

The importance of narratives to the study of crime cannot be overstated. Scott and Lyman (1968:62) suggest, “Since it is with respect to deviant behavior that we call for accounts, the study of deviance and the study of accounts are intrinsically related, and a clarification of accounts will constitute a clarification of deviant phenomenon.” Accounts, or narratives, act to “verbally bridge the gap between action and expectation” (Stokes and Hewitt 1976), and as Bruner (1987:15), argued, “In the end we become the autobiographical narratives by which we ‘tell about’ our lives.” As such narratives are of vital importance for understanding motivation, action and identity.

Generally speaking, narratives track events over time and make a point (Presser 2013; Presser and Sandberg 2015). Often such stories are explicitly or implicitly moral, and relay the actors action in a morally contextualized way (Presser 2013). Narrative scholars point to varying types of narratives, but in whatever form they take, narrative criminologists consider narratives “constitutive of reality and not merely representation. [They] make things happen because they guide human action.”, and argue, “Our narratives communicate who we think we are and who we hope to be.” (Presser 2013:25-26).

It has been argued that narratives, “may be the way through which human beings make sense of their own lives” (McAdams 1995:207; see also Baumeister and Newman 1994), and understand who they are and how they should think and act (Holstein and Gubrium 2000). Narratives provide researchers with the richest data on how individuals perceive their own lives and actions (Polkinghorne 1996). Consequently, narrative criminologists take seriously the concept of narrative identity (Riceour 1988; 1992; Somers 1994; Loseke 2007), and argue the way people choose to frame their experiences says much about the identity of the person (Maruna and Copes 2005). Riceour (1992:118) argues that narrative identities, “are at once descriptive and emblematic”. Descriptive of personal character that permits identification of oneself to oneself and to others, and emblematic of action and “keeping one’s word” (Riceour 1992:123), or efforts at self-consistency. Narratives exist at three distinct levels: a macro-level (cultural narratives), a meso-level (organizational and institutional narratives), and a micro-level (personal narratives), (Loseke 2007). People draw from cultural and organizational or institutional narratives and synthesize them with their own lived experience to construct their personal narratives and by extension their identities. Cultural and institutional narratives provide actors with templates of culturally salient and valued identities with associated characteristics, dispositions, and codes of conduct (e.g. mother, professor, grunt marine), they can borrow from to build their own personal narratives and identities and subsequently motivate behavior (Loseke 2007). They provide “narrative resources”, which are available for people to draw from so they can cast themselves “in preferred ways, with particular themes and plotlines” (Holstein and Gubrium 2000:104). In doing so, people are able to construct a contextualized sense of identity that to some greater or lesser degree enacts and reproduces the attitudes and dispositions of the

cultural form they are borrowing from and signals who they are to themselves and others (Riceour 1992). Of course, important markers of social identity like race/ethnicity, class and gender intersect and inform a person's identity in a way that shapes the narratives they pull from to construct their own narratives and in turn their identity (Holstein and Gubrium 2000).

Presser (2009; 2012) suggests that narratives exist prior to action, relay an individual's narrative identity, and motivate offending. The narrative approach has been used to understand various types of criminal offending including White collar crime, mass murder, drinking, the use of cannabis, carjacking, street violence in the UK, identities of crack users, terrorism, drug dealing, and female drug trafficking (Copes, Hochstetler and Williams 2008; Sandberg 2009; Klenowski, Copes, and Mullins 2011; Brookman et al. 2011; Landolt 2013; Copes, Hochstetler and Sandberg 2015; Fleetwood 2015), as well as desistance from crime and rehabilitation (Maruna 2001; Ward and Marshall 2007; Stevens 2011). Importantly, narratives relay to an audience what the narrator perceives to be their personal qualities based on prior action. Narratives provide a script to the audience of what to expect from the person in subsequent interaction, and most importantly relay an identity that individuals will try to live up to in the future. Indeed, the act of telling a narrative is a venue for individuals to enact their identity (Reismann 2002).

Thus, narratives are important for understanding both individual identity and action. However, people do not pull cultural or institutional narratives from a buffet of narratives to construct their narrative identity. People pull from narratives that are available to them on the basis of the fields they inhabit, and construct their narrative identity on the foundation of the habitus they possess and the capitals they own. This is so for two reasons. First, people are simply not exposed to all the possible cultural or institutional narratives that exist and are

only exposed to narratives that are salient within the fields they maneuver through. Second, of the narratives people are exposed to, some are viewed as more plausible to draw from than others because there is a fit (or lack of) with their habitus and available capital, which in turn effects the construction of their narrative identity. It is because of these caveats the concept of “narrative habitus” is necessary.

Narrative Habitus

Narrative criminology argues that narratives are causal and not simply post-hoc rationalizations. Yet, theoretically this is an assumption for which narrative criminologists can reasonably be critiqued. Understanding narrative identity as a product of habitus and conditioned by available “local” (Holstein and Gubrium 2000), or “cultural” and “organizational” narratives (Loseke 2007), within fields allows narratives to be understood as socially contextualized and thus prior to, and constitutive of action. Fleetwood (2016) provides the first, and thus far only, criminological delineation of “narrative habitus”. The concept of “narrative habitus” combines the insights of Bourdieu’s theory of practice with narrative criminology’s focus on the production and effect of narrativity. Fleetwood (2016:173) suggests “narrative habitus conveys the way that narratives are natural and logical; the sense that the story could never have been otherwise.” She makes the argument that “narrative habitus” emerges from the embodiment of field logics which provide “narrative doxa” that structure individual’s narratives and narrative identity. In other words, narratives emerge from the internalization of field logics which inform the dispositions (habitus) of people and orient them towards particular narratives with which to understand their identity and their actions. Fleetwood (2016:186) gives primacy to narratives and suggests the, “narrative habitus generates interpretations and representations.” This is a slight

modification of habitus which I find unnecessary. Bourdieu (1990:68) clearly states the habitus allows for a, “pre-verbal taking-for-granted of the world”. Actions, the narratives people use to consciously understand them, and their narrative identity are the product of the generative structure of the habitus, which provide, “schemes of perception and appreciation of practices” (Bourdieu 1989:19), and orients individuals to a “probabilistic future”. Put more plainly, the habitus works below the level of narrative identity, informing which narratives one pulls from to construct a narrative identity. While both are integral to understand motivation and identity construction, this formulation of “narrative habitus” gives primacy to habitus rather than narratives. A person’s unique habitus informs the content of narratives and the narrative identity people choose to “live by” (Holstein and Gubrium 2000), which are conditioned by the availability of possible narratives circulating within the field(s) a person inhabits and their available capitals. Thus, a drug dealer may narrate their drug dealing behavior along the lines of a business person, or a counter-culture rebel, or simply as someone helping out friends. In any case, the narratives available to a dealer to understand their dealing behaviors are set within the bounds of the fields in which they exist and the content of personal narratives, and thus their narrative identity, are conditioned by the dealer’s habitus and capitals. Thus, drug dealing, or use, is a behavior informed by a person’s habitus, but the way in which they consciously understand their drug involvement, the way they understand *why* they are drug involved, is understood through available narratives which are selected and constituted on the foundation of an individual’s habitus. As Mills (1940: 904), once noted “The differing reasons men give for their actions are not themselves without reason”. The concept of “narrative habitus” then provides insight into why people choose one action over another and to what consequence. Moreover, “narrative habitus” allows

researchers to understand human agency in a way that is sensitive to both structural and subjective influences. These contributions will best be realized through qualitative research of the sort Bourdieu commonly engaged in to construct his theory of practice.

CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGY: NARRATIVE AS METHOD

Research Sites

Participants were pulled from two distinct geographical and neighborhood contexts. *Winterton City* is a mid-size metropolitan community in the mid-west. It is the economic, political, and cultural hub of the state in which it resides. It has the largest population of any single city in the state and is considered demographically heterogeneous relative to its surrounding communities. Participants from Winterton City (n=39) are largely pulled from a small section of downtown which contains the city's highest rates of crime, poverty and racial diversity. While violent crime and drug use are common in these areas, they are not on par with the country's most violent, drug ridden neighborhoods. The people I interviewed here were largely economically disadvantaged people of color, although due to the city's demographic make up, a small number of economically disadvantaged White participants (n=10) were interviewed. Their drug use ran the gamut from recreational cannabis use to poly-substance users with significant addiction issues. Many had experienced personal and legal troubles associated with their drug involvement. Most of the participants here had attempted to quit drugs at least one time, to varying degrees of success. Most all had overwhelmingly negative associations with drug use and dealing the most extreme of which related to death and the loss of freedom through incarceration. Participants were often eager to tell their stories and relayed their experiences with a level of emotion, humor and self-reflexivity that was engaging and at times unexpected.

Two Rivers is a small suburban town orbiting a mid-sized metropolitan city in the mid-west in a different state than Winterton City. Two Rivers population is under 10,000 people and is demographically homogenous. White, working and middle class individuals

make their homes there working in various industries, often in Prairie City (the mid-sized metropolitan city Two Rivers orbits), just a few miles away. There is little violent crime in the area, but it is considered by residents to be a community with a fair amount of drug use. Participants interviewed from Two Rivers were mostly White, working class individuals who were economically stable, but not affluent (n=21). Their drug use was variable with some participants exclusively using cannabis, while others tried various psychedelics and still others used drugs like methamphetamine and heroin. While some had plans to quit as they aged and “grew up”, few of the participants had tried to desist from drug involvement. Only a few had experienced prolonged periods of serious addiction, even fewer experienced significant troubles from their addiction beyond loss of self-esteem. Those that had desisted in the Two Rivers sample had increased levels of economic and social support by comparison to their counterparts in Winterton City. Few participants in Two Rivers had experienced legal trouble, and for those that had, it was often considered a temporal blip, rather than the start of a winding narrative of drug use and incarceration.

Sampling

Participants were located through multiple non-probability sampling strategies as is common for qualitative research (Boeri and Lamonica 2015). First, a purposive sampling strategy was used. Purposive sampling is often used when the researcher has pre-existing knowledge of where to locate participants of hard to reach populations (Boeri and Lamonica 2015). Initial participants were located through pre-existing knowledge of possible participants and by contacting community centers at which flyers were posted advertising the study and its purpose.

From initial participants garnered through purposive sampling a snowball sampling technique, sometimes called “chain referral” (Berg 2009), was utilized to find additional participants. In practice, I did this by giving willing participants “recruitment cards” they will be able to give to their associates with information about the study. Similar to purposive sampling, snowball sampling is appropriate for finding hard to reach populations (Berg 2009; Boeri and Lamonica 2015). However, there are drawbacks to using snowball sampling as participants are likely to refer others within their own social networks and snowball sampling is at times referred to as “network sampling” (Neuman 2012). As personal networks tend to be homophilic such a sampling strategy can limit variation in participants. However, this limitation can be overcome by developing a large sample, or through developing multiple research sites (Boeri and Lamonica 2015).

Sample Characteristics

The sample characteristics for this study were fairly evenly split along race, gender, and user and dealer status. In total, 60 current or former users and dealers were interviewed. Thirty-two individuals identified as users only, while the remaining 28 identified as dealers to some greater or lesser extent. I interviewed 29 White people and 31 people of color, as well as 31 males and 29 females spread across both research sites. I interviewed 39 low socioeconomic individuals from Winterton City and 21 working to middle class individuals from Two Rivers. Participants from Winterton City worked service or labor sector jobs, many were jobless, and several were at various stages of homelessness at the time of the interview. Participants from Two Rivers were largely college educated with stable jobs ranging from service sector to health professionals to managerial work. Participants ranged in age from 22 to 75 with an average age of 37. Drug use ranged from regular recreational

usage of cannabis to sustained drug addiction and use of multiple drugs. The number of years participants used drugs ranged from 5 years to 20 years with an average of approximately 9 years. The number of years participants reported engaging in drug dealing ranged from 5 years to 28 years with an average of approximately 8 years. Average years using was higher than average years dealing as most dealers move to dealing after time as a user. However, a few participants started selling drugs at very young ages and did not start to use until sometime later. It is these individuals who account for difference between those longest dealing and those longest using.

Analytic Procedure

In the present study, I relied on semi-structured interviews with current and former drug users and dealers drawn from two distinct geographical and neighborhood locations. The research procedures used to collect and analyze the data presented were reviewed and approved of by Iowa State University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) (See Appendix). Due to the sensitive nature of the topics to be discussed, IRB approval was contingent on a full board review. At the review, I presented the rationale and purpose of my study, as well as how I planned to protect subjects and their responses during the interview itself and in perpetuity. Extra care was taken to protect respondent's anonymity including never recording respondents legal name or contact information. At initial contact and prior to the interview, participants were informed of their rights as research participants and explained how their anonymity would be protected. Participants were given a copy of the informed consent form, were asked to read it, and had it read aloud to them prior to the start of the interview. Permission was granted from the IRB to forgo written consent forms due to the sensitive nature of the interviews and verbal consent was garnered and audio recorded to begin each

interview. Interviews took place in public locations that allowed for privacy, including parks, lakes, libraries, coffee shops, and community centers. Participants were compensated \$50 for their time during the interviews. Interviews lasted approximately 60-120 minutes and were audio recorded for later transcription. After transcription, audio recordings were destroyed.

Bourdieu (1990) considers habitus as durable and transposable dispositions of mind and body that are weighted towards early life experiences, especially those with family and significant peers. To understand an individual's habitus, life histories are exceptional tools for assessing an individual's perception of self and how it has evolved over time. One goal of this study was to assess how, or if a person's habitus, and in turn, their identity, was effected by their drug involvement. Bourdieu (1990) notes that while a person's habitus is durable, it is not immutable and is open to revision with sustained experience in a field. For the purposes of this study, I qualified "sustained experience" as five or more years of using or selling drugs. Thus, the examination of narratives (discussed at length above) are vital to the research conducted here, as narratives "map the diversity of ideal motives that exist in a culture, and in addition it helps us investigate how people creatively draw on cultural repertoires to link themselves to a specific culture" (Hammersvik 2018:89). Sandberg (2016:155), suggests narratives "are seldom the outcome of conscious strategies by storytellers, but more a kind of practical sense learned through socialization", and links this explicitly to Bourdieu's (1990) theory of practice which gives attention to sense making through socialization. Thus, the examination of personal narratives and how individuals construct these narratives by relying on cultural narratives and associated identities (Holstein and Gubrium 2000; Loseke 2007), were the key to the analysis.

Participants' utterances, the data of this analysis, are used to relay coherent narratives of experiences and one's identity (Agar and Hobbs 1982). Narratives cohere at different levels: the global, themal and local levels. Global coherence looks at narratives as a whole and attends to the overarching goal of the narrative (i.e. the point trying to be made by the narrator). Thematic coherence is concerned with "chunks of content" (Agar and Hobbs 1982:7) that connect the speaker's utterances to a broader cultural world including the beliefs, values, or goals that motivate their decision making and inform their identity. Local coherence attends to the way participants' utterances link together in a meaningful way throughout a narrative. I attend largely to thematic and global coherence, or the broad themes and overarching point of narratives and how they relay the motivation, meaning and identity of participants.

Semi-structured interviews were used to elicit narratives from participants. Semi-structured interviews are useful because they provide the researcher with a roadmap for the interview but still allow for deviations and probes of further inquiry (Neuman 2011; Weisheit 2015). The interviews were structured so as to try to capture the life histories of individuals as they relate to their drug involvement. The use of life histories allows researchers to go beyond the immediate and proximate situation of an event, or an offense in the case of criminology, and give insight into a, "broad range of psychological, sociological, mystical-religious, and cosmological-philosophical issues" (Atkinson 2002:128). Analyzing life history accounts are useful for developing or critiquing theory and concepts and are excellent for understanding the degree of agency people perceive themselves to have and how they enact their identity (Shover 2012). Reissman (1993) has indicated that narratives often pour from participants spontaneously without specific prompting by the interviewer. However,

some researchers have noted difficulty in eliciting narratives (Mishler 1986), and suggest, counterintuitively, the most efficient way to elicit a narrative is through inquiries about specific times, places and situations rather than broad questions aimed at getting participants to provide an entire life story from one question (Holloway and Jefferson 2000). As no one method for eliciting narratives is consistently suggested in the literature, I utilized both an initial broad question of “Would you mind telling me about how you got into drugs, your experience with them and where you are today?”, and a protocol directing participants to talk about specific times, people and situations.

Participants audio recorded responses were transcribed with the ensuing transcriptions imported into NVivo. NVivo is a commonly used qualitative data analysis software. NVivo facilitates the coding and analyses of transcription fundamental to qualitative inquiry (Corbin and Strauss 1990). The use of NVivo allows the user to code the data and examine the data for recurring words, themes, or phrases that are especially salient to the study at hand. To begin, all transcripts were read in their entirety to get a general sense of what each interview contained, prominent areas of similarity and dissimilarity between respondents, and the overall flow of the interviews. This process began the first level or phase of coding. Analysis of the data began with what is commonly referred to as first cycle coding (Saldana 2013). Coding can be considered “tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study” (Huberman and Miles 1994: 56). Coding decisions related to what utterances to code and the meaning ascribed to such utterances were informed by prior research, the theoretical framework used in this study, and the research questions of the study. Transcripts were coded with addressing the research questions posed and code labels were derived inductively from participant’s

responses. I attended to the way participants described their context, motivations for use and sense of identity in my initial codes while making memos to note emergent differences between race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location. First cycle coding involved the initial interpretation of participant's responses by assigning a code to a word, phrase, or analytically important theme present within the interview. Specifically, "initial coding" was utilized. Initial coding involves the beginning examination of transcripts line by line for similarities and differences while being open to all possible theoretical and analytic possibilities (Charmaz 2002; Saldana 2013). These codes were developed from the "raw data" of the interviews. Utterances were coded for their level of meaning. Thus, codes were derived from a few words or phrases, whole sentences, paragraphs and narratives. Due to individual interdiscursivity, codes derived from individual sentences or thoughts were often nested in larger unfolding narratives. Thus, I used both "holistic-content reading" which consider stories holistically for the point the narrator is making as well as a "part-content reading" in which I analyzed specific utterances within narratives for their thematic and narrative importance (Lieblich 1998). I examined narratives both for their content and for similarities and differences between users and dealers as well as people of different racial, gender, socioeconomic status and residential location. In addition, I was attuned to the way people contrasted themselves between others and their selves overtime as these are integral for how people construct coherent narratives and in turn their identity. The first cycle involved several iterations to pare down and refine the initial codes on the basis of relevance across and within narratives. This iterative process of coding refining codes after examinations within and between transcripts is known as the "constant comparative" method and is key for examining qualitative data (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Charmaz 2002).

Next, “second cycle” (Saldana 2013), coding was undertaken. During this second cycle of coding, “focused coding” was used. Focused codes are abstract and broad and include the many of the initial codes they subsume (Charmaz 2002). Focused coding involves looking for salient, significant and frequently occurring codes within and between transcripts in order to develop theoretically and analytically relevant themes (Charmaz 2002; Saldana 2013). These themes consist of “axial” codes, or sub-codes revolving around a central analytically important theme (e.g. a theme of “motivations to use drugs” could include sub-codes such as “curiosity”, “escape”, “rebellion”, and “fitting in with peers”). Themes were examined using insights from narrative criminology (Presser 2009; Presser and Sandberg 2015), and for their relevance to the research questions. Coding was considered complete at the point of data saturation, or the point when no new themes, codes, ideas, or relationships appeared and all cases could be understood or explained using the themes and codes developed through the method of constant comparison (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Charmaz 2002). Constant comparison allows research to develop themes and concepts and link them to others present in the data in order to achieve thick and rich descriptive analytic understanding (Charmaz 2002).

CHAPTER 5. FINDINGS

Drug Use and Context

One of the main objectives of this study was to understand how those that were drug involved brought meaning to the context that surrounded them and the extent that they perceived context to encourage their involvement. When queried about the influence of context on their drug involvement, most participants noted multiple salient influences. These influences included chaotic, conflicted or disorganized family lives, peers or romantic partners with attitudes favorable to drug involvement, and growing up in milieu where it was perceived there was “nothing better to do” or drugs were omnipresent. These contextually informed influences varied little by race/ethnicity or gender.

It was more common for participants from Winterton City to note the experience of living in areas of poverty, crime, drug use and trade. Many from Winterton City felt their communities had been forgotten and neglected by those with the influence to do something. Many even noted the reason they participated in the interview was in hopes of shining a light on the experience of people in communities such as the one they called home. This sense of feeling abandoned and hopeless permeated many of the accounts of those I interviewed from Winterton City. On the other hand, those relatively more affluent participants from Two Rivers suggested their small town afforded them little to do, and drugs were readily accessible from the major city a short drive away. Their proximity to a major city combined with their relative anonymity in the city where they acquired drugs allowed them the freedom to use drugs with few negative consequences. Many also were able to skirt suspicion because they did not exhibit stereotypical behavioral or possess demographic characteristics of the cultural portrait of drug users. These contextual influences acted as important cornerstones

for participants' initial motivations to become involved with drugs and how they constructed an identity consonant with their experiences.

Physical Context

When I asked participants about how the neighborhood setting they grew up in influenced their perception of and willingness to engage with drugs they often called on social forces effecting their lived environment including family, lovers, and peers. Some also mentioned cultural influences that shaped their interest in drug use, while others completely rejected the notion that context informed their decision making instead saying they "made their own choices". Indeed, some were almost militant about their ownership of their actions such as Keysha, a Black user from Winterton City who said, "I'm saying I don't really feel like I had a role model or something that influenced me. I used because I wanted to use. I don't blame it on nobody else." Some participants however did mention important aspects of the objective physical environment that shaped their interest in drugs.

Most participants from Two Rivers were born and raised there and while they lived only a short drive from Prairie City some participants noted their insulation in Two Rivers as a contributing factor to their interest in drug involvement. Jay, a White user and former dealer, said that he perceived growing up in Two Rivers as boring and lacking positive role models for young people. In this context, drugs became a viable route to alleviate boredom and spice up an otherwise mundane existence.

"Well I think it's pretty prevalent around a small town. The drugs are prevalent because its uh, you kind of grow up with this idea that well we could go to the pool, we could ride our bikes... (pauses) see this is my point, I'm trying to figure out what things kids could do, so uh, that's kind of a way for us to turn to drugs. I think they may have been a driving factor and not so many other people we could follow as an influence around.

JE: So like a lack of entertainment options?

J: Lack of entertainment. Lack of maybe mentors that were older than us, to you know, we don't have an overwhelming amount of programs in this town. I think that drives the behavior to want to try new things. Cause once you've done it for a while it kind of gets old, you get tired of riding your bike, let's go do some drugs instead (laughs)."

This expression of boredom and having "nothing to do" was most common amongst the White participants of Two Rivers. The location of the town and its social makeup provided a context where participants became motivated to use, because as Dorian notes, "There's nothing to do socially. Boredom is something that led to that sort of experimentation." Take Cullen a White poly-drug user from Two Rivers for instance, who said the small-town context of Two Rivers discouraged adventuring into Prairie City, while encouraging adolescent activities he and his friends viewed as "cheesy" at the time. I asked Cullen how growing up in Two Rivers influenced his later interest in drugs and he replied,

"Honestly just friends, boredom. I mean there is just nothing around here to do. When I guess, when I was 15, I thought... (trails off). Prairie City was so close our little town, was so close to our little suburb, but when I was 15, we got to go all the way to Prairie City to go do this or that. It's just like Prairie City, that sketched us out so let's just go grab a bag of weed and go to my house out the country and smoke and chew (tobacco). I guess you could say in way drugs were an easy way out cause you have those classmates that in high school we all make fun, or not really we, I didn't really, but people make fun of those kids that are real creative, ones that are like 'hey let's get some of us together and go do this' and your like, 'screw that, I'm not doing that, that's cheesy, go play hide and seek at 16, that's cheesy', but you look back and you go, 'that was probably the better thing, I missed out on some childhood things' you know, even though I was that old, I missed out on going to that random football game I didn't go to cause I was too worried about getting a bag of weed and stuff like that."

The insulation of Two Rivers not only provided a sense of boredom for many of the residents of Two Rivers as they aged, but it also left many residents with a sense that they had a naïveté about the world. Indeed, when I asked Davey to describe himself when he was younger he said he was, "Really fucking naïve." This lack of experience beyond the cocoon

of Two Rivers, combined with the at times unsavory characters met for drug transactions in Prairie City, made Two Rivers and the boundless country roads surrounding it attractive places for young people naïve to street culture to develop a close association with drugs and drug using peers which lasted into adulthood.

Winterton City provided a decidedly different context than did that of Two Rivers. Winterton City is considerably larger with considerably more economic and demographic diversity. Participants from Winterton City largely came from a small area of downtown with limited housing, low quality entry level work, and lacked community support organizations. The neighborhoods participants came from were among the most physically dilapidated and crime ridden areas of the city. These areas shaped the people I talked to and many noted that growing up in such areas provided a context where they were exposed to drug use and its harms from an early age. Antonne, a Black meth and cannabis user from Winterton City, noted that despite growing up in a home that did not expose him to such behavior, the neighborhood he came of age in exposed him to numerous people who were using drugs.

“I wouldn’t necessarily say in my house but the neighborhood, like the kids, yeah, their families and stuff, their parents had did it, or whatever else, my friends in the neighborhood, definitely yeah. But my house no. I never even saw my mom take a drink.”

Antonne was far from the only participant to note repeated exposure to drugs and crime where he grew up. Chris, a Black former cannabis user-crack dealer, called on classic notions of environmental determinism to explain his future involvement with drugs, when he said:

C: Just the product of the environment, you just around it so much.

J: So, it was something around you all the time?

C: Yeah, so it becomes like the norm. You know like certain drugs or certain situations with certain stuff.

He went on to note the difficulties of being poor and struggling with drugs in Winterton City. To him Winterton City lacked support for those battling drug addiction where people could learn new habits and thought patterns that might help them desist and remain abstinent.

“They don’t really have no drug houses, they got a few but there’s supposed to be more. Winterton City got a real big drug issue. I don’t know if you know the studies on that but they got a lot of drug users. Not a lot of drugs here, but I’m saying a lot of people that’s on drugs and like it might be from prescription pills, from smoking weed or just doing cocaine or meth and they don’t have too many houses for that, like sober houses/halfway houses. Like say I’m on probation or whatever and I’m doing drugs, I gotta go back to jail instead of going to a spot that. They got rehab, but I mean like sober houses where people like me that’s been through it are talking to ‘em and walking with ‘em. They don’t have that here. Hopefully they do get it but it goes back to America kinda needs drug users, just to keep it going.”

Chris again noted the importance of environment when he said that despite a widely held perception that Winterton City had “a real big drug issue”, there was not appropriate social support services to deal with the issue. Chris also noted the revolving door of jail or prison that many participants from Winterton City experienced as a consequence of their drug involvement. Finally, Chris emblemized the distrust and disillusionment many in his community have of America as a civil society. In this context, once one has become meaningfully enamored with drugs they can be exceedingly hard to escape, driving people deeper into identification with, and persistence in, drug use.

One of the biggest differences between the two research sites were the types of drugs mentioned by participants as prevalent in their area. Specifically, Black participants in Winterton City regularly noted the pervasive and deleterious influence of crack-cocaine in their neighborhoods. Crack ravaged Black communities across the U.S. in the 1980’s. The highly addictive drug led to numerous people addicted to crack and significant levels of

violent crime associated with its use and trade. Dedra, a Black drug user from Winterton City, had recently desisted from drug use after nearly 20 years of crack use.

“I first became involved with drugs in the 1980’s, it was cocaine. It was back when they had, it was like powder form and you could mix it soda and it was in the seal, paper seal. This place, The Forbidden Fruit, a place where you could buy different types of pipes, you know pipe smoking was popular, pipe tobacco and whatever. And so that’s how I started. It was a very good form back then too, it was very pure and very addictive. Because back then when they had more, the powdered form where you could uh free base was a better type of free basing and more potent. There was part of the city that by word of mouth where to go to buy that, so but um that kept going on for a few years. Then the dealer got busted so you know that stopped that type of trade, like man I’ve been here long enough to know that ain’t been around since back then.”

Dedra notes in years prior the neighborhood availability of higher potency powdered cocaine that was suitable for freebasing was prevalent, particularly if one knew the right people and where to go. Drug users share an insular network, one that is shaped by the realities of neighborhood context. When this network is disrupted users can sometimes struggle to find replacement dealers in an underground economy, particularly if they have limited mobility. The powder cocaine that drew Dedra to its freebase use was eventually replaced by inferior quality, pre-cooked crack that was not suitable for freebasing and imparted a less intense high. However, at that point Dedra was addicted to crack and had to learn to adjust with changes in neighborhood availability of her drug of choice and ready availability of rock cocaine.

Physical context undoubtedly plays a role in the meaning brought to drug use and the way in which it is incorporated into a person’s identity. Skippy, a poly-drug user and former dealer who was raised in Two Rivers, had lived in various places around the country in his 20’s and provides an interesting comment on the influence of context. Changes in physical

context actually prompted changes in Skippy's perception of his motivation for use and by extension his identity in relation to his drug use.

“Well uh, that's a conflicted kind of thing, when I was living in California I was surrounded by people who used medical marijuana and so um that kind of became a form of medicine in my mind, and its, I guess I would consider myself a daily illegal drug user, considering marijuana is illegal federally and in this state. Um, and it I just have a problem calling it a drug, but it is.”

As he had spent a sustained period of time in a different locale he had come to view cannabis use differently, as a medicine. His own perceptions of cannabis use clash against how he believes others might perceive his cannabis use, namely the government. Yet, physical and in turn cultural context left a significant impact on how Skippy viewed his use and himself in relation to it. Later in our conversation Skippy suggested he was “addicted” to cannabis as after a couple days without smoking he craved it and had a harder time sleeping. Yet, if Skippy was in a local where his daily cannabis use was viewed as medicinal, he would have likely viewed his craving and trouble sleeping as a natural consequence of cessation from his medicine.

Family, Lovers, Peers

Family interactions and dynamics were regularly noted as important for creating a context where participants developed an interest in drug use. Some participants had family members that used openly and unabashedly and created an environment in which drug use was normalized. Others had parents who provided little social control, supervision or parenting even if they did not use themselves, and in that vacuum found their way to drug use. Some individuals had emotionally abusive or withdrawn relationships with parents in which an association with drugs, and those with whom they used, provided a sense of connection that they were lacking from early in their life. These types of social contexts were

more commonly noted among participants from Winterton City whose family lives were quite different from the generally stable, supportive environments that participants from Two Rivers grew up in. Take Claire for instance, a White mother from Winterton City, who started using drugs in college after becoming enamored with a Jim Morrison look alike. Claire starting using cannabis with “Guy 1” before trying various pharmaceuticals. Claire’s drug use became problematic at the point that she became pregnant and “Guy 1” began to engage in outside affairs. I asked her if anyone suggested she stop or provided her help at that critical point in her life and she related her response back to her relationship with her family.

“No one ever did. And this goes back to, I don’t have a relationship with my family or my mom is narcissistic, controlling which is why she protected but never emotionally engaged with me. So, she never had emotional conversations, so she never was the one who ever said, what are you doing? She knew it, she knew I got pregnant, so knew I got pregnant somehow, she knew about the drugs but she never had that conversation. It was just I was wearing shorts and she would say, ‘wow you’re dressed like a slut today’. It was that type of thing where, I would be there and she said, ‘I’m willing to pay for you to get breast implants so it would even you out.’ It was those things but she never said, don’t use drugs you know - why are you with this guy? Had somebody done that I think I would have been shocked because I was not used to that. And I didn’t have a relationship with my dad so no one was coming after me to lead me, parent me, stop me. I wanted them to but no one would. So that’s where I see it coming full circle with bonus child, I’m trying to everything I wanted to them to do for me, trying to be what I needed and they never did. So, I think I would have been very resistant because I have to give up Guy 1 and that’s all I have. But I don’t know because I would have gravitated towards it because I would have felt loved and I wouldn’t have needed it from other people.”

While Claire notes her relationships with men contributed to her use she believed she would have gravitated towards drugs in search of love and validation that she found with drugs in the process of romantic relationships. Claire’s drug use took place from her early 20’s to early 30’s yet she talked about her need to connect with and receive support from her family at that time as if she was much younger. Perhaps had Claire received the types of

validation she received from romantic partners and drugs from her parents she would not have involved herself with drugs. While Claire had abstained from drugs for many years by the time our conversation took place she was reliving the experience with a step-child (bonus child), who was struggling with drugs. She felt the child was lacking the same sort of guidance and support she had lacked as a youth and led to her eventual use of drugs.

Women were more apt than men to tie experiences of abuse and neglect to their future drug involvement. While a few men noted having uninvolved parents, women much more commonly noted chaotic family experiences that shaped why they began drug use, brought meaning to their use, and by extension how they incorporated it into their identity. Rose was a White, former dealer and current long-term drug addict from Winterton City whose drug of choice was heroin. Rose may have best emblemized the way early life experiences condition not just the choice to use drugs, but how one incorporates that choice into their identity.

“To put it in a nutshell, escape was my original introduction to drugs and stuff because my home life growing up was very volatile. By the time I was 16 I had been through 7 stepdads. I shot and killed one when I was 10. I never had a bad night’s sleep about it. You know, I just don’t. It’s nothing that hardly anybody knows about but I don’t worry about it. But because of, going to school was my escape, it was like dealing with, the only peace I ever had. But it got to the point that when I went to school that was like my time so I was like try to teach me something. My mind was always constantly worrying about dad and what happened last night and stuff. Cuz I mean my mom was never married to my dad, because he was married and she didn’t know it and so when she got pregnant with me he was like I already got a family so too bad, you know. And that was that. Well back in them days you did just give up kids like you do now so naturally she kept me and everything. Well I didn’t until later, really real late in life wonder what my mom grew up like as a result of her ability to raise me. So, because I grew up just watching the light just get beat out of my mom little by little just you know and it made me mad cuz I was like, don’t put up with it. My uncle and my mom were close and so he used to be a boxer and she would spar with him so she’s no slouch. But yet I never seen her hardly ever stick up for herself. And me being, you know a

firecracker like my grandpa, fuck with my mom and you got me too. So, none of them ever physically came after me until I got myself involved. Hit my mom and it's on. Several of them crossed the line in other areas, you know and it was, my mom was, bless her heart, the minute they crossed that line and came towards me, they were out the door. But when I got older I kinda felt that she kind of inadvertently resented me for it. Cuz, even though she did the right thing that cost her a husband. But I didn't realize that or know that's how I felt at the time, it's all just crazy to me. So, you think we'd be tight, or at least have a strong mother-daughter bond and we didn't. And I never really thought about it or worried about it at the time, but that's the way it was. So, you know, when I overheard, and this was kind of the straw that broke the camel's back, back then they used to have heat vents in the floor and ceiling and I used to eavesdrop laying on the floor in my room. Well, after I killed my stepdad my mom and grandma was talking and she was more or less freaked out because it didn't mess me up mentally or emotionally. Well, it didn't, you know I was just... At the time we lived in [another Midwest state] and uh, he had just a couple of days before approached me in a bad manner and I told my mom. Things were bad up to that point anyway and he worked nights so we had already made plans for one night when he went to work to get on a bus and go back where my grandma and grandpa was. So he goes to work and on his lunch hour he just knew something was wrong or whatever. Well he come back home and found we were gone. He beat us here (to grandparents) to town, we came on the Greyhound and he beat use here. He was crazy. We were at our, my grandma and grandpa's and he had my mom out a 3rd story window and just, I don't know, and I knew where my grandpa kept his gun and I shot him. Well, because that didn't mess me up she thought there had to be something wrong with me. My grandma said, 'what do you mean? she was protecting you. It's not like she just meant to do it or planned to do it.' But my mom she was like there, it was like she couldn't believe that I wasn't a mess over it so there had to be something wrong with me. And that really bothered me, so I was like so what's wrong with me, and that really messed me up. I was like, I was already so sad because me and my mom wasn't close and we had been through so much together. So that was kinda like... and I don't think it was even a month later when I smoked my first joint. Yeah, that messed me up more than anything.

Admittedly this is a long narrative but the data insights it reveals are substantial. It is important to note the context of our interview at this point. I met Rose at a public library and the quote above is in response to the *first question I asked*. Rose was ready to tell her story, and more particularly, she was ready to present a particular version of herself to me. Rose

was clearly a person life had given few breaks and she was beaten down physically and emotionally. Shortly into our conversation, Rose started crying. I asked if she needed a few minutes to compose herself and she insisted she was not truly upset. Yet Rose's voice would rise and fall with the arcs of her narratives displaying sadness and anger and a life hard lived. In fact, about midway through our interview Rose escaped the library study room to vomit as she was so emotionally worked up (and possibly fighting withdrawal symptoms). While the first line of her response points to the genesis of these emotions, by the third sentence she noted killing one of her step-fathers. Due to Rose's feelings of misunderstanding, loss and abandonment, drugs became both a way to cope with experiences of parental neglect and to affirm to herself and others as someone not to be trifled with. Lacking familial connections Rose bonded with whom she used and later dealt. These connections and reputation as resilient and tough were clearly important to her as she noted her participation in running crank with motorcycle gangs and that "you could walk into any biker bar in Winterton City and they would know who I am". Rose's identity was almost completely overtaken by her history of drug involvement and self-depiction as a tough and potentially dangerous person. Yet as an aging addict, many of her peers had died or been incarcerated and she was clearly lonely despite her expressions of independence. At the end of our interview she offered to meet again to speak because she "likes talking about this stuff".

Alternatively, some participants grew up in a context where drugs were present in the home and use was common among family members. Participants who grew up in this context often had longer more serious drug using careers than their peers who grew up in homes where drugs were less prevalent. For instance, Quincy, a Latinx former poly-drug user-dealer from Two Rivers, first exposure to drugs was around the age of ten when he accidentally

ingested cocaine powder off the tip of his finger, mistaking it for sugar, after his parents left it out on a plate in the kitchen. For such individuals, drug use became a normalized part of life at an early age, leading to an early initiation relative to their peers with more conventional home lives. For instance, Jamahl a Black cannabis user from Winterton City grew up in a family where cannabis use was normalized and said he first tried cannabis because he thought it was “cool”. When I asked him what he thought was cool about smoking cannabis he does not note pharmacological effects of the drug, but contextual influences that informed his perception of the drug.

“Just, I don’t know, rappers did and stuff like that. I could smell it. My family was doing it. Now there’s studies that it’s good for you.”

Jamahl notes both cultural and familial contextual influences that informed his participation in drug use and provided him narratives of acceptable and unacceptable use. Jamahl was one of the many drug users I talked to that noted they only smoked cannabis and drew boundaries between the use of cannabis and the use of other drugs, including alcohol, for various reasons. For Jamahl, these boundaries were in part formed by growing up in a milieu that normalized cannabis use but stigmatized other types of drugs and users that were prevalent in his community. Thus, the disjunction between acceptable and unacceptable forms of use were much more visceral for participants from Winterton City than for those from Two Rivers who were not exposed to drug use and dealing in their neighborhood streets. Ultimately, these familial contexts and boundaries informed how participants identified with drug use and their level of use.

There exists research on the effect of romantic partners on introducing people to drugs (Mieczkowski 1994; Holloway and Bennet 2007). While I did find women who noted they first tried drugs at the behest of a romantic partner it was not more common than for

men. Importantly, it seemed the intersection of love, personal tragedy and drugs bound people particularly close to drugs as the relationship was largely built on shared use. This was the case for Antonne, a former cannabis and meth user from Winterton City who stopped using three days before our interview. He used cannabis recreationally in his youth before falling on hard-times shortly after dropping out of school.

“It started out over the summer, hanging out with a friend. I started hanging out more as I got older with them. Basically, I became homeless for a while. I was living in a shelter, basically on my own, but with other people who were in the hard drugs. And I didn’t really do it for the first couple months. Then I got separated from my wife, why I moved into that place, whatever. And, I met some other chick there and she was on the drug and I stayed away from her for a while, I was with her for about a year and then after that year I had to tried it. Ever since then, it wasn’t like I didn’t want to get off the drug, it’s just a hard thing to do.”

Antonne was presented with a situation after his living circumstances degraded and his wife left, a situation that was conducive to drug use. He lived in a shelter around people “who were in the hard drugs”. While he kept himself from such “hard drug” use for a time he eventually became enamored with a young lady he met while at the shelter. After a time, Antonne’s resolve broke and he embarked on a winding road of meth addiction. These sorts of influences, specifically the connection of drug use with valued peer associations, motivated continued drug use among participants. Antonne noted, in such a context getting clean is especially hard.

While family and romantic partners provided important contextual influences, friends were noted by almost all participants as among the most important contextual influences informing their motivations and decisions regarding drugs. Peers provided the social context in which people lived, worked and played. For many participants, the social context that peers provided in adolescence were important for their interest and identification with drug

use. Participants were often introduced to drugs for the first time through friends. Often in an intimate setting, friends would make initiates comfortable and teach them to enjoy the experience (Becker 1953). The association with drug usage to valued peer associates seemed to be a particularly powerful force in shaping participant's motivations and identity in relation to drugs.

Cullen was a White, working class drug user from Two Rivers who grew up playing sports and working summer jobs. I asked Cullen about the area where he grew up and how he thought it might have influenced his interest in drugs he responded this way,

C: One simple way to put it would be peers. That's a huge thing right there.

J: What about the peers?

C: Well I guess like when mom and dad stop having that influence just generally on kids, you're young, you get into school, you start getting into cliques, you want to be cool you want to fit in with. One of my friends, he started to smoke weed and I just looked over and he offered it to me and I just started smoking it and next thing you know we're smoking together and then it turns into an everyday thing.

Cullen later went on to try increasingly harder drugs with his friends from cocaine, to pharmaceuticals, to DMT, and has credited his drug using experiences with forming many of his personal and professional and academic interests. At the time of our conversation he was returning to school to study physics. Cullen had overwhelming positive perceptions of his use and thought his life had been improved by his experiences with drugs. This was despite fights he had with his wife on the subject and the expenditure of little remaining money on drugs rather than material goods for his family. Cullen had also seen one of his friends who sold drugs experience significant legal troubles including stints in jail. All of these things paled in comparison to the positive experiences he had on drugs and with like-minded peers. For Cullen, his peer associations, his experiences on drugs, and his identity are all tightly linked.

In our conversation, Cullen noted he had few friends he did not use with, and of those friendships that he maintained most were friends from prior days with whom he did drugs. While such friendships initially promoted an increased personal identification with drugs that was desired, it eventually had the effect of isolating him from other non-using peers, pushing him further into an association with drugs and drug using peers and encouraging his persistence.

It was in the context of such peer groupings that participants learned what they liked about drugs, what they drew from the use of drugs beyond just “fitting in”. Ella was a White, middle class drug user from Two Rivers who began using cannabis on a daily basis as a teenager and eventually used various drugs from pharmaceuticals, to psychedelics, to cocaine. Ella explicitly linked her initial participation in drugs with valued and trusted peer associations and with her realization that she is more calm and relaxed while under the influence of drugs, namely cannabis.

J: I was gonna ask, what do you think ultimately got you into it?

E: Yeah, just people I was close with, people I hung out with. There was a couple of us that did it, and I did it, and I liked it. I was calm, it made me feel not so amped up, and like hyper, kind of like I was at a normal level.

J: So, you think it leveled you out in a certain sense?

E: Yeah, like it just made me more calm. I’m really good at like, just speaking way before I think and then it makes me think about stuff before I run my mouth and offend someone, or say something really stupid, and ya know I feel like I go, go, go all the time, and it was just like a nice even balance. It makes me a lot calmer than normal, yeah that’s really it I just feel better, like ‘ok I’m relaxed’. And apparently I’m not naturally a very relaxed person so I think it helps.

Here Ella noted the importance of her peer relations exposing her to drugs for the first time and the effects she felt from it. In that context, she learned to view her use as something fun and relaxing, even something that made her feel more “normal”. Thus, the context she was in

provided a scheme of perception from which to understand her experience as something enjoyable and worth participating in again.

The influence of peer context was not only important to those in Two Rivers, but also those in Winterton City and I found very little difference in frequency with which peers were noted as an important influence by participants regardless of race/ethnicity, class, gender or residential location. Participants from Winterton City were just as apt to suggest their drug use developed as a byproduct of peer associations. Aylon for instance, a Pacific Islander and former cocaine user-dealer from Winterton City who was in an out-patient program at the time of our conversation said:

“It evolved just by the people I hung out with, they used the chemicals and drank beer, smoked weed. Some of my friends grew up in like a higher class than me, they always had money to spend on the chemicals like that they wanted.”

Aylon’s story is quite similar to that of Antonne’s noted above. His troubles with meth did not begin until he was re-introduced to it after completely desisting from drugs after high school. Indeed, as Aylon alludes to, some of his drug use was a product of its presence and his desire to fit in with valued peers. Thus, peers exert a powerful social and material influence on the context surrounding drug use.

Perhaps the most notable difference between participants of Two Rivers and that of Winterton City is that the latter had more negative impressions of their use than did the former. Those from Winterton City perceived their drug use as a barrier to their success professionally and socially, even if they had not experienced significant legal trouble as a consequence of drug involvement. Antonne noted this perception which was common amongst his peers in Winterton City. Antonne kept referring to his friends and when I asked if they contributed to his use or if he used because he wanted to “fit in” he replied,

“Absolutely, because if you weren’t doing it then you were concentrating on school. If you weren’t doing the right thing then you were partying or hanging out with the people you were hanging out with.”

It is worth noting that instead of focusing on how his peers encouraged a good time and how he reveled in his debauchery, the tone is far more self-critical. Perhaps had Antonne not experienced a high level of negative consequence from his meth use, he would consider the influence more positively. Among the largely White, working and middle class participants of Two Rivers only a couple had experienced negative consequences from their use. As a result, those from the less privileged place were forced to pull from cultural narratives of drug use that did not include narrative resources construing drug use as harmless, fun and innocuous. Jay from Two Rivers, had his own bouts of addiction with meth but still suggested his identification with drugs was largely positive.

Cultural Context

Culture provides broad narratives people can pull from to construct a sense of identity (Holstein and Gubrium 2000). Cultural narratives provide a template for how to think and act, they contextualize the thoughts and beliefs of individuals, giving their experiences a coherent framework around which to organize and motivate future behaviors. Many participants mentioned various media influences which they considered formative for their interest in drugs. From movies to music, to the internet, various components of the social context in which they were embedded informed both their decisions to become involved with drugs and their identification with the activity. When I asked Bradford, a White, working class, former user-dealer who had previously mentioned in our interview a “Tony Montana style pile of cocaine”, if media like movies and music had shaped his perception of drugs, he

answered in the affirmative while tying in his upbringing in a diverse, economically depressed neighborhood.

“Tupac... there’s a lot of people that were popular at that time, but there was a lot of local stuff that the gangs listened to, like blood (gang) music that was really heavy in the late 90’s early 2000’s that if you weren’t listening to Biggie or Tupac, you were listening to the music that is with your people.”

Bradford’s interest in drugs developed through cultural transmission and was a product of growing up surrounded by drug use. Cultural influences such as rap music and artists like Tupac provide culturally valued templates for people, even White individuals like Bradford to model. The influence of music was important for participants regardless of race/ethnicity, class or residential location. However, it was often rap music that participants mentioned rather than rock or country as promoting their curiosity in drugs. Some noted references to drugs were common in rap music generally, while others mentioned specific artists, like Bradford’s reference to Tupac, or Jamahl who said, “Just listening to Lil Man. Not like he was influencing me to do it but in every song he says something about weed.” Despite Jamahl’s assertion that he was not influenced directly into trying drugs by listening to rappers like Lil Man, he was provided with culturally salient justifications, motivations, and meanings that he could ascribe to himself and his use. Notably, women did not reference music as something that exposed them to and helped cultivate an interest in drugs. Perhaps because much of music, particularly rap music, is hypermasculine in nature, the content of such music is more relatable and thus more influential for males.

Movies were also commonly mentioned, from films such as *Dazed and Confused* to *Pineapple Express*, to *Scarface*. All of these films provided participants visual, verbal, and behavioral cues they could reproduce in their own actions. The various pieces of media that

influenced any one person varied, but all provided an interactional model that was culturally approved of, as evidenced by its popularity in media. When I asked Adrian a Black drug user from Winterton City what stirred his initial interest in drugs he suggested, “Actually, videos, you know like I watched a lot of Cheech and Chong movies.” The Cheech and Chong franchise from the 1970s and 1980s is known for its slapstick humor and significant amounts of cannabis usage, stance against the drug war, and countercultural drug references. The protagonists are likeable, if idiotic, “stoners” who get themselves into high jinx. It is notable, that while Bradford calls on media such as *Scarface* and gangster rap to contextualize his drug involvement, Adrian’s drug use is contextualized by decidedly more lighthearted depictions of drug involvement.

I argue these different cultural narratives provided each with different ways of bringing meaning to their experiences as drug users. Culturally available understandings about the intersections of art and drugs were salient for many participants who noted some of their favorite musicians, comedians, or movie stars were known for their drug use. Participants whose drug use was informed by these types of influence often tried to emulate what they saw or heard. Davey suggested his perception of drugs were, in part, influenced by his knowledge that drugs influenced “amazing music and movies and art” and some of his use is motivated to reproduce such experiences and products therefrom.

“It definitely seemed like all these things weren’t that bad if all these people were doing them and making this amazing music and movies and art. So, it’s kinda like ‘huh well how can something so horrible make things so beautiful’ so I don’t know. It was one of those things where like, that’d be cool if sometimes I’m able to, if it’s just from smoking weed or doing some kind of other drug, and it’s just doodling on a notepad and makings something really cool or like ‘holy shit this like art, goddam’. I don’t know.”

For Davey, drug use was something that could enhance one's life and make one more creative and productive. Later in our conversation he noted psychedelic drug experiences that were formative to his views of the world and himself. He had successfully incorporated a positively tinged meaning of drug use into his identity, one that encouraged his use. He was not the only one, and some participants noted media they consumed at early ages as important contextual influences that facilitated their curiosity in drugs and provided for them narratives of drug use they could use to bring meaning to their choices as they aged. Jay humorously notes how television and movies he watched as a child "planted the seed" of drug use in his mind.

"Well Garfield the cat was always looked like he was a pretty chill cat (laughs) he was a pothead. He was absolutely a pothead (laughs), I think uh well we watched shows like Scooby Doo, Shaggy was definitely a pothead (laughs), but it wasn't said, but he had a VW van and he talked to a dog, so... (laughs). Alice in Wonderland, I mean come on."

Thus, Jay's drug use was informed by socially available narratives from which to understand his own future use: as a "chill" relaxing activity and a mechanism for producing encapsulating experiences.

Many of the participants aged into drug use at time when the internet was becoming a resource where one could find information about anything and everything. From YouTube, to social media, to websites and forums, the internet provided a digital context for participants to be presented with narratives to bring meaning to their use, learn about drugs from like-minded peers, and motivate their own use in hopes of having similar experiences. Jay was a White poly-substance user from Two Rivers who at the time of our conversation was clean after recent stint on methamphetamines, but who noted "I'll probably use again", and who

highlighted the importance of the internet as a non-physical context that fostered drug use and identification.

“Well getting older there was website that we could look up people’s stories, their trip reports, Erowid.com, and uh use that quite frequently and use that quite frequently and reading stories of random people on the internet explain a sort of backstory so you could confirm that they are equipped to explain everything they explained about seeing donkies fly out the window or something (laughs). They, it’s kind of that anxious tingle you get in your stomach reading it, and you’ve got that sitting next to you, but you don’t wanna try it wildly... you wanna assess your tolerance, you want to look at what’s gonna put you over the threshold, but you didn’t want to take too much either. You’re reading somebody else’s story about what’s gonna happen to you it adds to the anticipation of doing it. That definitely helps, cause then you can get your own stories and tell them to other people and continue the degenerative cycle (laughs)”

Jay provided a particularly insightful quote here when he first discussed the importance of the internet and its presentation of stories or “narratives” of drug use. These narratives of use, provided by a digital landscape of like-minded peers, created a context that encouraged and affirmed drug use. Jay noted how reading such “trip reports” as they are known, actually added to the thrill of the experience. He concluded by noting that after exposure to positive narratives of extreme drug induced experiences, such as “donkeys fly[ing] out of windows” one is emboldened to try the drug for themselves, spread their story to others, and “continue the degenerative cycle”.

Drug Use and Motivation

The motivations people expressed for their use were complexly related to the context they grew up in, and motivations for initial drug use were a hodgepodge of well-worn staples including, curiosity, rebellion, hedonism, coping, and a desire to fit-in with valued peers. These early motivations did not seem to be saliently defined by race/ethnicity, class status, gender or the residential location of those in my sample. However, as participants became more entrenched in drug use and the culture associated with it, their motivations evolved

over time. These motivations were more salient depending on residential location. People of color were more apt to note their initial motivations evolved into addiction, or a motivation to “get their fix”. Two River participants on the other hand were more apt to learn to conceive of their drug use as something that was advantageous for them. They eventually became motivated to use, in part, because of the role they perceived it had in helping shape their interests and understanding of themselves. These motivations were integral for understanding why participants initially began and persisted in use. These motivations are also of central importance for how participants incorporated their drug involvement into their narrative identity. While most could articulate various motivations for their use, some struggled to understand how their lives had brought them to the point of our interview. Connor grew up in a working class family and was seemingly on a path to success before developing an addiction to heroin. Connor had trouble understanding why his own use became so extreme compared to that of his siblings and peers,

“Honestly it’s something I’ve kind of battled with for many, many years. Why do I take it to the extreme? My family attributes it to when I was 23 years old, I was in a really bad car accident and I suffered a pretty bad head injury. I shattered this side of my face and it was around that time or after that time where things really started to cascade down for me where I couldn’t come back, you know, when I started taking my drinking to the extreme or my drug usage to the extreme and not caring about any consequences and things like that. And my father always attributed that accident to it. To this day I don’t really know. Um, you know, I know how I felt before, I liked to get high, I liked to use drugs, even before that. But, yeah, I suppose after, I whacked my frontal cortex pretty good and that’s where the decision making ...”

Curiosity

Curiosity was a commonly noted motivations to initiate drug usage, regardless of demographics. It could be the reason curiosity is such a common motivation for drug users is

that multiple contextual influences encouraged curiosity. Indeed, many participants when queried about why they first began using drugs replied shortly and matter-of-factly “curiosity”, or Adrian who said he “just wanted to see”, as if the desire to use drugs should be apparent, natural and normal. Indeed, for some participants, the environment they grew up in prior to their drug use led to a natural curiosity with drugs.

While for some what motivated their interest in drugs couldn’t be clearly articulated, for others, specific moments and experiences shaped their perceptions and peaked their interest in drugs. When asked if he had ever had a different view of drugs before he tried them Antonne said,

“That’s weird, I do remember being young and you’re like, “I’m never going to do drugs, that’s nasty, you know”. And then, I guess a formative experience would be that it happened to me, I make my own decisions, but being younger being curious starting out with weed, my two buddies I was hanging out with, cuz you know at the time we didn’t do any drugs, when your little you just have fun just fun, you know just kids or whatever. My two neighbor friends went over to a family member’s house and smoked. They told me they had fun, they were laughing and whatever else, so I wanted to try it and stuff like that so that formed like the wanting to do it in my head but it was still years later before I actually had experience with it.”

Several participants noted a distaste or disdain towards drugs when they were children that had evaporated by point of the drug use. Early motivations may not manifest themselves immediately but lay dormant until the right contextual conditions emerge. Antonne was a casual drug user with peers in his late teens before getting clean for several years in his early adulthood. His troubles with drugs began as a part of a romance with a favored young woman who particularly enjoyed meth. Perhaps, had he not been exposed to perceptions favorable to drug use as a youth, his opposition to drugs would have been more resolute, both as a hedonistic teenager and later as a love-struck adult. In statistical analysis, peers have

been shown to be of significant importance for predicting drug use (Svensson 2003; Bohnert, Bradshaw and Latkin 2009), but such research lacks the ability to define the nuanced ways in which that relationship may manifest. For instance, Gary, a scientifically minded ex-poly drug user explained a large part of his interest, particularly in “harder” drugs came from his scientific mindset and interactions with drug using peers.

“I tried to kind of do it intelligently. I was the one getting phone calls from people hey we just duta duta duta (gibberish meant to represent speech), and this much and I’m like, ‘ok let me get on Erowid.com real quick, let me find out what you did to yourself’ (laughs). So, I’ll be honest I’ve done psychedelics. I don’t think that was influenced by anything other than curiosity at that point.”

For Gary, his identity as someone of intelligence fused with his pseudo-research obligations to assist his already intoxicated friends helped cultivate his curiosity to try drugs like mushrooms and LSD. Moreover, the association with drugs, peers and responsibilities increased the degree to which Gary incorporated the dispositions and values associated with drug use into his identity.

Rebellion

Some participants felt their drug use was a product of feeling rebellious and anti-authoritarian. This motivation was almost exclusively expressed among participants from Two Rivers. Their generally stable home lives growing up, lack of local culture, and proximity to a large city left them with few avenues for proving their masculinity, bravery, or unruliness. Participants who called on rebellion as an important motivation often had strict or controlling parents and grew up involved in various activities from sports to church and viewed their drug use as an attempt to break out of such patterns and establish a new purposeful identity. For instance, Eduardo, a working class Latinx male from Two Rivers, grew up with particularly controlling parents who monitored their children’s school, peer

associations, and even searched their bedrooms. In this context, people like Eduardo desired independence and space. His involvement with drugs, largely cannabis and pharmaceuticals, did not start until the end of high school and was ongoing at the time we spoke.

“My parents they just never, you know, they always made that stuff super bad. They were very strict parents so we grew up as in, like we kind of feared our parents, you always respected. But we wanted nothing but to not piss them off and stuff so as far as that, drugs were just looked at like any other crime. So we were around it growing up, cause like I grew up in the trailer parks and we moved all over, but growing up like that, I didn’t really feel like you subjected yourself to it as much as if your parents are actually doing it and you actually put eyes on it. I never seen it, or knew anything, I mean smoking cigarettes here and there, but, my parents didn’t do... like they didn’t drink, they didn’t do nothing. They just went to church and stuff. No in terms of that stuff, my biggest wasn’t till high school really, when I met my peers directly... Cause they, they’re from Mexico so they’ve seen the drug world, and how it looks so they see family members that are getting killed and whatnot that are like mafia type people. Not big into the cartels, but they do drug stuff, like I have uncles that would always run around with guns, little you don’t think nothing of it, now looking back it’s like, ‘why did they have a gun on them on the time,’ in Prairie City no less. So that’s when it’s like stuff adds up, but that was their main concern, but I think with them it was mainly, they just combine all the drugs together, like coke, cause that was, that was like the main Mexican thing and I mean don’t get me wrong, that’s a whole ‘nother ballgame than when it comes to weed type of people and lifestyle. So they just combine like most people do, like a drug’s a drug, so they just combine it and they all it’s all looked at as the same. But ya know, no-one’s getting hurt, obviously the aspect of you could go to jail and shit is part of it, but I feel like that’s the rush when you’re young, like ‘oh I got to try and get away, my parents have been so strict my whole life’ it’s like that little bit of rebellious in your life, cause you got the kids that their parents don’t really tell them what to do.”

While Eduardo’s parents had been exposed to extremely harsh realities associated with drug use and trade, Eduardo’s own experience was decidedly more mundane. Living in Two Rivers, he was not exposed to neighborhood violence and crime associated with drugs. His experience as a working class male from Two Rivers insulated him from this and combined

with what he perceived to be unreasonable strictness and confinement Eduardo was motivated to rebel. Due to his peer context and desire for rebellion, drugs became an advantageous way to push back against authority while having a good time with peers.

Indeed, this expression of rebellious motivation existed prior to their drug use and their drug use actually gave shape and meaning to their identity as a troublemaker. Take Markus, a White user from Two Rivers, who was a daily cannabis smoker, but also used various psychedelics and whose initial interest in drugs came from youthful angst directed towards his strict military father,

M: He was very military like, because he served 20 years in the military. So he obviously hasn't experimented with drugs, cause I've asked him about it and he said no . . . whether that's a lie or not, I don't know that part (laughs), but he tried to push that on me, which drove me the opposite way. He was a 'no, no, no' and I was a 'you tell me no, I'm gonna go try that'.

J: How would you describe yourself when you were younger, did you kind of push back at authority?

M: Early on in childhood I was modeling what they were doing. Very gullible to what they were saying and telling me. But as I developed into my teen years, that's when I really started to become my own person, and when I started to become rebellious with their rules, with their guidelines, cause I didn't want to be confined to that.

Yet as Markus aged his rebellion and angst turned more general and he felt as if he was acting as a living foil to the negative depictions of users that circulate in much of conventional society. After being involved with drugs for several years, his identification with drug use became such that he felt he represented drug users generally, and in a positive light. Later in our conversation when talking about his motivations for drug use Markus noted,

"Part of me wants to go back to I had been told wrong my entire life and now I wanted to see what it was *actually* about, and understand it by using it and having that experience and saying,

‘hey I know that’s false cause I’ve tried it’. (emphasis by participant)

For Markus, his rebelliousness and his drug use were markers of independence, of experiential knowledge hard-won. This rebelliousness and the independence portrayed by drug use encouraged the incorporation of such dispositional qualities into his identity and encouraged his persistence in use.

Some considered their rebelliousness along the lines of trouble making and viewed themselves as “troublemakers” or “ornery”. These self-perceptions can be considered motivational. Indeed, Ella noted that while she grew up in a context that was socially “boring”, that subjective interpretations of self were important for why she was drawn to drugs.

J: So it was more of a boredom type thing, just nothing better to do?

E: Um maybe, but there were kids in the same town who didn’t do it so...

J: Right, and that’s actually what I’m interested in trying to figure out.

Why do people who come from the same place, and have similar experiences, like boredom, why do some end up using drugs and others don’t?

E: Yeah, I feel like I was always a little bit of a trouble maker though, not really a trouble maker, but...

J: like from an early age?

E: not early, but maybe middle school I was kind of ornery and definitely in high school...

J: In what way? Did you push back against authority?

E: um no, cause I always really respected my teachers and parents, stuff like that, so not really like that, but I don’t know, I think I just thought I was really cool (laughs). I thought I was really cool (J: like you didn’t have to listen cause you were cool), yeah like ‘I’m cool, whatever’. And in high school, I think all I cared about was my friends, ya know, that’s all I cared about, hanging out. My parents never saw me cause I was never there, I was a social butterfly, I just wanted to be everywhere with everybody.

Thus, while some participants were rebellious their rebellion was actively antagonistic while others, like Ella, engaged in similar behaviors, but considered their rebellion far more

quaintly. Ella noted she did not feel the need to push back against authority, but felt like she was above the rules and was largely focused on having a good time with friends which drugs facilitated.

Very few of the participants from Winterton City noted rebellion as a motivating factor for their use. Of the few that did, it could be argued their use was a coping mechanism to deal with harsh parenting practices and that rebellion was a preferable way to construct one's identity than as someone who was emotionally broken, economically destitute, and scraping to get by on the streets. Janice, a Black former poly-drug user from Winterton City, noted how very controlling family conditions and severe punishments led to her "being rebellious", leaving home, and ultimately become entangled in a lifestyle where drug use was a major part.

"Leaving home was probably I think being rebellious with all the strict discipline and punishments and stuff like that, and the drug usage was basically a way for me living on the streets, and different environments and people that I had to be around."

Janice was very reticent to talk in detail about her drug using past, instead focusing on how she had cleaned herself up and how she had focused on her responsibilities as a mother, forcing her to give up her involvement with drugs. It seems that as her "rebellion" was motivated out of different contextual circumstances than was the rebellion of people like Eduardo, Markus, or Ella. It did not provide the same positively tinged meaning to incorporate into her identity and help motivate her ongoing use. Motivations of rebellion were closely linked with motivations for extreme entertainment best characterized as hedonism.

Hedonism

For many drug users, their initial interest in drugs was driven by the pursuit of a good time. Such a yearning for the “high life” (Collison 1996), and a desire for a party lifestyle (Shover 1996), seems common among deviants regardless of the type of crime. This was true among some of those I interviewed as well. Participants were exposed to drugs in a way that highlighted the enthralling, enjoyable aspects of drug consumption. Either through cultural diffusion, exposure in communities or among peers, drug users enjoy drug use for the ecstatic experience both pharmacologically and socially. Consider this passage from Davey,

“I personally felt like I had more fun when I was doing something beyond drinking, it seems like there was more possibility for shit to get crazy and I don’t know, it was nice, there when it seemed like a lot of people were doing stuff, you’d role up on some people you thought were just smoking a joint, but it actually had a little coke in it and it was like ‘oh what’s this?’, or you ran into some people doing ecstasy and they’d be like ‘hey man we got some extra pills, you wanna get in on this?’ and you’d be like ‘oh well don’t mind if I do’, and I don’t think that’s gonna happen at straight parties, they’ll be drinking a Coors Light going ‘oh, I would like another beer, please’, and it seemed like when you’re drinking too, just drinking and getting drunk that’s different than getting like real fuckin’ twisted and it seemed like that brought more diverse people that you’d never think you’d party with and it’s like ‘this motherfucker is pretty cool!’ then all of a sudden you bump into some people and you’re talking mad shit with this person you’ve never met before and you’re just like ‘this motherfucker gets it!’, so it’s like cool cool, so I don’t know. I prefer the parties where drugs are flowing.”

Davey was certainly not shy about expressing his enjoyment of the physical and psychological effects of drug use, but he was also swept up in the barely-bridled energy associated with more extreme forms of drug use that sometimes allowed “shit to get crazy”. Perhaps more interestingly, the increased excitement associated with the anticipation of the effects of a night of drugs and partying was at least partly related to the social dynamics and

lifestyle inherent in such parties. By using drugs, particularly harder forms of drugs, Davey and others like him are able to cultivate a group of like-minded peers and distance themselves from “straight” people living boring lives. Even those who have been coached to avoid the lure of intoxication can be swayed but what seems to be a fast-paced, exciting and pharmacologically gratifying lifestyle.

Davey was not the only one to mention the specific pharmacological effects of drugs, particularly mixing drugs, and how that was important to their sense of fun and circumstantial satisfaction. For those regularly taking drugs, particularly smoking cannabis on a daily basis, to set oneself apart as a serious member of the counter culture and not someone on the periphery, participants focused on their engagement with sub-culturally salient symbolic capital, namely drug consumption and partying. I asked participants to describe a particularly happy memory from their time involved with drugs. Those with hedonistic motivations often recalled parties, moments of extreme intoxication, or vague memories of wild nights. Take Bradford for instance, a former user-dealer from Two Rivers who describes his drug preferences and one particularly memorable experience,

“(laughs), probably lacing an ecstasy pill with acid, or LSD, and instead of being on one, you were on both, but they kind both made each other content with each other, like if you were ever paranoid one or the other they kind of smoothed each other out. I was at like this like massive rave and there’s all the people there and all the people there were just messed up and I mean glowsticks, light shows, DJ and everything and that was a lot of fun.”

While women did not often express explicitly hedonistic motivations in the same manner as men where they reveled in their debauchery, they still noted a preference for a party or to get high over conventional activities. Like Stella, a current cannabis user, who suggested her use was, “Just for fun. Like let’s get out of here and go get a smoothie and

drive around and smoke some weed.” This is a rather playful interpretation of a car filled with high school, and later college aged, individuals leaving school to drive around while smoking cannabis. Stella enjoyed a party lifestyle through high school and into college before getting a job back in Two Rivers and becoming a successful business woman. She was not the only one for whom this was the case. Ella discussed her indifference to conventional after school “extra-curricular activities” and her motivation to get high with friends and find the party when she was younger.

“uh yeah, maybe cause in high school I smoked pot and drank and people that didn’t, not everyone, but for the most part people that didn’t were more involved in sports and ya know extra-curricular activities and I wasn’t really. I just wanted to hang out with my friends and get high, go to a party.”

This quote came from a question I asked if she viewed she was different than people who didn’t use drugs. Note she specified a particular time in “high school” where drugs had special attractions. As Ella aged, her drugs and alcohol usage scaled back considerably to exclusively daily or near daily cannabis use. Being from Two Rivers, Ella was surrounded by a social context in which most of her peers were attending college and she received emotional support from friends and family, despite the troubles she experienced as a consequence of her use. This social capital, and the social expectations surrounding after college plans, led Stella and those like her to significantly curtail their drug use by her mid-twenties and be on track for successful professional lives.

This was true even among individuals with significant associations with drugs in Two Rivers. Their hedonistic, party oriented motivations did not lead to their ruin. Take Bradford, who was one of the few participants who initially started selling drugs before finally using them himself after realizing some success dealing.

“People tell you not to do it, just to make money off it, but not to do it at first I stuck to that. But eventually it got to the point where I was making money and still had some left over so it was like why not party with it. So, the people who were hanging around me later got to partake in some extracurricular activity drug use (laughs), at discounted prices (laughs).”

So, while some move into selling to maintain a lifestyle that includes a drug habit, others like Bradford become interested in drugs only after they have learned to associate them with good times, particularly good times with friends. This desire to keep the party going, his ability to facilitate that, and his learned enjoyment of a myriad of different drugs that he sold, did not lead to his ultimate downfall. While his hedonism certainly put him behind at the time of our conversation, Bradford had stable employment as a waiter at a fine-dining establishment in Prairie City and operated a small business on the side. I found while hedonistic motivations of drug use were expressed by participants across race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location, the consequences of such hedonism were quite different for those from Winterton City.

Those from Winterton City who were motivated by hedonism to partake in drug-related fun, considered their experiences as drug users to be encapsulating and kept them interested, engaged, and feeling alive. These encapsulating experiences were a product of the pharmacological effects of the drug intersecting with the chaos of street life. Consider this exchange with Aylon, whose preferred drug was cocaine even though he associates his addiction problems with methamphetamine.

J: What was it about cocaine that did it for you?

A: It numbs your brain and it speeds you up. It speeds you up, it lights up space in your head that you just can't compare to. I'm a big caffeine junky so it's just that stimulant type thing but supercharged.

J: What do you think you enjoyed most about the drugs?

A: Being suspenseful, semi-suspenseful.

J: How was it suspenseful for you?

A: There was always something new going on. People or trying to avoid getting in trouble, there was just always something going on. Yeah. It was suspenseful.

Aylon touched on both the pharmacological effects of drugs and the suspense associated with drug use and associated with drug using peers. Aylon also participated in drug trade as a “courier”, driving a dealer around with large amounts of methamphetamine to make sales. In this context Aylon’s desire to experience a more colorful existence puts him in much greater danger than those from Two Rivers, who are protected by various forms of social privilege. While these sorts of sentiments were echoed by those from Two Rivers, Aylon did not exist in a social or physical space that allowed for many mistakes. Due to this context, the meaning of Aylon’s hedonism takes on a different tone, one that did not have the playfulness or carefreeness of those from Two Rivers. Rather, Aylon’s hedonism was motivated out of his feelings that he was most loved by family members or romantic partners, and felt closest to people when he was “being crazy”. The effect was serious deleterious consequences socially and legally for Aylon and people like him.

The attention and sociality, a part of the party lifestyle associated with drug use, were mentioned by several participants. They enjoyed the whole of the lifestyle: using, partying and being known as someone who partied. Dedra described her favorite aspect of the party lifestyle, “What I liked about it was the attention and dressin’ up and uh you know trying to see what I was missing out on.” It was important for those who used drugs to feel as if they were living fast-paced exciting lifestyles, and that they were not “missing out” on fantastic experiences.

These drug induced party experiences were often coupled with, and emerged out of, romantic or peer contexts favorable to use. It was particularly important for participants to

experience their hedonism with other people. Their drug use is motivated by having a good time, specifically with valued company. Dom noted this, along with his motivation to have a good time with the opposite sex.

“With me my experience with drugs, I was just doing it just to have fun with people. Just for the party. You like to do this kind of drug, this is the drug I like to do. When I have girl she like this kind of drug and I’m like ok let me try it and see if I like it. You know I did that just for something, just for a little excitement.”

Dom provided an example of how peers and romantic partners may provide the context in which hedonism takes place, but internal motivation for “a little excitement” is often required for hedonistic motivations and meaning to be brought to one’s use.

Encapsulating experiences were meaningful to participants beyond just the experience of intoxication and fun. They imparted lasting memories of what “fun” should look like and with what sorts of people it should be sought. Participants often talked about trying to recreate such moments, or how they would look back on such hedonism fondly. Many acknowledged these happy memories were often just products of intoxication, but that did little to minimize the positive meaning associated with them. Jamahl related to me a particularly fond memory he had of a night of extended partying and excessive intoxication.

“We smoked 2 zips (ounces of cannabis) on my brother’s birthday and we had champagne man, and it was just like he was moving out of his mom’s crib and everybody called it, the whole gang called (inaudible), it was cool. That was a big night. But now we all grew up and don’t see each other much and shit but we all remember that one night.”

Jamahl had lost several friends and family members to drugs and violent crime. For him and his remaining friends, their hedonism marked some of the few positive moments they had between experiences of poverty, discrimination, and victimization. Thus, hedonism can be a particularly strong motivation for drug use, particularly when one incorporates a positive

perception of their use into their identity. Indeed, these hedonistic motivations set the stage for the identities that participants would construct around their involvement with drugs.

Coping

While it was more common for participants from Winterton City to call on motivations of “coping” to explain their drug use, such justification was not uncommon among those from Two Rivers. Most suggested they used drugs to cope with negative experiences in childhood, feeling of self-doubt, and relatedly feelings of anxiety. Participants from Two Rivers were also apt to mention coping with the stress of work as a motivating influence for their use.

Certainly, the most common thing participants used drugs to cope with was a lack of self-esteem. Some participants noted that their drug use happened in a social context where their peers were also struggling with self-identity and drug use provided them a resource they could use to build a rewarding sense of identity or “ego”. Gary from Two Rivers, mentioned that some part of his use was motivated by his lack of self-esteem and anxiety, and using drugs made him “more comfortable in his own skin”.

“Yeah anxiety has been a huge, huge, huge issue. No self-esteem going through your teenage years. I think it was all just self-medication honestly. Kind of we could, you know we were all a little more comfortable in our skin to the point that when it wasn’t around (drugs), we would quickly fall into a clash of the ego’s, or the lack of egos.” (laughs)

At the time his drug use provided him a rewarding sense of identity and peer connections. Now several years after desisting from use and sales, Gary is married with children and works in technology. His identity which was formerly wrapped up in drugs, and being the person his friends came to when they took a drug without proper prior research, was entirely wrapped up in being a father and husband at the time of our conversation. Thus, he looked

back on his motivations, and his identity or “ego”, as something that was born out of self-medication and not a true expression of who he really was.

This motivation of coping with feelings of self-doubt was common between research sites and across race/ethnicity and gender. So was the perception that drug use not only helped one cope with stress, anxiety or self-doubt but also made the user feel “more normal”. Cass a White, recently desisted pill addict from Winterton City speaks to this when she says,

C: They took away my anxiety. They made me feel normal. I could concentrate and do what I needed to do. And it stopped all the other stuff inside my mentality so I could focus and do what I needed to do. The very first time it took my pain away but I noticed a feeling of just a pleasantness, pleasantry. You just feel good. And you want more of it.

There’s like an urge, I need more.

J: And you felt that the first time?

C: (nods), Because it was stronger than what I needed. And I noticed that every time I told the dentist that my teeth hurt, that he wrote a prescription. And I think I got prescriptions, like 4-5 a month from him for like 6 months in a row.

J: Sounds like he was, I don’t want to say encouraging but ...

C: Well, all I had to do was flirt. He was one of those.

Cass notes she felt “normal” the first time she took pills as prescribed by her doctor and she was immediately drawn to the sense of calmness and pleasantness they provided her. To

Cass, pills were something that helped her function in a way that stopped her self-doubt and anxiety. Cass also noted an important way gender affected her experience as a drug user and how she could use her femininity to help facilitate refills on her prescriptions. Cass was not the only participant to mention coping with stress and anxiety as a major motivation for their drug use. Angel a Black, current regular cannabis user notes similar motivations when she says,

“I have anxiety really bad and I think that it is, it is a mental problem, it’s a mind game. I’ve seen my mother suffer from it at a younger age. I never really knew, I used to think that she was lying and playing around and I would think oh, she just wants us to be good right now or she just wants us

to be so attentive or something. Like I said, my mom was crazy but really she was suffering from it and stress and how it's not good for you. So I do it to take the edge off. I do it at the end of my day when I want to take my bubble bath, where I'm gonna be, I just do it to clear my mind because sometimes I know that I can sit and worry about things I have no control over. I can sit and feel like the world is on top of me and I can't breath and I'm thinking I know I have people who truly love me, what is my problem. So, it helps me get my head better, I can center right down there with all my thoughts and things in a calm manner because of my thought process is not so fast."

Thus, I found drug use to be an important coping mechanism for people to deal with the stresses of their everyday life, or major traumas of the past, and this motivation to cope with drugs transcended demographic characteristics.

While some participants used drugs as a way to cope with feelings of inadequacy or anxiety others used drugs to cope with the feelings and memories of a traumatic past. Experiencing abuse, exposure to death and violence, and feeling of parental abandonment were noted by participants as trauma which were dealt with through the use of drugs. Consider this exchange with Eddie, a White, former long-term heroin addict from Winterton City who presented a very rough, gruff exterior and seemed only slightly interested in talking to me.

J: What do you think was the ultimate draw of the drugs, what was it about say heroin that drew you in?

E: Looking for something, just looking for something I thought I didn't have.

J: Did you almost feel like it was fulfilling?

E: Uh, huh.

J: What gap or hole was it filling?

E: Euphoria. It's euphoria. All the bad stuff happens and then you're in a state of total euphoria.

Eddie came of age in a difficult family situation in which he was forced to be independent from a young age. This experience left him looking for some feeling of positivity and enjoyment to dilute the pain associated with past traumas. Skippy, from Two Rivers, alludes

to the ability to escape the emotional pain with drug use when he said, “I mean to be honest, just pain, like emotional trauma um, and just wanting to escape. It’s really not a whole lot beyond that”. While some were trying to escape past traumas, others were trying to “numb” traumatic experiences. Consider this snippet of conversation with Keysha when I asked her what her reasons were for drug use.

J: What’s your reason?

K: Numb.

J: What are you numbing?

K: Childhood experiences, um having to have my kids when I was young and having to deal with that now, I didn’t think about that before I react, does that make sense? My actions, I should have thought about that more and I wouldn’t be dealing with what I’m dealing with today.

Regardless of race/ethnicity, class, gender or residential location, participants noted coping with negative experiences as a motivation for drug use. The experience of abuse, neglect and loss cut across demographics. However, in my sample these experiences, and the motivation to cope with drugs, had significantly more lasting and negative consequences for those from Winterton City than Two Rivers. Even those who had experienced significant difficulties from Two Rivers such as Skippy or Jay had stable employment, stable housing and were seemingly on track to reproduce the working or middle class conditions from which they came. In many respects, their pain was temporary and did not lead to a cycle of self-medication and trouble.

Fitting In

When peers provide a social context that promotes drug use participants were sometimes motivated to “fit in” and use to maintain these valued peer associations. While peers certainly help form perceptions, this may occur with or without explicit encouragement. Many participants noted they first tried drugs because they “were just trying

to be cool” among their peers. Some came of age around peers with whom drug use was common and their desire to use drugs was a product of their interest in fitting in and creating or maintaining friendships they valued. Across race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location the most common motivation for use espoused by participants was their desire to fit-in and maintain valued relationships with friends or significant others. Thus, peers were particularly important for cultivating interest and developing an identification with drug use that was conducive to increased use and crime. Consider this exchange with Bradford when asked about his motivations to initially try drugs,

J: Was it a curiosity type thing? Like what was the motivation to try it?

B: Like here hit this.

J: Was it a peer pressure type thing do you think?

B: I was young and wanted to be cool and they were offering it so I did it.

To Bradford, his willingness to do drugs for the first time signaled to his friends that he was like them and willing to do what they did. Perhaps more importantly, using drugs provided Bradford with a symbolic resource he could use to construct a narrative identity as someone who was “cool”. Bradford, spent his adolescent and early adulthood in Two Rivers, but spent his early childhood in Prairie City surrounded by drugs and crime. As one of the few White people in his neighborhood he had to work particularly hard to fit in with his neighborhood peers and drugs provided him an opportunity to do that.

The desire to fit-in among valued peers cut across class, race/ethnicity, gender and residential location. Drugs provided those who had trouble fitting in, or lacked a sense of belonging, with an avenue for connecting with others they valued. Cass was a White, female pill addict from Winterton City who had an unstructured and emotionally unwelcoming home life which led to her leaving home in her late teens and couch surfing. At the time of our conversation, Cass was still couch surfing and was semi-homeless. She had been keeping this

up for years by the time we spoke. It was with the people she used that she was attached and felt a sense of emotional connection. A desire for such connection was a motivating force for Cass to initially try drugs,

J: What about, you mentioned your peers, your friends, was there some aspect of trying to fit in?

C: Oh, yeah. It all was, because I was already homeless and I hung out with, all my friends were rich. Like their parents were osteopathic surgeons and here I was this homeless girl that you know... It was all about fitting in, otherwise what was I doing? They loved me for my personality and I was the crazy, I was funny and so, I don't know, it was about trying to fit in because it took me a long time to even start drinking. Cuz the taste of beer made me sick but I didn't want anything to do with drugs. Of course, the marijuana came first. I think I'm allergic to it. They never really... I had a stint with meth but other than, I did acid a couple of times but other than that it was the alcohol for a few years and then the pills.

Cass felt the only way she could fit in with her friends was by being crazy, funny and on drugs. When she left her home in late teens she found the sense of belonging and connection she was lacking in her home life among those with which she used. Cass even notes two common barriers to drug use she experienced: perception of bad taste and bad reaction. Yet Cass felt she could not transcend her social position to associate with the peers she valued unless she did drugs. After these connections had been developed they became a force that bound Cass to drug use and motivated her persistence. For Cass, and many like her, drug using peers provided a rewarding sense of community and connection they lacked in other areas of their life.

Motivations Evolve

The motivations expressed by participants were not univariate. Individual motivations took several manifestations. These motivations changed as participants aged, had increasing experience with drugs, and the meaning brought to their use changed. While all participants

initially started drug use recreationally, some learned to use drugs as a way to cope with anxiety, while others were motivated by rebellion and hedonism. Take Dorian for instance, who first became involved with drugs as a byproduct of spending time with friends and desiring drug infused fun. When I asked him if he would characterize his own use as recreation, medication or addiction replied this way,

“Basically all three. Now reflecting back, it was self-medicating social anxiety, then at the time it felt like it was just helping me socialize, like ‘oh were all just having fun’ and then you think back to nights where it was less fun and more just like... I don’t want to say addiction, but we should have been able to have fun without doing drugs.”

Dorian notes that at the time he felt like was simply motivated by hedonism, but now years later and a few years clean he is able to look back and see that his motivations and thus identity as a drug user was not exclusively about having fun and socializing, but also in medicating his anxiety and in his dependence on drugs for pleasurable experiences. This tendency to reinterpret their motivations from earlier periods of use at the point of our interview was not uncommon. Consider another example of this from Gary,

“It really depends on the drug involved, cause we all kind of went through stages were people would start messing around with over the counter type stuff and it was just, ‘hey dude, no, no, no, you’re gonna kill yourself’. There was never any hard drug use, well there was a point where it was starting with ecstasy where it was an every weekend thing there for a while and that could have very easily spiraled out of control, but we didn’t. I absolutely think there was an addiction, to marijuana frankly, absolutely addiction, although at the time we thought of it more as recreation.”

Here Gary reinterprets his motivations surrounding drug use with the gift of time to gain perspective. At the time, he and his friends viewed their drug use as purely recreational even if they occasionally had to communally pull back so as to not “kill” themselves accidentally. Despite this he had a decidedly different view of his use than more conventional folks might.

Indeed, many people would consider weekly ecstasy use and multiple times daily cannabis use to be evidence of drug use “spiraled out of control”. Ultimately participant’s perceptions of their motivations evolved as they had increasing experience with drugs and the passage of time. Often though, the realization these motivations had evolved, from hedonism to addiction for example, reportedly came only after desistance or significant reductions in use.

Drug Use and Identity

The context that participants grew up in and their motivations for drug use shaped their identification with it and by extension their behaviors in relation to drugs. Participants’ habitus shaped by their early life context provided them the dispositions and attitudes that made drug use attractive and informed their motivations. Drawing from salient cultural and subcultural narratives, participants crafted their narrative identity through a synthesis of narratives available and their own lived experience. I found participants crafted their identity by drawing on several distinct narratives. Some participants constructed for themselves a “party” identity in which participants found drug use as a way to manifest extreme fun in an otherwise mundane life. Also, a “responsible drug user” identity in which participants drew boundaries against extreme forms of use and considered their use non-problematic. Some participants constructed a “super mom” identity while others constructed a “failing mom” identity. In these, participants synthesized subcultural narratives of functional drug use or addiction and cultural narratives of motherhood. Finally, some participants drew from a subculturally prevalent narrative in which they presented drug use, particularly psychedelic drug use, as valuable and beneficial to the user for intellectual, personal and spiritual growth thereby constructing a “psychonaut” identity. These identities are not distinct and participants

may pull from more than one narrative and construct a uniquely complex narrative identity by blending them with their lived experiences.

It is important not to think of these identities as distinct and participants often pulled from more than one to construct their own identity. It is also key to remember these identities vary in intensity of association and no drug user is completely encapsulated by their identity as a user. As Shover (1996:78) noted in his seminal study of persistent thieves, “Among [those] who *do* identify with crime, even if their identification with it is weak or inconsistent, an array of criminal identities [are] represented...Adults generally have multiple identities grounded in diverse settings of everyday life including the family, the workplace, and places of recreation and leisure. Although most of our identities are conventional and legitimate, an individual’s repertoire of identities may include criminal ones as well.” I discuss some of the commonly constructed identities of drug users and note how participants’ identities as drug users are informed by the “diverse settings of everyday life”.

Scholars have previously noted that drug use and crime allows individuals to project to others a particular persona as someone who is independent, rebellious, and courageous. I would suggest that this is true, but only for those whose perceptions of drugs have been shaped in a way to valorize their use and are motivated to partake, in part, to affirm to themselves their own identities as someone who is independent, rebellious, and courageous. In my sample, such perceptions and attitudes laid the groundwork for the “party identity” of some drug users. Take Davey, a White, working class poly-drug user from Two Rivers, who noted in our conversation that from elementary school he viewed himself as a troublemaker and that some of his initial interest in drugs came from his belief that “this is what troublemakers do”. As noted above Davey’s perspective of himself as a troublemaker in

search of a good time combined with a social context that fostered that perception of self led to the decision to use drugs to affirm that identity to himself as well as others. Recall the narrative of Davey's hedonistic motivation above. Davey felt most himself when he was engaged in extreme partying and drug use, and constructed his identity, in part, by casting himself against "straight" people. Davey and others like him drew from a subculturally available party identity to bring meaning to their behavior and construct their identity as a drug user always up for a good time. In doing so people from Two Rivers like Davey, Jay or Skippy brought meaning to their drug use in a way that encouraged their risky and heavy use. This party identity was most prevalent among White males from Two Rivers who often held perceptions of their hometown as dull and found drugs a way to bring excitement to an otherwise monotonous working class existence. Women from Two Rivers did embody a party identity to a lesser degree. Their partying was often depicted as less extreme (i.e. types and amounts of drugs), and they did not narrate their party experiences tinged with the same level of self-satisfaction as men. For women, partying was just part of the lifestyle associated with regular drug use. Those from Winterton City rarely identified with a party identity. For some, their use and the negative consequences from it were so extreme they could not plausibly pull from and construct a party identity in relation to their drug use. For others from Winterton City whose use was not so uncontrolled, they avoided such extreme depictions and identifications with drug use.

Indeed, the most common way economically disadvantaged people of color from Two Rivers who were not severely addicted constructed identities consonant with their use was by casting themselves against extreme, hedonistic, party forms of use. Instead they drew from a "responsible drug user" identity subculturally available that suggested responsible drug users

are those that use, but not to excess, use soft drugs but not hard ones, and do not use drugs at work, school, or around uninitiated family. Due to race/ethnicity and class, drug users of color or low socioeconomic status must construct boundaries and their identity much differently than does someone like Davey if they hope to avoid the stigma of being poor, Black and a drug user. Indeed, the context that users from Winterton City experienced, one where drug use was associated with addiction, crime, and death shaped the identity of participants as they had to work to avoid the stigma of such associations themselves. Take Adrian, a Black drug user from Winterton City who had spent a few stints in jail.

“To me it’s not harmful (cannabis), it makes you mellow, it’s nice, it’s not like I’m out here doing a crime. Like I smoke and play a video game. You know it’s relaxing, I’m not going crazy...I’m not wanting to get stereotyped. It’s bad enough I’ve got tattoos all over me. I’m not like wanting to be in that category.”

For economically disadvantaged people of color like Adrian, whose use was controlled it was important to present an identity of someone who is not just functional as a drug user, but responsible as a drug user, and as a responsible person more generally. Those that relied on a responsible drug user identity to develop their narrative identity in relation to drug use spoke of not using before work or time with children, and only in moderate enough amounts for relaxation, not extreme intoxication. This subcultural identity was most called on by economically disadvantaged people of color from Winterton City who cast themselves sharply against the extreme forms of use and addiction many of them had been exposed to from parents, peers, or their surrounding community. Many of them specifically noted as disadvantaged people of color they had to work especially hard to keep their drug use from reflecting negatively on them and stigmatizing them in a degrading way. They focused on their ability to be a responsible and moral person regardless of their drug use. For them, their

use was a rather small part of how they conceived of themselves as a person. They were more attached to other prosocial responsibilities, often centered around family obligations, and were generally weakly associated with drug use and deviant subcultures.

Thus, developing a drug using identity, or a deviant identity for that matter, does not happen in some sort of situational vacuum, but is part of an unfolding process that often begins before any significant deviant behavior begins and is a product of intersecting social identities. Additionally, due to differential social positioning, drug participants can construct identities in relation to their involvement they view reflect positively on them as individuals while calling on diametrically opposing values (excess vs. moderation). By creating such boundaries lower socioeconomic individuals, and people of color, like Adrian, portrayed their use as restrained and controlled and relied on a responsible drug user identity to construct their identity. In comparison, their White counterparts from Two Rivers portrayed their use as adventuresome and hedonistic, and almost exclusively in a positive light, while relying on a party identity to bring meaning to their behavior and their sense of self.

Gendered norms were important cornerstones for how individuals constructed an identity, and an identity as a user and a mother was particularly important. Motherhood is a particularly important social identity and female participants regularly noted how their identity and obligations as a parent intersected with their identity and interests as a user. Participants who were mothers were apt to incorporate the mother and drug using facets of their life in one of three ways. First, the majority of respondents suggested they did their best to keep the two worlds separate. They drew sharp boundaries around exposing children to drug use or deals and made clear their obligations as mothers came before their interests as a user. Second, some suggested that their drug usage made them “super moms” and gave them

the patience, energy, or focus needed to perform all their motherly obligations at a level they could not otherwise achieve without the aid of drugs. For instance, consider this quote from Eve a Black crack user from Winterton City,

“This is part of being what you call a functioning addict. I would take the kids to a museum, where we lived every place had a free day-the museum, the aquarium, the zoo was free 24/7 so what I would do was smoke me a bunch of shit (crack) and then pack a bunch of lunches-fill the trunk up with lunch meat, bread, potato chips, pops and take 'em to the park and let them play or take 'em to the museum and just let 'em go.”

For Eve, her crack usage gave her the energy and attention necessary to keep up with the exuberance of youth. Far from preventing her from fulfilling her motherly obligations, Eve feels her crack use is under control, and despite her addiction, she “functions” more than adequately as a mother. This is one way that participants who were parents, specifically mothers, incorporated their drug use into their narrative identity alongside their other pre-existing social identities. This form of identification with drug use, as a super mom, is drawn from circulating narratives in drug subcultures that drug use enhances one’s abilities and makes them capable of things they might not be sober. This type of identification encourages persistence over an extended period of time as such super moms perceive their use to be a positive, supportive influence.

Finally, some mothers could be referred to as “failing moms” who expressed a dissociation with their children as they became increasingly fixated on drugs and their children were removed from the home or came to an age they voluntarily became estranged from their parent. It was not that such participants did not care about their children, but that their addiction and estrangement from their children pushed them further into identification with drugs. For instance, when I asked Melisa, a White long term meth user from Winterton

City, how her perception of herself changed over the years she had been using drugs she replied this way,

“Um, my biggest issue is with having lost my kids. Because society views a woman whose deemed an unfit parent particularly harshly. It’s not the same for fathers. Because for a female a woman a mother you have failed at the one thing that you’re supposed to be good at and that is unforgivable in society’s eyes. And this whole opioid crisis is a big thing right now but they still don’t like junkies and they still don’t have any compassion for women who lose their children because of drugs so it again makes me feel that I can’t talk about my kids, I want to talk about my kids I love them still and I’m proud of them. But I have to be careful that I don’t get in a position where people ask questions that will lead to them finding out that my children aren’t with me and it wasn’t my choice that they aren’t with me.”

Here Melisa notes that some part of her identity is both informed by her identity as a woman and mother as well as how society views her as a mother-addict. This quote from Melisa reveals the distressed sense of self which characterized many of those who struggled with addiction. Later in our conversation Melisa told me there were times she would be in the process of intravenously using meth and she would realize “they were right”, and that she was not fit to be a mother, despite the love and affection she felt for her children. Thus, drug use and parenting intersected in interesting ways that informed the identities and behaviors of those in my sample. Those that kept their drug use and parenting separate rarely also identify as addict and described using and navigating through less dangerous environments than those who were struggling to maintain their familial obligations and thus had “no reason” to clean up or abstain from drugs. Here participants could call on similar cultural resources with performative expectations attached to them, like mother, to bring additional meaning to their drug use. Yet, depending on the context and constellation of influences that made up participants’ lived experience they could frame the meaning of drug use and parenting in drastically different ways (super mom vs. failing mom). Both super moms and failing moms

had deep attachments to their identities as drug users, though those that drew from a failing mom identity could be said to be more deeply associated with drug use as they were barred from actively engaging in mothering.

Those that appeared to most fully incorporate drug use into their identity and sense of self were White, male participants from Two Rivers. The cultural vacuum and insulation their community provided gave little chance of negative consequences and also provided the opportunity to carve out a meaningful identity as a drug user. Such strong identification with drug use was uncommon amongst people of color or economic disadvantage in Winterton City. The realities of being poor, a person of color, and living in disorganized neighborhoods provided adequate cultural resources from which to build a coherent sense of identity. Drug use was just a small part of their overall narrative identity. Some male participants from Winterton City had so fully incorporated it into their lives and narrative identity that drug use was viewed as a panacea and one that helped users learn more about themselves and the world. Such participants drew from cultural narratives of drug use, particularly psychedelic drug use, as something that was mind expanding, personally rewarding, and spiritually powerful. In doing so, they identified with a subculturally informed “psychonaut” identity that was prevalent only among White, males from Two Rivers. Those that drew from a “psychonaut” identity used various drugs with some regularity, but were daily cannabis users, and viewed their use to have positively affected their life. Markus, a poly-drug user from Two Rivers who was a public educator alludes to the ubiquity with which drugs had informed his daily existence. When I asked him how he viewed his drug usage he replied this way,

“It’s circumstantial, it kind of depends. So, like weed, I definitely use it more recreational, but I’ve had some injuries in my life that I’m sure it is

helping with. Uh specifically, I separated a joint in my shoulder and it can be painful if I sleep on it wrong, but for me it's more recreational. It's more of a routine, if I get to wake up and smoke a bowl I've started the day off good. I know I'm gonna feel good. I know I'm ready for the tasks ahead. And then some more of the hard drugs that are special occasions would be more recreational as well, but it's hard to say they're not medicinal, because they're been times you know, I've taken shrooms and it's changed my perspective on things. So, it's like man in the long run it's actually helped me and changed my mind, changed my views on certain things because it's opened up my mind."

While Markus identifies as a recreational drug user, he notes just how integral his use is to his daily life and ultimately his sense of identity and perceptions. Indeed, he goes on to suggest his more extreme drug experiences were medicinal because of how they changed his perspective and opened his mind. Markus viewed himself as more open-minded and progressive than many of the people he grew up and worked with and considered his drug consumption to be directly responsible for it. Thus, identification with drug use can shape peoples' identity and behaviors tangential to drug involvement. This was probably most vividly expressed by Cullen who credits the entirety of his personal and professional interests to his identification and experiences with drugs.

"I hate saying this because I love his podcast so much and he really doesn't ever promote drug use, he really doesn't and if you listen to his podcast he will sit there and tell you all the negatives all the side-effects along with the positives but he just says I'm just telling you this cause some people want to take out the positives and only tell you negatives, but Joe Rogan I would say has a huge influence. I mean I've done DMT I've done coke, but when he talks about it I sit there and go, man if only I did those when I was older instead of younger, like now how I see life, learning things, man I wish I... I could learn more from it now. I could get more out of it, it's not just for the high now. It's just like man that really opened up, cause it did open up my mind and change my whole scope of like, I went from wanting to, I mean I didn't know what I was gonna be freshman, sophomore year, I thought anything from like construction science which I mean is a science, but mostly construction cause that's what my dad does, or maybe one day engineering, maybe, and that was only cause of math, nothing to do with science, that was math driven. I just wanted to be a teacher of engineering, a professor or something. I

didn't want to actually go and crunch the numbers on the structural parts of things, but then I did DMT and it's just like, (smacks hands) boom all of a sudden I love physics, love astrophysics, loved learning about quantum mechanics, I love learning about engineering, I can't get enough of it now. I'm always asking people questions about their vehicle. 'what does that do, why did you put that on there?' and you just learn as you get older and smarter, they don't know what that actually does for the vehicle, but it's cool if I do, so it's just like, 'oh ok' you know. It just changed my whole scope of things. So, if I could do it now, it would maybe help me more I guess."

At the time we met he had returned to school to study physics and was doing well in his coursework. The context Cullen was in motivated his use and provided multi-dimensional narratives of drug use he could pull from to bring meaning to his drug use. Ones that presented drug use, particularly psychedelic drug use, as something that one could do to learn about themselves and the world at a deeply intellectual and spiritual level. Thus, his positive identification with drug involvement, produced through a synthesis of his experiences and the cultural narratives he pulled from to bring meaning to his use, actually resulted in *positive personal and professional outcomes* for Cullen and others like him such as Brock, Dorian and even Jay.

JE: What about later on after you'd been using drugs regularly for a few years, did that change you at all?

J: Yeah, that came along a lot later. I think they definitely can take ahold. And it changes self-perception a little bit. And it changes, because so many things are changing after you've taken that first, whatever it is. It opens your eyes up to a whole new different world so to speak. So you kind of question what you learned before that, because it's pretty profound actually when you experience that first thing, it's like, 'whoa everything that I thought I knew, I don't' so I think that's what led me to challenge, challenge just life in general. One experience that sticks out is the first time I did acid. I felt, I lost, they call it ego death. I couldn't remember who I was, I knew of me, but I couldn't remember me. And I remember closing my eyes and seeing cubes floating around and little scenes from life were in each little cube just floating around in nonsensical order. After that experience and the next day, all the lights were so much brighter, the sky was a different deep blue, they were colors that I recognized but... different, in some way. And I think after that, that's really what, not that

experience itself necessarily, but that feeling really fueled me like, ‘wow this is doing something that we don’t, we can’t understand’. Like we aren’t able to understand this yet. We need more... we just can’t understand this. So that was an epiphany.”

Here too, Jay noted that after a while drugs can take “ahold”. Jay was a particularly interesting participant as he had experienced bouts of addiction and the personal strain associated with it. Yet, he also had significantly positive experiences with drugs and his identification with his drug using experiences were overwhelmingly positive. In the quote above he focused on the positive aspects of drug use, how it opened up his eyes, and caused him to challenge what he had previously thought and believed. Even the experience of “ego death” was interpreted as an epiphany that helped him experience life in a more vivid way and fuel his continued interest in such experiences.

For individuals such as these, drug involvement was perceived as the bedrock of their identity. Even for those who had desisted, the dispositions and values orientations they gained within drug using networks became incorporated as a durable part of their identity and shaped how they perceived the world and interacted. Consider Dorian who was several years clean at the time of our conversation,

“I think it’s the foundation of who I am. I feel like I had such a frame of reference through the younger years of my life that now it’s hard for me to understand ego in terms of other people and being understanding of how someone else is making decisions, I don’t know, based on their values that are based on different foundations.”

The experiences of drug use can be powerful, and those who persist in desiring and achieving these experiences for an extended period of time are inevitably presented with various ways to understand their use and themselves as users. Those like Dorian who possessed a psychonaut identity incorporated the experiences and value orientations presented to them

during their subcultural associations so fully that even after these associations ended they imparted a lasting impact on their narrative identity and decision making processes.

Drug Trade and Context

Physical Context

The environments of Two Rivers and Winterton City shaped the perceptions of participants who engaged in drug trade and Jaquon, a Black user-dealer from Winterton City provides some interesting insights into how physical context can shape a person's motivations to sell drugs.

J: So I moved here from a town in the south. We came here in the early 80's. We came here with chickens, yeah, we had chickens in our kitchen and we had the cages up so that in the winter we put them in the kitchen whatever so. The southeast side of this city is where we moved to originally. It was quiet, everything was peaceful over there. Then we moved over here to the west side and the west side was very different from the south end. It just, ah, the people was different as well.

JE: How was the neighborhood and people different?

J: The neighborhood was different from like on the southeast side, it was more like if I didn't have it you was just more used to not having it and being able to adapt to that. And as you went west with it, it was like well I don't got, but I'm going to figure out a way to go get it, that was the difference. So, the people tend to, was different. And as I moved west, that was what started leading to the drugs, alcohol and stuff like that.

JE: Was there a particular experience that stands out in your mind with that move west and the idea of if I don't have it I'm going to figure out a way to get it?

J: Just like friends, different people from the neighborhood, this was what they was already into. You know the west side, the area where I come from, was already known as violent ... There was a house over on 22nd, I don't know if you could google it or whatever, but there was a house over on 22nd, it was actually my apartment building and I used to have some friends hang out with me over there and one day, uh somebody was like hey do you know where I could get some drugs. So, one of my friends was like, I know where, so he sold 'em some. So, the people started coming there on a regular and they thought it was that type of spot, and it ended up turning into that type of spot. It turned into the spot, it turned into it so much that that become one of the busiest streets in this city.

JE: So, you were almost like the center of it for a while?

J: Right, right, yeah. And so, my mom hurried up and moved away from there. And then that building just turned into a junky building just like this was where to go if you wanted drugs.

JE: How did that, like you said people were coming to your building, did that affect how you thought of yourself, like I'm kind of in a happening spot.

J: Yeah, it made me, well, you're getting this easy money, let's go on and get it. So that's what led me into selling drugs.

Here Jaquon notes the importance of neighborhood location. As he moved from east to west across Winterton City, the environment became more criminogenic. After the move in his teen years he was thrust into an environment of drugs, crime and violence. This shows how people both determine and are determined by the context in which they live. While drugs were already prevalent in the area when Jaquon got there, through his and his peers' actions he turned his neighborhood street into one of the "busiest streets in the city" for drugs.

Athea a female user-dealer from Winterton City who dealt only when economically necessary suggested the environment she was in provided obvious scripts for how to become a drug dealer and how to engage in the trade. She needed no specific training. In her community it is a "kind of common sense" or street wisdom.

J: Did you have someone, did that other person sort of show you the ropes, show you how to do it, or did you learn by trial and error.

A: No, it was kind of common sense. I just watched and uh...

J: It wasn't that hard to put together?

A: Right.

J: How about how did you find like people to sell it to? What was that like for you?

A: Well for one, in your community you know who is using and who is not.

J: So it's common knowledge?

A: Right, uh huh.

Athea went on to note that the availability of drugs in her community was the number one concern in her community as drugs cause the dissolution of families and relationships. She said, "we can't get a hold of drugs if the drugs weren't here. If there wasn't drugs or alcohol

then we wouldn't have to worry about that because it causes so many things, it just causes the breakage of homes and families and relationships.” The physical environment that included poverty, crime and drugs informed her initial motivations to sell and led her to reproducing the environmental conditions she decried as detrimental.

The physical environment of Two Rivers was also mentioned by a few participants with dealing experience. When dealers mentioned the physical context of Two Rivers it was to emphasize its dullness. For Dealers from Two Rivers, dealing was a way to bring some excitement into their lives while also being rewarded materially and symbolically for their efforts at the trade. Dorian noted that Two Rivers was boring and dealing drugs spiced up life and assured regular attention would be turned towards him.

“That was kind of like a breaking the boredom thing in small town like add a little excitement, and it also like you know, I know a lot of people that have facilitated their own drug use through their own drug use, get enough for everyone...”

Here Dorian noted the way the context of a small town provided little to do and how that conditioned his motivations to deal to “add a little excitement” to his life while facilitating his own drug use, and the party lifestyle surrounding persistent drug use. His contextually informed motivations conditioned how he incorporated his dealing activities into his sense of identity. He was a partier surrounded by those living less exciting existences.

Family

The context provided by family interactions and dynamics were complexly important for forming individual motivations to deal drugs. These included permissive parents who kept little supervision of their children, experiences of abuse and neglect, and exposure to drug use and dealing on the part of their parents. These influences varied little by race/ethnicity, class, or gender. Yet, when they are understood in tandem with the influence

of residential location they provided insight into the motivations and identities of those involved.

Many participants who became dealers had parents with permissive, “hands-off” parenting styles that stood in stark contrast to the controlling restrictive parenting mentioned by many of those who exclusively used drugs. Dealers like Skippy or Dorian had family lives characterized by divorce and conflict in which their parents were occupied and less able to supervise. In this family turmoil drug dealing became attractive socially and materially. In the excerpt below, Dorian and I discuss how his upbringing and relationship with parents informed his decision to sell drugs.

J: When you were growing up how would you describe your relationship with family and how do you think that influenced your drug participation?

D: It was rocky. It was a rocky life. I think my parents were like separated for a time in those formative years so that made it easier to look for friends in bad places...

J: Like maybe not as much supervision?

D: Yeah, for sure. They were too focused on trying to get their shit figured out and not...

J: Gotcha. Did your parents ever give you the drug talk, did they ever sit you down?

D: My dad just said, ‘stay out of jail’, and I guess that was odd for our social group. Normally they get, ‘don’t ever do this, don’t ever do that’ but my family was always like, ‘eh, well, stay out of trouble’.

J: So, sort of cryptic, so as a kid did that made you think you could push the edges as long as you didn’t get in trouble?

D: Yeah. Just make sure you stay safe ya know. They weren’t like stay away from everything, just stay away from the cops (laughs).

In these sorts of family contexts participants learned that actions were not inherently wrong or problematic, it was the consequence that was the measure of an action. Thus, “just stay away from the cops”. This quote underlines the differences in contextual danger between Two Rivers and Winterton City associated with participants’ deviance. Many participants from Winterton City noted their fears of victimization from those in the community or the

police, either for themselves or their loved ones. For those from Two Rivers, drug dealing was a fun distraction from the mundane. For those from Winterton City it was significantly more complex.

Yet such permissiveness could take on a more active tone. Bryan a user-dealer from Two Rivers in his mid-twenties talked about the differential relationships he has with his mother and father and as it relates to his dealing.

“Uh, with my dad, my mom was not cool from the get-go but after I moved out they’re cool with it now. My dad didn’t really ever care but then every once in a while I would find something missing and I wondered what’s going on and I figured out that my dad was stealing weed for his friends. (In the voice of his dad’s friend) ‘Here’s \$50 for an ounce, can I grab that?’ (In his own voice) ‘I’m like you sold an ounce for \$50, what?, like, quit taking my shit.’ Oh, me and my dad don’t totally get along anymore, there’s a strain because why would you steal from your son. Especially when you don’t have a drug problem, you just want money. Oh, come on, let’s be an adult about that. Me and my mom, our relationship has gotten better since high school, I would say. We can tell each other anything, and what not.”

Bryan noted how at first his mother was not accepting of his dealing until after he moved out. Perhaps this was because she viewed him as an adult, or because she no longer worried about legal trouble following her son home. It would seem the answer to her acceptance of his dealing developed out of his success dealing. Indeed, it is not uncommon for Bryan to help his parents with a bill. Alternatively, Bryan is motivated to deal, in part, to recoup the economic losses he has experienced as a consequence of his father. Both of these relationships have the effect of pushing Bryan deeper into his association with drugs and strengthen his identification with drug trade.

If not attitudes of permissiveness the social context provided by some dealer’s families included significant levels of emotional and physical abuse. These sorts of family environments pushed young people onto the street with a need to survive. The contextual

influences of family and place played a particularly powerful role for Athea who used dealing as a mechanism for economic independence and a preventative measure against being “used” by others. When I asked her if her family influenced her later involvement with drugs she replied negatively, but went on to explain how her family environment set the stage for her later motivations to deal.

“No, because I was basically, on my own. I was 17, and I ran away from home because my stepmother was, she just wasn’t a loving, her words were just so degrading, and my own mother was struggling with um being clean from alcohol. Which I would see every once in a while but she needed to get well and so I would/I was dependent on my dad, I was dependent on that nurturing but it was blocked because she would do things to block that pathway of me and my dad to get the nurturing I needed. My dad got with my stepmother when I was like 7-8, so I didn’t, from 8 on up I didn’t have a good childhood. Because I was rebellious towards her because I knew that she was not a good parent or a parent figure. She physically assaulted me, so I was already like a person-damaged goods, I wasn’t sexually damaged I was mentally damaged goods by the time I became a teenager. So, I had a lot of trust issues, I had by the time I was a teenager I had set in my mind, I will not be used by nobody, I will not, um, you know, I didn’t know how to be loved. If someone was trying to love me I would push them away because I didn’t know if it was genuine. So, I think I was pretty much, just like, I can’t describe it, I wanted to do, I didn’t want help from nobody. I just wanted to do everything on my own because I didn’t know if it was genuine. Like, you know, my dad had this lady that he cared about and you know, she came into our home, we didn’t go to her, she came into our home and she violated me. And she’s supposed to be, you know, a mother figure. So, I didn’t want no one to get close to me, I didn’t want to get close to no one. And it, that was it. So, I was trying to take care of myself, the best way I know how without um, showing any signs of weakness, like I couldn’t do it, even though I was breaking the law, because that’s not legal to do but I was just trying.”

Here Athea provides an excellent example of how the context she was in as a teen and young adult conditioned her motivations to leave home and sell drugs to survive. As will be seen below, these contextually informed motivations shaped how she constructed her identity as

an able drug entrepreneur and the way she incorporated dealing drugs into her narrative identity.

Some parents may not encourage their children's dealing passively or actively, but provide a context in which drugs are prevalent and normalized. When these family dynamics dovetail with the social context created by peers, culture and the surrounding community participants such as Bradford find drug dealing an available and logical activity.

“My mom smoked crack so I saw her doing that, my neighbor was selling her those drugs, and I always saw her smoking weed. But then my friends and I we were the runners, if people had a package we took and so we saw people doing stuff and we tried and we got into it as well. And I mean you see the movies when you're a kid growing up, like Scarface and you see the mountain of cocaine on his desk, and then you see it in real life and you see the money and it's just like well I'm not getting an education where I'm supposed to be getting an education, and I know I'm supposed to be doing something else besides playing football in the street, so maybe I should be making some money.”

Bradford's exposure to drugs at a young age normalized them. He was involved in the drug trade early and looked up to those in his community that had drugs and money. In a context where he was receiving little emotional or social support he began to believe he needed to “be making some money” and began selling drugs instead of making deliveries for other dealers as he had done in his early adolescence.

Of course, some participants started dealing in the context of addiction. They may have initially started using for any myriad of reasons, but at the point their use became so consuming they could no longer support their habit conventionally they turned to dealing. As they were already users, those that became dealers already had access to suppliers and a community of customers. Consider this narrative from Ronald, a Black crack user-dealer from Winterton City. Ronald relayed this story to me after my first question, “Can you tell me the story of how you got involved with drugs?”

“It was back in say 1988, my brother, we were sitting in a car and smoking some weed and uh I said that smells different and I said what is that? And he says, it’s primo. I said can I try that and he said no man you don’t want to get it, you don’t want to do that. I said, come on man, let me hit it, let me hit it. And so, he let me hit it but before that he said, I want you to run in here and take this to this dude, take these rocks in here and he’s going to give you some money. I said, he’s going to give you some money for some rocks? He said, no man, it’s rock cocaine. So, I took it in there and he gave me some money and when I came back they were still smoking so I said, let me hit that again. He said, nah. He wouldn’t let me hit it but him and his wife they was smoking and so he said this is what they call primo. You just put it on weed and roll a joint and smoke it. He finally let me hit it and I said, whoa and he let me hit it again. So, after that I got introduced to it but I didn’t get addicted to it. So, he showed me where he was going to get it and I started making trips down there like when I would get off from work, especially on the weekends and would I go down there, I was living in the south and I was making trips down to Louisiana. I was making trips down there and me and the guys would get together and smoke primos, and I was selling some of it. Then it got to where I wasn’t really addicted to it until I just kept on making trips down there and kept on making trips. But after that I started kind of getting a problem but it wasn’t really a problem until I came to Winterton City. I was sneaking around and hanging at the [at the park downtown] on the east side and working out in [the next town over]. I had a job and I was selling dope on the side but I was using too. And then it got to where it was a problem, I would ease away from everybody and go park somewhere and take a hit on a pipe and didn’t nobody ever know cause I was in a mix of people making money. And then it got to a point where I lost my job, hanging out on the street didn’t have money in my pocket. Doin’ whatever-ripping people off, going in stores stealing and stuff like that.”

For Ronald and others like him, their initial motivation to sell drugs was oriented towards making money. However, as is sometimes the case the specter of addiction came in to derail those efforts. After a move that effected his physical context, his social context changed as well, and he was without prosocial bonds acting as barriers to serious addiction. In this new context, one that included addiction, Ronald’s addiction became all-consuming and motivated his drug dealing and other petty crime.

Drug Trade and Motivation

When asked why they engaged in drug dealing, participants' explicit motivations for dealing drugs were similar across race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location and were focused on money. All the dealers I spoke with viewed the efforts in dealing as entrepreneurial and drew on cultural narratives of entrepreneurship to contextualize and motivate their dealing. While some of them did not view dealing drugs as their job, many did view it as their job, and justified this line of thinking with the rewards gained from their trade. Regardless of level of occupational identification dealers called on entrepreneurial values of recognizing a customer base and filling a need. However, the meaning brought to the proceeds of dealing was considered very differently by participants. Take for instance, Tara a White user-dealer of methamphetamines from Winterton City and her explanation of how she got into selling drugs.

“I’m more of an opportunist so I’ve never gone into business for myself but if I know of somebody who wants something um and it will allow me an opportunity to have some product or money or both, so if an opportunity arises and it’s profitable for me to so then I know how to and if it’s easy for me to do so then yeah”

Tara notes how her dealing activity was a product of opportunity, ease, and profitability. Such a business minded perspective on sales would be welcome in any boardroom. It is worth noting that while Tara admits to making money or “product” in her transactions she does not view herself as having “gone into business”. She is simply a trader or middleperson taking advantage of price differences between supplier friends and customer friends. This type of boundary work was common among those from Winterton City who sold to subsist economically, or feed their addiction as was the case for Tara. These motivations to reap profit at the ready, shaped the way Tara incorporated dealing drugs into her narrative

identity. To Tara, she was an opportunist, not a petty drug dealer. Tara was far from the only one to express such attitudes. For instance, Bryan from Two Rivers said,

“The people that sell drugs are smarter, I would say. They notice, well to start selling drugs, there has to be a need to have a drug dealer in that area or that group of friends or whatever.”

It is clear in this quote from Bryan that these motivations are contextually developed and impart meaning. Bryan viewed himself as savvier than mere users. This perspective was not unique among the dealers with whom I talked. Their elevated position, economically and culturally, within drug using networks over simple customers helped justify their efforts as traders and encouraged their identification with drug dealing, and the incorporation of dispositions and values associated with drug dealing into their habitus. Those that received material and symbolic rewards were more apt to be “good time dealers” while those who viewed dealing drugs as an “opportunist” venture were more apt to consider themselves “hustlers” (to be discussed in detail below).

Lifestyle

These entrepreneurial attitudes cut across race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location, but due to the different context dealers from Two Rivers faced relative to their peers in Winterton City they brought meaning to their dealing and its proceeds quite differently. These differential contexts informed the motivations for dealers and the way they constructed their identity in relation to those behaviors with real effects for the way they engaged in the trade. Indeed, while most all dealers considered themselves entrepreneurial and hard-working the meaning brought to dealing was significantly shaped by class and residential location. Dealers from Two Rivers could be said to engage in “conspicuous consumption” in which they enjoyed material and symbolic rewards from dealing activity. These White, working and

middle class dealers did not need to deal to pay the bills, rather they often dealt as a supplement to their income and to afford things they otherwise could not, even if it was just more drugs. Thus, the focus for dealers from Two Rivers was on enjoying a lifestyle they could only afford as dealers. Such a lifestyle provided them material rewards of money that they could use to finance their hedonism while also providing them more intangible benefits. Bradford was a dealer from Two Rivers who grew up in a context that encouraged his drug dealing, and as he had the necessities of life as he aged into adulthood, the proceeds from this drug dealing were spent on drugs, the party, and having a good time.

“Well I wasn’t in school so I didn’t have a whole lot to do other than sell drugs and it was like, ok I’m partying with all these people who are twice, triple my age ya know and I don’t know if was really to fit in, but why not. Then later on down the line, ya know it was a party. I tell people before I don’t know if I was ever addicted to any of the drugs I was doing or selling, it was more for the party. Yeah, I was drinking good liquor, I was only doing the best stuff, I was buying whatever I wanted. I should have just put it all into a bank account (laughs).”

This appreciation for a party lifestyle over a conventional one is common amongst persistent criminals (Shover 1996), and was commonly noted among the dealers with whom I spoke. This was particularly prevalent among dealers from Two Rivers who were able to use the proceeds from dealing on entertainment based consumptive patterns. Michael, another dealer from Two Rivers discusses his own disinterest in stability, and thirst for excitement and fun, when he told me he was spontaneous and had little use for stable employment or conventional annoyances like bank accounts. This attitude as someone who values excitement and eschews conventionality shaped why those with such attitudes sold drugs, how they engaged in the trade, and how they used the proceeds from their dealings. Indeed, dealers like Michael from Two Rivers enjoyed consumptive patterns that would shock many. Consider this exchange we had.

J: What is about money that does it for you? Is it just food, shelter, or is it status too?

M: Umm, yeah, I would say I want a little extra you know. I think this whole time I haven't been addicted to drugs or addicted to the fast life so to say, but addicted to the money... And do stuff that back in the day I wasn't able to do I guess.

J: Would you say that as you started making money at it would you say that that was one of the biggest draws, affording stuff you couldn't when you were younger?

M: Oh yeah, yeah, yeah. Like when I was 17, 18 years old I used to just for the day, fly 3, 4 friends to Las Vegas just to eat, we couldn't gamble, but just to eat buffets and stuff, and we'd jump on the redeye and come home so yeah stuff I couldn't get before.

Such extreme consumptive patterns were not abnormal for such dealers either. While they were nowhere near the top of the network hierarchy they made enough money to afford extras most working class adults could not. It is hard to overestimate the draw to dealing drugs that comes from enjoying recreational and consumptive patterns that outstrip your peers and parents. Another example of this can be seen in this exchange with Bryan.

B: Money is, you know. More money makes you more happy. Just feeling better. You're doing better in life so, I'm great.

J: What do you think you enjoy most about drugs?

B: Uh, that there's a feeling and that's great. And I get to meet some really crazy people through selling or through smoking or going to the bar and meeting different people in one night. I would not be able to have some of the experiences I've had if I don't, you know. Like the first time I ever got on an airplane, I paid for it with drug money but I flew to Washington for a Bluegrass thing. I probably still would not have flown on an airplane if I did not sell drugs and now I've flown on an airplane like 8 times I think.

J: So, you're selling has provided you some access to these things?

B: Yes, just different activities. I wouldn't be traveling to states so...

J: So, the festivals and stuff?

B: Yeah, like this summer I'm going to Atlanta, Virginia, and I think there's going to be a Cali, Denver, Wisconsin, Chicago and Minneapolis I go to at least once a month for different shows and what not.

Thus, for dealers like Bryan while their initial motivations may have revolved around making money, they quickly realized such money was best used on keeping the party going. While it may seem on the surface that such efforts at sustaining the party or having a good time are

facile and superficial expenditures of money for fun, for dealers like Bradford, Michael and Bryan, selling drugs provided them with a lifestyle and a constellation of associated experiences they felt they had little chance of attaining in any other way.

There was also one additional intangible motivation expressed by participants that existed in connection to the lifestyle associated with drugs, that of increased status and acceptance. It has been noted elsewhere that those who deal appreciate an increased level of status and acceptance within their networks (Erickson, Hochsteler and Copes, In Press). Dealing drugs brings with it significant increases in popularity, but a specific kind of popularity that is only salient when one has drugs. The dealers I talked to knew much of their status and acceptance was tied directly to their ability to provide people with drugs and the social esteem they enjoyed would evaporate when their services could no longer be counted on. Despite this, the dealers that I spoke to, and specifically those from Two Rivers, were motivated to deal, in some large part, to gain acceptance or increase status amongst a group of people they valued. Skippy speaks to his and other dealers' initial motivation for cash, but also the intangible rewards of status and social importance.

“I would say perceived necessity, in the quickness of making money. I would say a lot of it is probably the status that you achieve, people look at you different. People talk about you differently. It's just an elevated state in those circles. I wasn't super successful in making a lot of money but what I did, I would either spend on other drugs, the drugs I wasn't selling, or I would just treat people to food or alcohol. I liked, it was the same with the drugs too. I'd just buy the drugs and then share it with other people it was really like I was doing it strictly for other people to be honest. It kind of made people happy you know.”

These material and symbolic rewards of money, drugs, fun, status and self-esteem, constituent parts of the lifestyle of dealers, all encourage persistence in the trade and increased incorporation of the dispositions and values associated with drug dealing into one's

identity. Dealers from Two Rivers were able to pull from subculturally available narratives of drug use as something that was socially, materially, and intrinsically rewarding. Their participation in drug trade helped them elevate their status and enjoy the thrills of drug use, dealing and partying.

On the other hand, those from Winterton City were more apt to consider dealing drugs as a necessary solution to the problem of poverty and unemployment. Only a small number of dealers from Winterton City considered dealing “fun” or “recreation” in the way Jaquon did. Even then it was not “fun” in the sense most would consider. Take this exchange with Jaquon and how he describes drug dealing as an encapsulating experience that he enjoyed despite not making substantial profit from it.

J: I never made no money selling drugs. I wasn't trying to be a kingpin. Just enough to get by.

JE: It really wasn't about that for you?

J: It was about being able to have some money, extra money.

JE: How would you describe that lifestyle?

J: It was pretty fun, it got crazy every now and then.

JE: Is there a particularly crazy experience that stands out in your mind?

J: I mean just a whole bunch of guys just standing together and everybody just bum rush one car to see whose stuff this guy is gonna buy.

JE: So, it was almost like a race to the buyer?

J: Right, right, that's what it was.

JE: Did that ever lead to conflicts?

J: Oh, yeah. People got beat up, shot.

While Jaquon is calling on motivations of fun and excitement, the context he is in creates significantly different boundaries around what is considered fun and exciting. Indeed, on the rare occasions violent incidents occurred in the course of their selling, dealers from Two Rivers were frightened off by violence and actively avoided situations where violence seemed predictable. For Jaquon, and a small number like him, part of the encapsulating

experience of dealing drugs, and what they built their identity around was being tough, street smart, violent if necessary, and quick on their feet.

Survival

More commonly though, dealers from Winterton City often expressed to me that they were not getting rich or buying the jewelry, clothes, or cars stereotypically associated with participation in drug trade. Rather they were scratching together a living between poor or non-existent employment, lack of structural support, and oftentimes the experience of addiction. In this context, some were resistant to accept the label of “drug dealer” and rather considered themselves “survivors”. Many of the dealers I spoke to from Winterton City viewed the context they were in as a propellant to deal drugs. They found themselves in financial straits they could conceive of no way to rectify legitimately and so turned to dealing out of necessity. Take Chris for instance, a Black former user-dealer from Winterton City, who suggested he gleaned no status for his dealing efforts. For him dealing was a job, it was “survival mode”.

“Uh, motivation for selling drugs? It would just be that my situation, just the position I put myself in cuz, like I said I didn’t have to. You can go get a job, you can do this but the situation I was in at the time that, you know, just make something happen so that’s what, it wasn’t like I want to sell drugs to be cool, it’s I need some money, today, right now because I had to get something to eat right now. And this guy gots this and this guy wants this, you know so, it’s not like I’m a big bad ass [because] I sold drugs, for me it wasn’t. For certain people, there is, but for me it was just more of a survival mode. For me it was a job. Like I said it was survival mode. Like I gotta pay this, I gotta do this, this is what I got. But you don’t make that your main, you know you still gotta find other different other hustles too though.”

A desire for economic subsistence and independence was a motivating factor for all the dealer participants. Thus, dealers were motivated to make ends meet financially and protect themselves from degrading experiences because of their addictions. For women in

particular, dealing drugs was a suitable alternative to what they deemed much worse outcomes. Particularly for female dealers like Shanice, who sold to support her habit as her tolerance grew over time, such dealing was preferable to selling material possessions or her body for drugs and money. Take Athea, for instance, who noted the context she grew up in and how that shaped her motivations to sell drugs after I asked her if some person was influential in her decision to sell drugs.

A: So it wasn't the person that I seen selling drugs, they didn't encourage me at all. And as a matter of fact they had told me they didn't want to help me. Yeah, they were like, this is something you can get in trouble for, so there and then I had to explain to them, at this point in my life, I'm willing to do what I need to do to survive. But I wasn't willing to sell my body. So, that was not an option and so um I choose to do that.

J: So, you viewed the selling of drugs as a preferable option over selling your body?

A: Uh, yeah. Because I was sleeping on my friends' couches and you know um, I didn't want to be a like a, I don't what word I can use, I didn't want to be a bother to anyone. I did have a job and it was only part time because of my age, and I was still trying to go to drop in school for so many hours a day, like a couple hours a day. So I was really doing what I should have been doing by going to school and um trying to keep a level head, but it was just hard because um eventually when you are staying with people, they want rent money, they want a bill to be paid and you know. I had to by my own hygiene, and I was trying to do the best that I could but it just wasn't, you know, working out. Plus carrying the load of knowing that, wherever I go, there's going to be a need of some kind. No matter where you go, even if it's a place of your own you need to pay your rent, you need to keep up your things in order to have a place nice or whatever, there's always a need. So, I was like, well I know how to do this, am I going to be all in on it? If not I'm not going to survive, I'm going to be all used up by something.

On the one hand, for female dealers like Athea, a Black single mother from Winterton City who had been doing and selling drugs consistently for nearly 20 years, dealing drugs was viewed as a particularly important tactic for economic survival and physical security. On the other hand, for men one of the attractions to dealing was the women who would present

themselves to dealers. Male dealers appreciated the sex and dating options surrounding their trade and considered it a motivator to deal. Ronald alludes to this when he says,

“That’s the main thing a person always wants is to have a women around and get sex and all the stuff like that. It was exciting.”

More commonly though participants suggested their dealing was motivated by pursuits of survival and economic solvency. They were not chasing millions of dollars or a desire to be a “king pin”. Despite this, some of the dealers from Winterton City that entered the drug trade to survive made profits well beyond the level of subsistence and survival. Take Tyrone for instance, a Black dealer from Winterton City who got into selling drugs after a failed attempt at starting a business.

J: So, you got into selling because of hurting for money.

T: Well, yeah. My brother came to me and said if you need money you ought to sell what I sell. I never would sell but I was about to lose my house, car, kids. So, I wrote a check to a guy and he trusted me and I wrote on the bottom of the check, Friday I’ll be back for the check. He said, ok. I wrote a \$75 check and never looked back from there. When I went back on Friday I had about \$1600 in my pocket.

Tyrone was eventually successful enough at this that he was able to reinvest his money in a small subcontracting business and is now retired and volunteers at the local VA hospital.

Tyrone was a particularly lucky dealer as he had engaged in the trade for an extended period of time and enjoyed some success without experiencing significant levels of legal trouble.

This could not be said for others who were also motivated to make money and to survive, but found themselves making significantly more money than they needed to survive. Dom for instance was one of these. He grew up in a context where drug use and dealing were prevalent and viewed as an avenue to improve one’s economic position and began selling crack at the street level to make ends meet. After some time, Dom began to realize significant

success and was selling significant quantities of crack-cocaine. At that point, Dom says his motivation turned from survival to greed.

Dom - D: Money, that quick cash, right there that day. Like I said you can make 30 grand in less than 2 hours and you get greedy with it cuz you see all the money in front of you.

J: That's crazy, that's more than what I make in a year.

D: That's what I say, like I work you know. Well a person that don't want to put the time in you know what I'm saying most people don't want to put that time in I want to make this fast money. I'll keep this fast money, when your greediness comes you can't stop it, that's how it is. It was if need the money right here, right now. It wasn't no job, if I needed 30 grand I knew what to do, go sell that drug and come right back. It was just at that point when you get greedy with the money. When you see all that money, it' you making in like 2 hours then it's oh my god I can make more you know what I'm saying so that's when you get caught up and get greedy. That's what happened, I got a little too greedy.

Dom was the only dealer from Winterton City that I interviewed that earned this level of money, and by his own admission at a certain point his motivation went beyond subsistence into greed. However, he still draws boundaries between dealing as an occupation and making "fast money". It was something he did when he needed money, "right now". Indeed, later in our conversation he suggested his dealing was an act of survival, not a desired lifestyle from where he drew intangible rewards of status and self-esteem. This perception of his motivation and level of identification with drug dealing is shaped by the context he is in and the narratives available to him to bring meaning to his experiences.

Drug Trade and Identity

The context, both physical and social shaped the motivations of those I spoke with that engaged in drug dealing and ultimately informed their identity in relation to dealing. Dealers from Two Rivers were more apt to draw on motivations related to desiring a particular lifestyle characterized by increased status, partying and freedom. These dealers could be said to have constructed a "good time dealer" identity on the basis of these

influences as they drew from cultural narratives of drug trade as exciting and enthralling and associated with valued material and intangible rewards. Dealers from Winterton City on the other hand channeled a culturally available identity standard of a “hustler”. They viewed themselves as making the best of a bad situation, and while some were intermittent and weakly associated with dealing, they considered dealing a “hustle”, and themselves hustlers by extension, in much the same way as those who more fully identified as a dealer. While many of the dealers from Winterton City had been exposed to violence, and some had participated in violence themselves, they did not rely on an explicit street identity (Anderson 1999). Rather than projecting an intimidating street persona, to be a hustler, was to see an avenue to make some cash, whether as a quasi-occupation or a way to get through a rough patch. Some dealers from Winterton City also called on a “survivor dealer” identity and viewed themselves as forced into dealing to make the best of a bad situation. Due to feeling coerced into dealing, those that identified with a survivor dealer identity had a weaker identification with drug dealing and drug subculture than those who perceived more agency in their choice to deal.

As many of the dealers were entrepreneurial minded in their decision to sell drugs, it was this motivation that informed how they viewed themselves as dealers. They did not embody a stereotypical street tough. Indeed, several actively characterized themselves in the opposite manner. Indeed, Skippy rather comically emblemized this when he described how he dealt with those that did not pay up.

J: What did you do when people didn't pay back?

S: uh (laughs), I tried to be a badass. I tried to be like, ‘hey you’re gonna need to pay up’, ‘oh sorry, I’ll get it to you eventually’, ‘hey I’m not really messing around’, and they’re like, ‘what are you gonna do?’, and ‘well, uh, I, I don’t know’ (laughs), ‘I don’t know to be honest... I’ll throw some fish heads on your porch, I don’t know, you know where I live so it

doesn't even matter, you go up to my house, (mimicking shouting) 'hey he's selling drugs', so you got that over me' (laughs).

While the first few times Skippy got stiffed he tried to pull from cultural repertoires of drug dealers as mean, aggressive, and not to be trifled with, he quickly learned this was not a strategy that would be met with success. Skippy is White, 25 and from Two Rivers with slight physical features that would not allow him to project a tough, street minded dealer successfully. His underlying personal motivations, personal dispositions and identity as a dealer did not promote violence as a plausible course of action. Instead of intimidation or violence, which several of the dealers I spoke with had experienced, far from internalizing a street leaning persona as a dealer, he eventually learned to chalk up losses and move on. Dealers like him viewed violence as immoral, unnecessary, and inefficient, and recognized that it brought unwanted police attention. Thus, dealers incorporate their dealing behaviors into their identity in a way that made sense of their experience in the present and what they intended to be in the future. The violent part of drug dealer identities, although certainly available in the wider cultural repertoire, simply does not fit in more privileged contexts and among people with greater life-chances. While it was uncommon, dealers from Winterton City were more apt to codeswitch to a "street" leaning identity should the situation arise. All that I talked to who had engaged in violence, disliked it, but viewed it as a part of maintaining a reputation that was integral to operating a successful business as a drug dealer, and not someone who could be "stiffed", "rolled", or "jacked".

Dealers generally viewed their participation in drug trade positively. The degree to which participants identified with their participation positively was also influenced by the degree of perceived choice participants had in dealing drugs, as well as the degree to which they perceived themselves as successful at the trade. Among those in my sample that sold

drugs, identification as drug dealer came from the ability to engage in other conventional activities that gave them a sense of pride and self-worth they felt they could not achieve through more conventional channels. They were able to enjoy both material and symbolic rewards from the efforts of their dealing and constructed a “good time dealer” identity due to these rewards. For them, dealing was largely a positive and redeeming experience from which to build a rewarding sense of identity. Skippy, a former dealer, who stopped after finding conventional work he found enjoyable was a good example of this. His background as a working class kid whose parents were divorced at a young age provided a context for him to reach out to other people for attention, affection, and belonging. Dealing drugs provided him with a ready avenue for these efforts. When I asked Skippy how committed he was to dealing drugs he responded this way,

“Um, yeah. I would say that it was part of my persona for a while. I enjoyed having all this attention I guess. I enjoyed being needed or something like that. Um, it made me feel sort of valued in a way, and I was filling a need that I was something that I had never really felt before, being someone who supplied amenities, or commodities, that brings joy to people. But at the same time, I could be baking cookies for people and I would still probably get the same feeling, it’s just that being valued for the job that you do, it made me feel like I had a purpose I guess.”

Dealers like Skippy draw a significant sense of satisfaction from their dealings. They appreciate the increased attention, the feeling of “filling a need”, and “providing joy to people”. These feelings of satisfaction encourage the incorporation of drug dealing into one’s identity or “persona” and encourage persistence in the trade. Yet, Skippy noted he could likely receive the same intangible rewards from baking. However, as a working class male from the Midwest, baking likely did not present itself as a viable course of action to construct a meaningful sense of identity that would net returns of affection and pride. Thus, dealing provided drug trade participants with more than economic remuneration for their efforts,

including symbolic rewards of pride and status that bound them to the role and promoted their persistence in the trade.

Those from Two Rivers existed in a decidedly different context and practiced dealing drugs differently than those in Winterton City. This informed the way they incorporated it into their identity. They enjoyed their experience as dealers. They were not trying to scratch out a living. They were specifically trying to have fun. In this context, their motivations were hedonistic, their rewards material and symbolic, and the depth to which they incorporated their dealing activity into their identity was significant. Bryan was a particularly successful active dealer at the time of our conversation. From our conversation, Bryan was a likeable fellow who seemed almost entirely motivated by money and good times. Yet when I talked to Bryan more it became clear that he derived significant intangible rewards from his participation in much the same way as Skippy. I asked Bryan how much he thought his drug involvement influenced his perception of self and behaviors. He had this to say,

B: Uh, in middle school I didn't think of myself so greatly and now I think I'm an upstanding citizen and what not.

J: So, it's improved your self-esteem?

B: Oh, yeah. 100%

J: What do you think about it has improved your perception?

B: Just smoking makes me feel better. And learning, educating myself made me feel like this isn't bad, you know, I'm providing a service, you know, yadda yadda so.

J: How do you think your life would be different if you'd never gotten into drugs.

B: Oh my god! I could not even. I would be a square. I think, I wouldn't have as much personality I guess that I have. I wouldn't be so outspoken I guess I'd be more of an introvert. I wouldn't go out and party at the bars as heavily as I do. Because a lot of people in even in this town I know pretty well. I'll go to any bar or restaurant and hey, what's up man? Even in the nearby larger city I can do that.

Dealers like Bryan draw improved self-esteem from their participation selling drugs because they become insulated by a network of largely trustworthy, reliable, non-violent drug users

who shower them with affection and shared good times for their service. This stands in stark contrast with many of the dealers I spoke to from Winterton City who described significantly more tenuous experiences associated with a life of selling drugs. Additionally, Bryan points out for those aiming for “life as party” the peer connections one makes are integral to the maintenance of such a lifestyle and it is clear he drew pride from his subcultural notoriety.

By incorporating their role as dealer into their identity, the actions of participants began to be shaped in part by their experiences and the values and modes of perception they had gained as dealers. Michael provides an excellent discussion of how his experiences ultimately changed him at a fundamental level effecting his identity and decision making processes.

M: Pretty much after that (a previous story about being kidnapped and extorted) you know I had a few other crazy things, but uh I had something happen to me before that that me and a buddy were shot at over a deal gone bad and they were chasing us and he was an older dude at the time and I think I was 14, 15 and all he kept telling me was ‘one scenario at a time, one scenario at a time, one scenario at a time’. It took me a while to figure out what he was saying not until I got into some more shifty stuff later on in life that I realized, deal with this, deal with this, deal with this, and then you’re done.

J: So do you think that’s influenced how you live your life generally, like day to day, week to week?

M: oh yeah. I’m spontaneous for sure. I could wake up tomorrow and leave my job, I’m taking off. Cause you never know when your gonna wake up or not wake up. I could die with a trillion dollars in my bank account and that doesn’t do me any good. So...

After over a decade of using and dealing various forms of drugs Michael has come to almost entirely incorporate the dispositions and values associated with drug trade into his identity.

His experiences dealing provided for him a template to bring meaning to his experiences and his identity, and motivated consonant action in all spheres of his life, not just those related to drugs.

The way in which those most deeply embedded in drug networks and subculture incorporated the dealing into their identity had real effects for the ways in which they practiced the trade. Dealers from Two Rivers generally abstained from dealing crack, meth, or heroin as they viewed them negatively. Their motivations for fun, and identity as good time dealers, ran oppositional to the cultural narratives they had encountered about the use of such drugs and encouraged them to draw boundaries which precluded using and dealing them.

Dealers from Winterton City who viewed their efforts at dealing as a mode of survival sold whatever they could find, even if they had some moral qualms about selling such drugs. Dealers from Two Rivers could be characterized as “good time dealers”. Those from Winterton City pulled from a decidedly different cultural repertoire: hustlers. Because of the neighborhood and cultural context that surrounded dealers from Winterton City they were more apt to incorporate a hustler mentality into their identity. This is emblemized nicely by Jaquon when he says,

JE: Ultimately for you how much do you think your involvement with drug dealing has affected your perception or way you view yourself?
 J: Well, I mean, from I mean like, let’s say if you a hustler you a hustler. That’s saying you can make money however you deem necessary. One would say, well, I’m going to hustle these drugs when others will say I’m going to hustle these clothes, you know what I’m saying. It gave you the mentality to become a better salesman.

Jaquon emphasized that the hustler mentality is not about a readiness to violence or intolerance to insults characteristic of a “street persona” (Anderson 1999), but rather is about “making money however you deem necessary”. For Jaquon, and dealers from Winterton City, the context of prevalent neighborhood crime, drugs, and experiences of poverty that shaped their motivations to “survive”, also shaped how they incorporated dealing into their

narrative identity. They were not the sorts of dealers depicted in popular media. It is true that some did experience and engage in violence, but none liked or drew any sense of enjoyment from these experiences. The effect of having incorporated the dispositions of a “hustler” into their narrative identity had ramifications for non-deviant spheres of their life and shaped their overall “mentality”. This effect cut across race, ethnicity and gender and seemed to be a product of class and residential location. Rose was a White user-dealer from Winterton City who explained to me who she was and how she came to know she was a “hustler”.

R: See I’m a hustler, when I realized I was a good drug dealer, I’ve dealt drugs more than I’ve done them. I’m all about the money honey. But I also was very fortunate and blessed to have hooked up with the kind of people who taught me well. I don’t care what I do, I try to do it to the best of my ability and to be good at it. And I made a good drug dealer, I mean not that there is a good one but.

J: But successful.

R: Yeah. But I’ll never forget my best friend telling me you’ll never be a good drug dealer. And, I’m like why not? And he’s, cause you got a conscience. And I said that’s why I’m going to be a good one. And he oh, and I was a good one. But when my kids got old enough and I didn’t want them growing up knowing their mom was a dope dealer and everything, I knew they deserved better and I deserved better and everything. So I eventually went to try and get help with daycare and such so I could go back to school and that ended up blowing up in my face and I lost my two kids.

J: Oh no!

R: Yeah, because of the fucking justice system. I was such a good drug dealer, I took the food stamps so I could be sure I could always feed my kids because you cannot depend on drug dealing being a good time. Just because you’re dealing doesn’t mean you’ll be getting paid that time as an example. I couldn’t prove how I was taking care of these kids and so well for so many years so yeah.

J: How did those experiences and your experiences as a dealer change your opinion of yourself?

R: Well, considering I never, that’s a good question, I never really knew who I was for a long time. I never really had a childhood. That’s weird cuz until here lately, I never really considered or thought about me even though it’s always been about me-if that makes any sense. I guess I never really had an opinion about myself until I started... oh gosh, that’s a good question. What was it again, how did I think of myself.

J: Yes, how did your experience with drugs alter your opinion or how you thought of yourself.

R: Well, I don't know because before drugs it's almost like I didn't exist.

Rose provides an excellent example of how the context she was in from childhood (noted above), set the stage for her association with peers who had attitudes conducive to involvement with drugs. She noted here how she quickly came to realize she was a "hustler". While she received symbolic rewards from her dealing, she brought meaning to them in a significantly different way than did those from Two Rivers. She valued being clandestine and begrudged the humble circumstances where she was likely to remain. Rose's narrative described how she viewed herself as a dealer and the type of esteem she generated from it. She went on to note how her kids were taken from her, in part, because she was a "good" drug dealer, which had the effect of cutting off the only reason she had to go straight, her children. The effects of a life lived like this is increased identification with a "hustler" mentality and behaviors consonant with that identity. Rose, and others like her, are denied or have had removed meaningful, purposefully chosen social identities. To fill that void they sometimes construct identities as hustlers in order to maintain a sense of self as someone who is strong, independent, and able to make ends meet in predictably permanent, harsh and precarious circumstances.

Dealers who felt they were forced into dealing either because of dire economic circumstance or due to the coercive force of a significant other developed a weaker association with their drug involvement and less actively incorporated their involvement into their identity. They were more apt to call on a "survivor dealer" identity in which dealing was viewed as a means to an end, an effort at making ends meet, and a choice forced by circumstance. This perception was found exclusively among those from Winterton City. I

found those who enjoyed symbolic rewards of pride and social esteem as a consequence of their dealing were more active dealers than those that did so to “pay a big bill” or to supplement their income in a time of need. Take for instance Rock, a Black user-dealer from Winterton City, who suggested his motivation was simply to get some cash to make ends meet and his depressed earnings as a dealer negated the intangible rewards he might receive, and thus build his identity around.

J: So, what was the motivation for dealing?

R: Yeah, get some cash.

J: How committed to that role, to drug dealing were you?

R: It was just something that I did for side cash

J: Side cash?

R: Side cash. I wasn't trying to be American Gangster like Denzel Washington and go to Vietnam and get it right directly from the source, no, no, no (laughs). And that was just something to do. It gave me something to start with and it gave me a little starter kit, you know. Put one and one together and now you got two.

Because dealers like Rock were just using dealing as a way to get by, to subsist economically, or maintain their addiction they did not draw the types of intangible and experiential rewards that those who made enough money to spend on lifestyle pursuits did. While such participants admitted to their dealing and identified as dealers. They did not do so with the same sort of gusto as those who had more fully incorporated dealing drugs into their identity. Clearly, privilege shaped the form of drug dealer self-conceptions, and so does income from drugs, but there was also difference by context no matter the income level. The survivor self-depiction seems more readily available and was more frequently used among Winterton City residents.

It has long been noted that dealing drugs is a highly gendered activity in which those that deal are able to enact masculine scripts of behavior. Recently though more attention has been paid to the experience of female dealers and I found gender norms informed the identity

of dealers in ways that often made their identification with dealing less salient. Specifically, women often engaged in dealing at the behest of romantic partners, and while some females viewed their dealing positively others viewed it quite negatively. Take Kandy, a Black dealer from Two Rivers, who had substantial experience dealing drugs on behalf of a coercive boyfriend.

“I mean, I had a good time but I was also during my abusive relationship time, so I would have gave up the money to have my sanity yeah, you know what I’m saying but at that time did I, no. You know I just kept going, he beat me up today, but he gave me \$300 tonight. That was pretty much how it was justified, you beat me to abuse me and you pay me to just be humble about it.”

Kandy, very much appreciated the money and lifestyle she enjoyed while a dealer, but this was also coupled with an abusive relationship, one where her partner required her to sell on his behalf. At the time, and under the circumstances Kandy was in, she had accepted this as her life. Yet, after roughly a decade of this her boyfriend was sent to prison and Kandy quickly pivoted from drug dealer to regular user. For Kandy, and those like her, her identity as a dealer was tied up in her romantic relationships and the domineering, coercive, abusive force that she encountered as a female inside a chaotic relationship.

Mothers who felt they had to deal to support their family economically were particularly reticent to accept the label of dealer. They viewed dealing drugs as a necessary evil in an attempt to provide themselves and their children with the basic necessities of life. Athea, a user-dealer from Winterton City was particularly hesitant to embrace an identity as a drug dealer as she only dealt when she needed to “supplement her income” or “pay a big bill”.

“Well, I wasn’t a drug dealer, I, well I guess I was. I wasn’t like you know somebody who was buying cars or jewelry, I did it every once in a while to pay a bill or something. It was just something that I had to do when I

was younger it was to survive, as I got older it was to, I don't know how you would word it, it was to supplement my income."

Thus, for many women, their identity as drug dealers were linked to obligations associated with significant others such as children or romantic partners, and their identification with and participation in dealing ceased when these obligations faded. Additionally, Athea emphasized the reason she did not more fully identify as a dealer was because she was not experiencing the material and symbolic rewards associated with the trade. Thus, differences in motivations informed the identity of dealers and ultimately the ways in which they practiced their trade. Those that dealt as a matter of survival, and who only slightly incorporated dealing into their identity, suggested they sold less drugs than those who enjoyed material and symbolic rewards that encouraged their persistence. Women dealers tended to talk about survival, and it is probably in part due to their familial obligations in the lower class, as well as their relative position in drug dealing networks and subcultures in comparison to men. Due to these influences female dealers from Winterton City considered themselves survivors and dealing drugs was just one manifestation of their efforts at surviving.

CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The goals of this study were to examine how physical and social context inform individual motivations for involvement with drugs, the meaning brought to involvement, the way that people identified with these behaviors and to what consequence. I find participants' understanding of and identification with their drug involvement was significantly shaped by cultural context and the influences of race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location. These influences informed the narratives available to people that motivate, bring meaning to, and shaped how participants identified with drug involvement. Indeed, future research on deviant identity and decision making that does not incorporate an understanding of the background of offenders and the context offenders move through will draw erroneous interpretations from descriptions of situated actions and motives (Mills 1940).

I drew on the work of Bourdieu (1977;1984;1986;1989;1990;1993) and work from the field of narrative criminology (Presser and Sandberg 2015), to provide an explication of the motives for drug involvement, the way participants viewed their surroundings to have informed their involvement in drugs and how participants constructed an identity in relation to their involvement. Bourdieu's three concepts of habitus, field, and capital were integral for how I made sense of participant talk. Recall that "habitus" refers to the underlying dispositions and attitudes of individuals that are inculcated on them in early life and inform their choices and behaviors. "Fields" are metaphorical spaces of social interaction which provide guidelines for interaction for the individuals embedded in them. Subcultures can be considered fields of action as they provide roadmaps, rules, or cognitive schemas a person uses to orient themselves in social space. "Capital" refers to a host of material (e.g. money) and intangible (e.g. modes of dress and address) resources people can use to position

themselves within fields of social action which are hierarchically organized. “Narratives” are cultural resources which provide templates of identities and actions available to actors in social life. Together these theoretical insights provide the concept of “narrative habitus” (Fleetwood 2016), which calls attention to the influence of narrative selection as informed by differences in habitus, fields of action and levels of capital.

I found participants’ habitus, or the generative structure working below the level of identity was informed by the contexts of their early lives. Their habitus was formed by interactions with family and valued peers that shaped their foundational understanding of the world, as well as helped structure the fields of action they navigated through. These fields of action present their own logics, norms, values and rules for participation, and participants learned these rules and norms and incorporated them into their habitus. In doing so, they were simultaneously presented with various subcultural narratives from which to bring meaning to and construct their narrative identity in relation to their drug involvement. Different contexts and fields of action provided different narratives from which participants could construct an identity. The influences of individual habitus and differential fields of action combined with individual levels of capital informed how participants constructed their narrative identity.

Consider the two lengthy narratives from Rose above. Her early life circumstances inscribed on her habitus a dispositional tendency to fend for oneself and stand up to perceived abuses. She was fiercely independent and determined to be tough. Such dispositions and environment did not foster positive growth and led Rose to use drugs to cope with the pain caused by her relationships with her family. Once ingratiated and invested in subcultural networks, Rose was presented with subcultural narratives she could map her

own prior experience onto and associate with herself. Due to Rose's habitus, valuing independence and self-reliance, she selected a "hustler" narrative to bring meaning to her experience and constructed a hustler identity in relation to her use and dealing. An identity as a "good time dealer" was simply not available to Rose. She did not have the economic or cultural capital necessary to sidestep issues with addiction and the legal system. An identity as a "survivor dealer" would not have suited Rose either. Her habitus, or her underlying dispositional and attitudinal characteristics, would not allow her to draw from a survivor narrative that would have emphasized her lack of agency and choice. Rather Rose's fiercely independent disposition, her habitus, encouraged her to call on a subculturally prevalent "hustler" mentality to construct a purposely chosen and meaningful identity. Her success as a dealer provided her with field specific symbolic capital that allowed her to maintain a hustler identity which those that tried and failed at the trade could not possess. Rose's case provides an illustrative account of how habitus, fields of action, capital and narratives can coalesce into a narrative habitus that informs identity and decision making.

I found drug use and identification with drug use was more positively tinged for White, working class individuals from Two Rivers who had experienced few negative consequences from their use. Their experiences of insulation in a working class suburb in the Midwest where it was "boring" provided a context where people, specifically young men, sought to construct a meaningful sense of identity that contrasted with the humdrum of their everyday lives. Most of the drug users I talked to from Two Rivers had a habitus which provided them a perception of their community as "boring" and drugs as mechanism to deal with mundane life through excitement and fun. With this habitus, shaped by their immediate context and upbringing, participants from Two Rivers self-selected into groups of like-

minded peers with shared understandings of drugs extending beyond pharmacological effects. In these groups, they were presented with the subcultural dispositions, values and rules that are the substance of social fields. Here, the subcultural field presented narratives of use that allowed participants to construct specific forms of identity associated with drug involvement, which justify it as harmless, playful, or valuable. The exact form or content of any participant's unique narrative identity was formed at the intersections of their habitus, fields of action, and levels of capital. Users from Two Rivers had significantly more economic, social and cultural capital than did those from Winterton City. These differences, along with differential neighborhood context, shaped the fields of action available to participants and, in turn, the narratives available for them to construct a meaningful identity. Due to these constellation of differences, the way people brought meaning to their behavior varied, but important markers of identity including race/ethnicity, class and gender were also important and shaped the meaning of drugs and how participants identified with their drug involvement. Many users from Two Rivers were able to construct identities in relation to their use, while drawing on narratives of fun, hedonism and rebellion. These findings are in line with other researchers who note these are attributes that are particularly valued among White, working class males and can explain both their participation and the degree to which they incorporated their drug use into their identity (Collison 1996). I found women also called on party narratives to construct their identities as drug users, but it seemed their identification was less intense. Thus, drug users from Two Rivers were apt to construct a party identity in relation to their drug use regardless of gender, but to varying degrees of intensity and import for their narrative identity.

Alternatively, drug users from Winterton City who were able to cast themselves against extreme forms of drug use and addiction, constructed a “responsible drug user” identity in relation to their drug use which drew on ideals of moderation. Drug use was not cast as wild, joyful and exploratory, but more often as an escape from reality, a fact of life, or a way to cope with the stressors of everyday life. Boundary work in which users constructed an identity by casting themselves against “addicts” or “junkies” was rarely done by White working or middle class individuals but regularly engaged in by people of color and Winterton City residents. However, positive valuations of drug use and self, regardless of the form they took on, were only projected by those with the capital to claim they were not drug addicts. Addicts drew from different narrative repertoires to provide, largely negative, meaning to their experience as drug users. While only a small number from Two Rivers talked of addiction relative to those from Winterton City, addiction seems to bring its own way of talking about drugs to the forefront across contexts. While some participants did become addicts, there is little analytic value in grouping all those who identify as addicts together. Thus, I noted some of the ways gender intersected with drug use and addiction in ways that informed how people identified as drug users, such as the super mom versus failing mom distinction discussed above.

While not all those who had traumatic, chaotic or emotionally cold upbringings were motivated to cope with these experiences through drug use and incorporate a consonant conception of themselves as drug users, this was common in my sample. Specifically, this was most common amongst those from Winterton City, regardless of race/ethnicity or gender. Lacking significant capital of any kind, and surrounded by adverse experiences, they were positioned to draw from cultural narratives of abuse, neglect and deprivation to

motivate their use and bring meaning to their identities as users. Even those participants from Winterton City who enjoyed their drug involvement in some ways had negative perceptions of it in general. This stands in stark contrast to views that were more frequent among Two Rivers residents who often considered their drug use to have enriched their lives. Even those with hardships in Two Rivers were likely to cast the positives of drug involvement similar to those around them, rather than seeing their use as a reaction to misery or an emotional coping mechanism. It has been noted elsewhere that individuals can construct different narratives around the same experiences (Chafe 1980). Indeed, Reissman (1993:64) notes, “It is always possible to narrate the same events in radically different ways, depending on the values and interests of the narrator. Telling about complex and troubling events *should* vary because the past is a selective reconstruction. Individuals exclude experiences that undermine the current identities they wish to claim.” I provide evidence which shows how participants construct “radically different” narratives of similar experiences, in part, as a product of navigating different social fields which provide them different narratives with which to construct narratives consonant with the identity they are *able* to project. All users would like to maintain a positive, rewarding sense of identity in the face of their drug use, but only some are able. Powers (2018) has discussed there exist few positive narratives of drug use from which people of color can understand their drug use and historically, drug users of color have dealt with cultural narratives of “drug brutes”. I would suggest the same can be said for those of economic disadvantage. Lacking economic, social and cultural capital, the only way one can construct a positive identity despite their drug use is to accrue and project subculturally valued symbolic capital, most notably the ability to maintain functionality in daily life and not be viewed a “dope head”. As Powers (2018) noted, to identify positively with one’s drug

use was simply not possible for people of color, particularly those of economic disadvantage. When these narratives did emerge in popular culture like the Cheech and Chong films mentioned by Adrian, as well as Powers (2018), they showed drug users of color using almost exclusively cannabis to cartoonish effects. This is certainly not in line with the types of spiritual or personal awakenings associated with the “psychedelic exception” (Powers 2018), extended to the more extreme forms of use by White people in popular media and culture (e.g. Ram Das, Terrence McKenna, Hunter S. Thompson, note all are male). Thus, the prevalence and salience of cultural narratives, intervening social identities (e.g. mother), and the forms of capital people possess dictate which narratives people can use to construct their narrative identity.

Gender was particularly important for the ways in which participants incorporated their lives as drug users into their identity. Gender roles and obligations are inscribed on peoples’ habitus (McNay 1999), at young ages and predispose them to value certain characteristics in themselves. By “doing gender” (West and Zimmerman 1987), they enact these gender roles and project a gendered social identity. Drug user is also a social identity and at the intersection of drug user and gender, I find that both men and women pull from gender expectations. They use these gendered obligations and role expectations to bring meaning to their drug use and construct their identity.

I find that men more actively “do gender” through their drug use. They project attitudes of rebelliousness, independence, and bravery that are hallmarks of hegemonic masculinity. Alternatively, while women “do gender” while doing drugs, women also use gender norms and expectations to evaluate their behaviors and inform the way they have incorporated drug use into their identity (i.e. “super moms” vs. “failing moms”). It is

interesting to note, participants in these cases were engaged in the same sorts of drug related behaviors. The ability for them to pull from narratives of motherhood that intersected with positive narratives of drug use was because they possessed levels of cultural or symbolic capital that helped them navigate experiences with police, child welfare, and the streets. This allowed them to maintain “functionality” as a drug user, and in some cases, construct an identity as a “super mom”. Thus, constructing an identity in relation to their drug use was less a matter of behavior and more a matter of an individual’s unique habitus, and the possession of various capitals and experiences that conditioned the narratives they might use to bring meaning to their behavior.

Few dealers I spoke to seem interested in stylistic displays of wealth or power but rather viewed themselves and their behaviors with an entrepreneurial spirit. Almost none embodied a street persona (Anderson 1999). This stands in contrast to what others have noted who study drug dealers (Sandberg 2008). This is likely because there are a multitude of ways a person can present oneself as a dealer and multiple subcultural forms one can draw from to construct a meaningful sense of identity. As noted above, much of these differences can be attributed to individual differences in habitus, levels of capital and various fields of action to which the actor may be exposed. It is certainly the case that many dealers do pull from subculturally available narratives of a stereotypical street identity but this was not common among those that I talked to, even those that had violent experiences. My sample consisted of a wide variety of dealers, and the few street leaning dealers I talked to is likely representative relative to larger proportion of “regular” users and dealers who do not embody the stereotype of the corner crew boss from open-air drug markets. It is likely that there are many more “decent” people than “street”, even in drug using and dealing circles (Anderson 1999).

The differences which emerged in the way dealers articulated their experiences related to the lifestyle that selling drugs provided them, and which in part, motivated their participation: conspicuous consumption and survival. Dealers from Two Rivers enjoyed their experience as dealers both for the monetary and intangible rewards associated with their efforts. For these good time dealers who already had the basic necessities of life, dealing was viewed as an enthralling activity in which one could build a rewarding sense of identity when their conventional life lacked any such avenue. Those dealers from Two Rivers that had economic capital prior to dealing were able to increase their levels of capital and enjoy intangible rewards of status, respect, and esteem. Ultimately, because of their insulation and privilege they were able to avoid serious ramifications for their actions. As a byproduct, many incorporated the dispositional and attitudinal qualities associated with being a good time dealer with real effects for their motivations and actions related and unrelated to drugs, as noted by participants above like Michael.

Dealers from Winterton City on the other hand were apt to consider their participation in dealing an act of survival. Even those who were successful at the trade and dealt more than to simply subsist had to deal with the dangers of being robbed, assaulted, or arrested on a daily basis. They also knew that their economic prospects and situations were precarious. Those without economic capital prior to dealing, and who engaged in dealing as a way to “survive”, did not have the same insulation and privilege as the counterparts from Two Rivers. They were apt to draw on narratives of hard living to contextualize, motivate and bring meaning to dealing. Some of these dealers considered themselves hustlers and by doing so turned their circumstances of disadvantage into evidence of their ability. They could make it under any condition or circumstance: rich, poor, or incarcerated. Drugs were viewed as one

of a number of various “hustles” required to get by. Indeed, some participants mentioned an interview with me for an hour at \$50 remuneration was a hustle in itself. However, participants did note it was through sustained experience in the subcultural world of drug dealing that they had learned how to hustle. Their lives and place taught this sort of fast and constant opportunism. Thus, participants incorporated the dispositions and attitudes related to drug dealing in a way that allowed them to view themselves in a positive light despite behavior and circumstances. Some dealers though were simply surviving, and could be called “survivor dealers”. These dealers perceived much less agency in their choice to deal and many felt coerced into dealing drugs to avoid degrading and humiliating experiences associated with poverty and life on the streets. While survivor dealers and hustlers often engaged in similar forms of use and sales, they drew from distinctly different subcultural narratives to bring meaning to their experiences and identities. Much like their counterparts from Two Rivers, the effect of their dealing was to reproduce, or fall from, the social position they had before they began the trade. Indeed, this is why many users from Winterton City noted they did not deal drugs despite their economic situation. They could not afford the risk to their social status, freedom, or dreams of upward mobility. While this may be true for all participants, those from Winterton City would be significantly more effected by any losses of freedom, opportunity, or future earning potential.

There are several limitations related to this research. The sample, while large by qualitative research standards, lacks sufficient size to yield large enough comparison groups to split analysis in several desirable ways. First, I was unable to locate enough female dealers from Two Rivers to make any confident inferences about the way in which White, working to middle class female dealers motivated their dealing, brought meaning to it, and

incorporated it into their identity. This is particularly unfortunate as there is a paucity of research on this subject. Second, while there is race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location variation in the sample, it is somewhat collapsed into residential location. This was inescapable as a study incorporating and analyzing all of this variation would need to be very large. It is best to see residents of Winterton City or Two Rivers as indicative of many variables. Largely, participants from Two Rivers were White, working to middle class individuals, while the significant majority of those from Winterton City were Black people of economic disadvantage. This collapsing of variation makes it more difficult to infer salient differences in the way participants understood context, motivated their drug involvement, brought meaning to their behaviors and incorporated it into their identity across race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location. Additionally, I interviewed very few people of color who were not Black. Only a small handful of participants identified as any other racial or ethnic background than White or Black. Thus, this study cannot speak to the varied and nuanced ways that being Latinx for instance, informs motivation and identity as they relate to drug involvement. Additionally, this study is retrospective and asked participants to go back, sometimes decades, into their memories for how they remember perceiving things when they were younger or in a haze of drug intoxication. Within narrative criminology, these last concerns are not viewed as particularly problematic, as identities are inherently reconstructive endeavors in which people draw from the past to develop a sense of who they are. The factual veracity of accounts is relatively unimportant. More important are the ways perceptions of the past inform identity in the present and motivate action in the future (Presser and Sandberg 2015). Despite other limitations noted here, the research presented in this study provides significant insights into the ways in which people who are

involved with drugs develop an association with drugs, bring meaning to their use and incorporate meaning into their identity across their lifecourse.

This study has significant implications for research, theory, practice and policy. This study is among the first qualitative criminological studies to provide an empirically driven examination of the ways race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location intersect to inform deviant identity and decision making. Moreover, the findings provide evidence that deviant identities are not situationally constructed and enacted. Instead, deviant behaviors are incorporated into an individual's pre-existing identity and are shaped by important markers of social identity and local context. Future research on drug use and dealing should investigate more closely the nuanced influences of race/ethnicity, class, gender and residential location in a way that can be sensitive to each and their relation to motivations to use or deal. These may provide the most pragmatic of research implications regarding intervention and desistance. Additionally, future research may want to turn more attention to the role of parenthood in drug use and dealing. While the influence of motherhood was not a focus initially, female participants' discussion of it made it important for analysis. Only a few male participants discussed obligations of fatherhood and research on how fatherhood intersects and informs involvement with drugs is limited (for an exception see, Grundetjern, Copes and Sandberg In Press).

I suggest identification with drug involvement becomes important for an individual's sense of identity, which motivates their persistence beyond the pharmacological influences of use. While the experience of social and economic disadvantage certainly creates barriers to desistance, I would add that the development of a salient, socially meaningful identity around drug involvement acts as its own impediment to desistance. When one perceives no moral

issue with their behavior, has developed important peer connections due to their participation, has experienced little repercussions and, in fact, views their drug use as something that contributes to their happiness, satisfaction and contentment it seems natural to continue the association. Theoretically the research presented here shows the empirical limits of a perspective like narrative criminology when not fused with a perspective like Bourdieu's, which can explain how people can incorporate drug involvement into their identity in different ways while existing in similar social conditions. People choose the narratives they live by, they do not passively receive cultural narratives, and in doing so they enact and reproduce their chosen identities and associated dispositions and values. To put it simply, one's habitus informs the narratives individuals will choose to orient their experience, from the fields they are present in, and from what is locally common. While the examination of narratives was key to this study, Bourdieu's conceptual tools provide a more fully elucidated understanding of choice and identity in relation to crime. Additionally, I provide evidence that while both men and women "do gender" by acting out norms of masculinity and femininity with their drug involvement, women also use norms of femininity as an evaluative standard for their identity. Finally, the results presented above provide rich insight for lifecourse criminology's understanding of the development of deviant identities, their evolution across the lifecourse and their effect on deviant and non-deviant spheres of life.

The results presented here may provide insight into drug prevention and rehabilitation efforts. Indeed, understanding motivations of individuals who use or sell drugs will allow practitioners to address the types of attitudes and beliefs that lend themselves to drug involvement (Pomazal and Brown 1977). The cost of not engaging in such research which

can adequately address the antecedents of drug involvement not only negatively effects drug users, but extends to society in both social and economic burdens. I found that those who existed at the intersection of multiple disadvantages were most negatively affected by their involvement. Their lack of economic and social support made it harder for them to manage as they dealt with the daily realities of drug use and life in disorganized neighborhoods.

Conversely, the privilege of those from Two Rivers buffered them from the negatives associated with drug involvement and today many are leading prosocial and productive lives with various levels of drug involvement. Thus, the experience of economic disadvantage and social exclusion is a significant factor in determining the lifecourse trajectory of those involved with drugs. Efforts aimed at addressing these concerns will have the effect of reducing drug use and curbing the deleterious effects of drugs. Indeed, female dealers in disadvantaged circumstances would be most swayed from their involvement by programs aimed at providing them with economic independence in perpetuity, as well as support for experiences of sexual and domestic abuse.

All people desire socially rewarding and meaningful identities. Yet people are not entirely free to be who they want. The way people understand and talk about themselves is conditioned by their habitus, capitals and the fields of action which present them with salient narratives and templates for identity construction. Influences of race/ethnicity, class and gender impose upon actors, their decision-making processes and how they view themselves, making understanding any individual person's identity an onerous task. Instead, I have presented several ideal-type identities that circulate within drug subcultures which users and dealers use to construct a meaningful identity, discussed the various conditions under which such identities are likely to be presented by participants, and the extent to which such

identities impose upon the narrative identity actors possess. The identities presented herein by participants are more than post-hoc rationalizations, they are socially contextualized, purposely constructed, meaningful markers of identification that give shape to people's sense of self and orient their decision making as they navigate through life.

REFERENCES

- Adler, Patricia A. 1993. *Wheeling and Dealing: An Ethnography of an Upper-Level Drug Dealing and Smuggling Community*. Columbia University Press.
- Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler. 1983. "Shifts and Oscillations in Deviant Careers: The Case of Upper-Level Drug Dealers and Smugglers." *Social Problems* 31(2):195–207.
- Adler, Patricia A. and Peter Adler. 1978. "Tinydopers: A Case Study of Deviant Socialization." *Symbolic Interaction* 1(2):90–105.
- Agar, Michael and Jerry R. Hobbs. 1982. "Interpreting Discourse: Coherence and the Analysis of Ethnographic Interviews." *Discourse Processes* 5(1):1–32.
- Agnew, Robert. 1992. "Foundation for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency." *Criminology* 30(1):47–88.
- Agnew, Robert and Ardith A. R. Peters. 1986. "The Techniques of Neutralization: An Analysis of Predisposing and Situational Factors." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 13(1):81–97.
- Agnew, Robert and Helene Raskin White. 1992. "An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory." *Criminology* 30(4):475–500.
- Akers, Ronald L. 1973. *Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Akers, Ronald L. and John K. Cochran. 1985. "Adolescent Marijuana Use: A Test of Three Theories of Deviant Behavior." *Deviant Behavior* 6(4):323–46.
- Akers, Ronald L., Marvin D. Krohn, Lonn Lanza-Kaduce, and Marcia Radosevich. 1979. "Social Learning and Deviant Behavior : A Specific Test of a General Theory." *American Sociological Review* 44(4):636–55.
- Akers, Ronald L. and Gang Lee. 1996. "A Longitudinal Test of Social Learning Theory: Adolescent Smoking." *Journal of Drug Issues* 26(2):317–43.
- Akers, Ronald L. and S. Sellers, Christine. 2004. *Criminological Theories: Introduction and Evaluation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Alexander Haslam, S. 2014. "Making Good Theory Practical: Five Lessons for an Applied Social Identity Approach to Challenges of Organizational, Health, and Clinical Psychology." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 53(1):1–20.

- Altschuler, David M. and Paul J. Brounstein. 1991. "Patterns of Drug Use, Drug Trafficking, and Other Delinquency among Inner-City Adolescent Males in Washington, D.C." *Criminology* 29(4):589–622.
- Anderson, Elijah. 1999. *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, Tammy L. 1994. "Drug Abuse and Identity: Linking Micro and Macro Factors." *The Sociological Quarterly* 35(1):159–74.
- Anderson, Tammy L. 1995. "Toward a Preliminary Macro Theory of Drug Addiction." *Deviant Behavior* 16(4):353–72.
- Anderson, Tammy L. and Joshua A. Mott. 1998. "Drug-Related Identity Change: Theoretical Development and Empirical Assessment." *Journal of Drug Issues* 28(2):299–327.
- Andrews, Donald Arthur and James Bonta. 1994. *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Aseltine Jr, Robert H., Susan Gore, and Jennifer Gordon. 2000. "Life Stress, Anger and Anxiety, and Delinquency: An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 41(3):256–75.
- Athens, Lonnie H. 1974. "The Self and the Violent Criminal Act." *Urban Life and Culture* 3(1):98–112.
- Atkinson, Robert. 2002. "The Life Story Interview." Pp. 121–40 in *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*, edited by J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bachman, Jerald G., Lloyd D. Johnston, Patrick M. O'Malley, and John Schulenberg. 1996. "Transitions in Drug Use during Late Adolescence and Young Adulthood." Pp. 111–40 in *Transitions through adolescence: Interpersonal domains and context*, edited by J. A. Graber, J. Brooksgunn, and A. C. Petersen. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bachman, Jerald G., Patrick M. O'Malley, John E. Schulenberg, Lloyd D. Johnston, Alison L. Bryant, and Alicia C. Merline. 2014. *The Decline of Substance Use in Young Adulthood: Changes in Social Activities, Roles, and Beliefs*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Baler, Ruben D. and Nora D. Volkow. 2006. "Drug Addiction: The Neurobiology of Disrupted Self-Control." *Trends in Molecular Medicine* 12(12):559–66.
- Ball, Richard Allen. 1966. "An Empirical Exploration of Neutralization Theory." *Criminology* 4(2):22–32.

- Baumeister, Roy F. and Leonard S. Newman. 1994. "How Stories Make Sense of Personal Experiences: Motives That Shape Autobiographical Narratives." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 20(6):676–90.
- Baumer, Eric. 1994. "Poverty, Crack, and Crime: A Cross-City Analysis." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 31(3):311–27.
- Baumer, Eric, Janet L. Lauritsen, Richard Rosenfeld, and Richard Wright. 1998. "The Influence of Crack Cocaine on Robbery, Burglary, and Homicide Rates: A Cross-City, Longitudinal Analysis." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 35(3):316–40.
- Becker, Howard S. 1953. "Becoming a Marihuana User." *American Journal of Sociology* 59(3):235–42.
- Becker, Howard S. 1963. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Beirne, Piers. 1983. "Cultural Relativism and Comparative Criminology." *Contemporary Crises* 7(4):371–91.
- Bennett, Trevor, Katy Holloway, and David Farrington. 2008. "The Statistical Association between Drug Misuse and Crime: A Meta-Analysis." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 13(2):107–18.
- Berg, Bruce L. 2001. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*.
- Best, David, Melinda Beckwith, Catherine Haslam, S. Alexander Haslam, Jolanda Jetten, Emily Mawson, and Dan I. Lubman. 2016. "Overcoming Alcohol and Other Drug Addiction as a Process of Social Identity Transition: The Social Identity Model of Recovery (SIMOR)." *Addiction Research & Theory* 24(2):111–23.
- Birnbaum, Howard G. et al. 2011. "Societal Costs of Prescription Opioid Abuse, Dependence, and Misuse in the United States." *Pain Medicine* 12(4):657–67.
- Black, M. M. and I. B. Ricardo. 1994. "Drug Use, Drug Trafficking, and Weapon Carrying among Low-Income, African-American, Early Adolescent Boys." *Pediatrics* 93(6):1065–72.
- Blackman, Shane. 2005. "Youth Subcultural Theory: A Critical Engagement with the Concept, Its Origins and Politics, from the Chicago School to Postmodernism." *Journal of Youth Studies* 8(1):1–20. Retrieved (<https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260500063629>).
- Blackman, Shane. 2014. "Subculture Theory: An Historical and Contemporary Assessment of the Concept for Understanding Deviance." *Deviant Behavior* 35(6):496–512.

- Boardman, J. D., B. K. Finch, C. G. Ellison, D. R. Williams, and J. S. Jackson. 2001. "Neighborhood Disadvantage, Stress, and Drug Use among Adults." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 42(2):151–65.
- Boeri, Miriam Williams. 2004. "'Hell, I'm An Addict, But I Ain't No Junkie': An Ethnographic Analysis of Aging Heroin Users." *Human Organization* 63(2):236–45.
- Boeri, Miriam. 2013. *Women on Ice: Methamphetamine Use among Suburban Women*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Boeri, Miriam and Aukje K. Lamonica. 2015. "Sampling Designs and Issues in Qualitative Criminology." Pp. 125–43 in *The Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Criminology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bohnert, Amy S. B., Catherine P. Bradshaw, and Carl A. Latkin. 2009. "A Social Network Perspective on Heroin and Cocaine Use among Adults: Evidence of Bidirectional Influences." *Addiction* 104(7):1210–18.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1989. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory* 7(1):14–25.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." Pp. 241–58 in *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, edited by J. Richardson. New York, NY: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods." in *Media, culture and society: A critical reader*, edited by R. Collin, J. Curran, N. Garnham, and P. Scanell. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bourgois, Philippe. 2003. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyd, Susan C. 2004. *From Witches to Crack Moms: Women, Drug Law, and Policy*. Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press.

- Brake, Mike. 1980. *The Sociology of Youth Culture and Youth Subcultures: Sex Drugs and Rock "n" Roll?* New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brook, Judith S. and Kerstin Pahl. 2005. "The Protective Role of Ethnic and Racial Identity and Aspects of an Africentric Orientation against Drug Use among African American Young Adults." *The Journal of Genetic Psychology* 166(3):329–45.
- Brook, Judith S., Martin Whiteman, Elinor B. Balka, Pe Thet Win, and Michal D. Gursen. 1998. "Drug Use among Puerto Ricans: Ethnic Identity as a Protective Factor." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 20(2):241–54.
- Brookman, Fiona, Trevor Bennett, Andy Hochstetler, and Heith Copes. 2011. "The 'code of the Street' and the Generation of Street Violence in the UK." *European Journal of Criminology* 8(1):17–31.
- Browne, Angela and David Finkelhor. 1986. "Impact of Child Sexual Abuse: A Review of the Research." *Psychological Bulletin* 99(1):66.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1987. "Life as Narrative." *Social Research* 54(1):11–32.
- Brunswick, Ann F. 1998. "Structural Strain: An Ecological Paradigm for Studying African American Drug Use." *Drugs & Society* 14(1–2):5–19.
- Buchanan, David R. 1993. "Social Status Group Differences in Motivations for Drug Use." *The Journal of Drug Issues* 23(4):631–44.
- Buckhalt, Joseph A., Gerald Halpin, Renee Noel, and Mark E. Meadows. 1992. "Relationship of Drug Use to Involvement in School, Home, and Community Activities: Results of a Large Survey of Adolescents." *Psychological Reports* 70(1):139–46.
- Burgess, Robert L. and Ronald L. Akers. 1966. "A Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory of Criminal Behavior." *Social Problems* 14:128–47.
- Burke, Peter J. and Donald C. Reitzes. 1991. "An Identity Theory Approach to Commitment." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 54(3):239–51.
- Burke, Peter J. and Donald C. Reitzes. 1981. "The Link between Identity and Role Performance." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 44(2):83–92.
- Burke, Peter J. and Jan E. Stets. 2009. *Identity Theory*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Burston, Betty Watson, Dionne Jones, and Pat Roberson-Saunders. 1995. "Drug Use and African Americans: Myth versus Reality." *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education* 40:19–39.

- Caetano, Raul. 1990. "Hispanic Drinking in the US: Thinking in New Directions." *British Journal of Addiction* 85(10):1231–36.
- Callero, Peter L. 1985. "Role-Identity Salience." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 48(3):203–15.
- Campbell, Nancy. 2000. *Using Women: Gender, Drug Policy, and Social Justice*. New York N.Y.: Routledge.
- Campbell, Howard and Tobin Hansen. 2012. "Getting out of the Game: Desistance from Drug Trafficking." *International Journal of Drug Policy* 23(6):481–87.
- Caputo-Levine, Deirdre D. 2013. "The Yard Face: The Contributions of Inmate Interpersonal Violence to the Carceral Habitus." *Ethnography* 14(2):165–85.
- Carbone-Lopez, Kristin and Jody Miller. 2012. "Precocious Role Entry as a Mediating Factor in Women's Methamphetamine Use: Implications for Life-course and Pathways Research." *Criminology* 50(1):187–220.
- Carliner, Hannah, Erin Delker, David S. Fink, Katherine M. Keyes, and Deborah S. Hasin. 2016. "Racial Discrimination, Socioeconomic Position, and Illicit Drug Use among US Blacks." *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* 51(4):551–60.
- Statistics, Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality. 2018. *2017 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Detailed Tables*. Rockville, MD.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2017. "Trends in the Prevalence of Marijuana, Cocaine, and Other Illegal Drug Use National YRBS: 1991 – 2017." Retrieved (https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/data/yrbs/pdf/trends/2017_us_drug_trend_yrbs.pdf).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2017. "Understanding the Epidemic." Retrieved October 27, 2018 (<https://www.cdc.gov/drugoverdose/epidemic/index.html>).
- Centers, Nathan L. and Mark D. Weist. 1998. "Inner City Youth and Drug Dealing: A Review of the Problem." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 27(3):395–411. Retrieved (<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022859205145>).
- Cerbone, Felicia Gray and Cindy L. Larison. 2000. "A Bibliographic Essay: The Relationship between Stress and Substance Use." *Substance Use & Misuse* 35(5):757–86.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1980. *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

- Charmaz, Kathy. 2002. "Qualitative Interviewing and Grounded Theory Analysis." Pp. 675–94 in *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*, edited by J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. London: SAGE Publications.
- Chassin, Laurie, David R. Pillow, Patrick J. Curran, Brooke S. G. Molina, and Manuel Barrera Jr. 1993. "Relation of Parental Alcoholism to Early Adolescent Substance Use: A Test of Three Mediating Mechanisms." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 102(1):3.
- Chen, Kevin and Denise B. Kandel. 1995. "The Natural History of Drug Use from Adolescence to the Mid-Thirties in a General Population Sample." *American Journal of Public Health* 85(1):41–47.
- Clarke, Ronald V. and Derek B. Cornish. 1986. *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspective in Offending*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Cloward, Richard A. and Lloyd E. Ohlin. 1960. *Delinquency and Opportunity: A Study of Delinquent Gangs*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Cohen, Albert. 1955. *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Cohen, Deborah A., Thomas A. Farley, and Karen Mason. 2003. "Why Is Poverty Unhealthy? Social and Physical Mediators." *Social Science & Medicine* 57(9):1631–41.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2002. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York N.Y.: Routledge.
- Collison, Mike. 1996. "In Search of the High Life: Drugs, Crime, Masculinities and Consumption." *British Journal of Criminology* 36(3):428–44.
- Coomber, Ross and Leah Moyle. 2014. "Beyond Drug Dealing: Developing and Extending the Concept of 'Social Supply' of Illicit Drugs to 'Minimally Commercial Supply.'" *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 21(2):157–64.
- Coomber, Ross. 2010. "Reconceptualizing Drug Markets and Drug Dealers—the Need for Change." *Drugs and Alcohol Today* 10(1):10–13.
- Copes, H. and J. M. Miller. 2015. *The Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Criminology*.
- Copes, Heith. 2016. "A Narrative Approach to Studying Symbolic Boundaries among Drug Users: A Qualitative Meta-Synthesis." *Crime, Media, Culture* 12(2):193–213.
- Copes, Heith, Andy Hochstetler, and Sveinung Sandberg. 2015. "Using a Narrative Framework to Understand the Drugs and Violence Nexus." *Criminal Justice Review* 40(1):32–46.

- Copes, Heith, Andy Hochstetler, and J. Patrick Williams. 2008. “‘We Weren’t Like No Regular Dope Fiends’: Negotiating Hustler and Crackhead Identities.” *Social Problems* 55(2):254–70.
- Copes, Heith, Lindsay Leban, Kent R. Kerley, and Jessica R. Deitzer. 2016. “Identities, Boundaries, and Accounts of Women Methamphetamine Users.” *Justice Quarterly* 33(1):1–25.
- Copes, Heith and Lynne M. Vieraitis. 2009. “Bounded Rationality of Identity Thieves: Using Offender-Based Research to Inform Policy.” *Criminology and Public Policy* 8(2):237–62.
- Copes, Heith and J. Patrick Williams. 2007. “Techniques of Affirmation: Deviant Behavior, Moral Commitment, and Subcultural Identity.” *Deviant Behavior* 28(3):247–72.
- Corbin, Juliet and Anselm Straus. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, C.A.: Sage.
- Cressey, Donald R. 1953. *Other People’s Money; a Study of the Social Psychology of Embezzlement*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Cronk, C. E. and P. D. Sarvela. 1997. “Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Use among Rural/Small Town and Urban Youth: A Secondary Analysis of the Monitoring the Future Data Set.” *American Journal of Public Health* 87(5):760–64.
- Cross, John C., Bruce D. Johnson, W. Rees Davis, and Hilary James Liberty. 2001. “Supporting the Habit: Income Generation Activities of Frequent Crack Users Compared with Frequent Users of Other Hard Drugs.” *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 64(2):191–201.
- Cullen, Francis T., Robert Agnew, and Pamela Wilcox. 2006. *Criminological Theory: Past to Present: Essential Readings*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Curran, Daniel J. and Claire M. Renzetti. 1994. *Theories of Crime*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon Boston.
- Currie, Elliott. 1994. *Reckoning: Drugs, the Cities, and the American Future*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
- Curtis, Ric and Travis Wendel. 2000. “Toward the Development of a Typology of Illegal Drug Markets.” *Crime Prevention Studies* 11:121–52.
- Cutler, Kristin A. 2014. “Prescription Stimulants Are ‘A Okay’: Applying Neutralization Theory to College Students’ Nonmedical Prescription Stimulant Use.” *Journal of American College Health* 62(7):478–86.

- Dahl, Silje Louise and Sveinung Sandberg. 2015. "Female Cannabis Users and New Masculinities: The Gendering of Cannabis Use." *Sociology* 49(4):696–711.
- Davis, Mike. 1988. "Los Angeles: Civil Liberties between the Hammer and the Rock." *New Left Review* (170):37.
- De Wit, Harriet. 2009. "Impulsivity as a Determinant and Consequence of Drug Use: A Review of Underlying Processes." *Addiction Biology* 14(1):22–31.
- Decker, Scott H. and Barrik Van Winkle. 1994. "'Slinging Dope': The Role of Gangs and Gang Members in Drug Sales." *Justice Quarterly* 11(4):583–604.
- Degenhardt, Louisa and Wayne Hall. 2012. "Extent of Illicit Drug Use and Dependence, and Their Contribution to the Global Burden of Disease." *The Lancet* 379(9810):55–70.
- Deitzer, Jessica R., Lindsay Leban, and Heith Copes. 2019. "'The Times Have Changed, the Dope Has Changed': Women's Cooking Roles and Gender Performances in Shake Methamphetamine Markets." *Criminology* 57(2):268–88.
- DeLisi, Matt, Michael Vaughn, and Christopher Salas-Wright. 2015. "Rumble: Prevalence and Correlates of Group Fighting among Adolescents in the United States." *Behavioral Sciences* 5(2):214–29.
- DeLisi, Matt, Michael G. Vaughn, Christopher P. Salas-Wright, and Wesley G. Jennings. 2015. "Drugged and Dangerous: Prevalence and Variants of Substance Use Comorbidity among Seriously Violent Offenders in the United States." *Journal of Drug Issues* 45(3):232–48.
- Dembo, Richard et al. 1987. "Physical Abuse, Sexual Victimization and Illicit Drug Use: A Structural Analysis among High Risk Adolescents." *Journal of Adolescence* 10(1):13.
- Dembo, Richard, Gary Grandon, Lawrence La Voie, James Schmeidler, and William Burgos. 1986. "Parents and Drugs Revisited: Some Further Evidence in Support of Social Learning Theory." *Criminology* 24(1):85–104. Retrieved (<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1986.tb00378.x>).
- Denton, Barbara and Pat O'Malley. 1999. "Gender, Trust and Business: Women Drug Dealers in the Illicit Economy." *British Journal of Criminology* 39(4):513–30.
- Denton, Barbara and Pat O'Malley. 2001. "Property Crime and Women Drug Dealers in Australia." *Journal of Drug Issues* 31(2):465–86.
- Donohew, R. Lewis et al. 1999. "Sensation Seeking and Drug Use by Adolescents and Their Friends: Models for Marijuana and Alcohol." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 60(5):622–31.

- Drapela, Laurie A. 2006. "The Effect of Negative Emotion on Licit and Illicit Drug Use among High School Dropouts: An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 35(5):752–67.
- Duck, Waverly. 2016. "Becoming a Drug Dealer: Local Interaction Orders and Criminal Careers." *Critical Sociology* 42(7–8):1069–85.
- Duck, Waverly and Anne Warfield Rawls. 2012. "Interaction Orders of Drug Dealing Spaces: Local Orders of Sensemaking in a Poor Black American Place." *Crime, Law and Social Change* 57(1):33–75.
- Duncan, Renae D., Benjamin E. Saunders, Dean G. Kilpatrick, Rochelle F. Hanson, and Heidi S. Resnick. 1996. "Childhood Physical Assault as a Risk Factor for PTSD, Depression, and Substance Abuse: Findings from a National Survey." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 66(3):437–48.
- Dunlap, Eloise and Bruce D. Johnson. 1996. "Family and Human Resources in the Development of a Female Crack-Seller Career: Case Study of a Hidden Population." *Journal of Drug Issues* 26(1):175–98.
- Ellickson, Phyllis L., Rebecca L. Collins and Robert M. Bell. 1999. "Adolescent Use of Illicit Drugs Other than Marijuana: How Important Is Social Bonding and for Which Ethnic Groups?" *Substance Use & Misuse* 34(3):317–46.
- Elliott, Gregory C. 1986. "Self-Esteem and Self-Consistency: A Theoretical and Empirical Link between Two Primary Motivations." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 49(3):207–18.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa and Ann Mische. 1998. "What Is Agency?" *American Journal of Sociology* 103(4):962–1023.
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage and David Huizinga. 1990. "Community Structure and Drug Use: From a Social Disorganization Perspective." *Justice Quarterly* 7(4):691–709.
- Fagan, Jeffrey. 1989. "The Social Organization of Drug Use and Drug Dealing among Urban Gangs." *Criminology* 27(4):633–70.
- Fagan, Jeffrey. 1994. "Women and Drugs Revisited: Female Participation in the Cocaine Economy." *Journal of Drug Issues* 24(2):179–225.
- Fagan, Jeffrey. 2000. "Contexts of Choice by Adolescents in Criminal Events." Pp. 371–402 in *Youth on Trial*, edited by T. Grisso and R. G. Schwartz. Washington, DC: University of Chicago Press.
- Fagan, Jeffery and Ko-lin Chin. 1990. "Violence as Regulation and Control in the Distribution of Crack." Pp. 8–43 in *Drugs and Violence: Causes, Correlates, and*

Consequences, edited by M. De La Rosa, E. Y. Lambert, and B. Gropper. Rockville: National Institute of Drug Abuse Research.

Farrall, Stephen and Benjamin Bowling. 1999. "Structuration, Human Development and Desistance from Crime." *British Journal of Criminology* 39(2):253–68.

Ferrell, Jeff. 1997. "Criminological Verstehen: Inside the Immediacy of Crime." *Justice Quarterly* 14(1):3–23.

Fillenbaum, Gerda G., Joseph T. Hanlon, Elizabeth H. Corder, Thandi Ziqubu-Page, William E. Wall Jr, and Dwight Brock. 1993. "Prescription and Nonprescription Drug Use among Black and White Community-Residing Elderly." *American Journal of Public Health* 83(11):1577–82.

Fitzgerald, John Lawrence. 2009. "Mapping the Experience of Drug Dealing Risk Environments: An Ethnographic Case Study." *International Journal of Drug Policy* 20(3):261–69.

Fleetwood, Jennifer. 2014. "Drug Mules: Women in the International Drug Trade."

Fleetwood, Jennifer. 2014. "Keeping out of Trouble: Female Crack Cocaine Dealers in England." *European Journal of Criminology* 11(1):91–109.

Fleetwood, Jennifer. 2015. "A Narrative Approach to Women's Lawbreaking." *Feminist Criminology* 10(4):368–88.

Fleetwood, Jennifer. 2016. "Narrative Habitus: Thinking through Structure/Agency in the Narratives of Offenders." *Crime, Media, Culture* 12(2):173–92.

Floyd, Leah J. et al. 2010. "Adolescent Drug Dealing and Race/Ethnicity: A Population-Based Study of the Differential Impact of Substance Use on Involvement in Drug Trade." *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 36(2):87–91.

Foote, Nelson N. 1951. "Identification as the Basis for a Theory of Motivation." *American Sociological Review* 16(1):14–21.

Ford, Jason A. 2008. "Social Learning Theory and Nonmedical Prescription Drug Use among Adolescents." *Sociological Spectrum* 28(3):299–316.

Foster, Karen and Dale Spencer. 2013. "'It's Just a Social Thing': Drug Use, Friendship and Boarderwork among Marginalized Young People." *International Journal of Drug Policy* 24(3):223–30.

Fraser, Alistair and Colin Atkinson. 2014. "Making up Gangs: Looping, Labelling and the New Politics of Intelligence-Led Policing." *Youth Justice* 14(2):154–70.

- French, Katy, Richard Finkbiner, and Louise Duhamel. 2002. *Patterns of Substance Use among Minority Youth and Adults in the United States: An Overview of the National Survey Findings*. Fairfax VA.
- Friedman, Alfred S., Shirley Bransfield, Samuel Granick, and Cheryl Kreisher. 1995. "Early Childhood Risk and Protective Factors for Substance Use during Early Adolescence: Gender Differences." *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse* 4(4):1–24.
- Friedman, Alfred S., Arlene Terras, and Kimberly Glassman. 2000. "Family Structure versus Family Relationships for Predicting to Substance Use/Abuse and Illegal Behavior." *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse* 10(1):1–16.
- Gardner, LeGrande and Donald J. Shoemaker. 1989. "Social Bonding and Delinquency: A Comparative Analysis." *The Sociological Quarterly* 30(3):481–99.
- Gary, Lawrence E. and Greta L. Berry. 1984. "Some Determinants of Attitudes toward Substance Use in an Urban Ethnic Community." *Psychological Reports* 54(2):539–45.
- Geiger, Brenda and Michael Fischer. 2005. "Naming Oneself Criminal: Gender Difference in Offenders' Identity Negotiation." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 49(2):194–209.
- Geis, G. 2000. "On the Absence of Self-Control as the Basis for a General Theory of Crime: A Critique." *Theoretical Criminology* 4(1):35–53.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Gottfredson, Michael R. and Travis Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford University Press.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss. 1967. *Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Hawthorne, N.Y.: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano, Grace Chang, and Linda Rennie Forcey. 1994. *Mothering: Ideology, Experience, and Agency*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- Grenfell, Michael. 2012. "Methodology." in *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts*, edited by M. Grenfell. Acumen Publishing Limited.

- Groves, W. Byron and Michael J. Lynch. 1990. "Reconciling Structural and Subjective Approaches to the Study of Crime." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 27(4):348–75.
- Grundetjern, Heidi. 2015. "Women's Gender Performances and Cultural Heterogeneity in the Illegal Drug Economy." *Criminology* 53(2):253–79.
- Grundetjern, Heidi. 2018. "Negotiating Motherhood: Variations of Maternal Identities among Women in the Illegal Drug Economy." *Gender & Society* 32(3):395–416.
- Grundetjern, Heidi, Heith Copes, and Sveinung Sandberg. n.d. "Dealing with Fatherhood: Paternal Identities among Men in the Illegal Drug Economy." *European Journal of Criminology* 1–17.
- Grundetjern, Heidi and Sveinung Sandberg. 2012. "Dealing with a Gendered Economy: Female Drug Dealers and Street Capital." *European Journal of Criminology* 9(6):621–35.
- Das Gupta, Tania. 1995. "Families of Native Peoples, Immigrants, and People of Colour." Pp. 97–120 in *Canadian families: Diversity, conflict and change*, edited by N. Mandell and A. Duffy. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.
- Haines, Rebecca J., Joy L. Johnson, Connie I. Carter, and Kamal Arora. 2009. "'I Couldn't Say, I'm Not a Girl'—Adolescents Talk about Gender and Marijuana Use." *Social Science & Medicine* 68(11):2029–36.
- Hammersvik, Eirik. 2015. "Four Barriers and a Set of Values That Prevent Violence among Cannabis Growers." *International Journal of Drug Policy* 26(3):290–95.
- Hanks, William F. 2005. "Pierre Bourdieu and the Practices of Language." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:67–83.
- Hardy, Cheryl. 2012. "Social Space." in *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts*, edited by M. Grenfell. Acumen Publishing Limited.
- Harris, Kathleen Mullan, Greg J. Duncan, and Johanne Boisjoly. 2002. "Evaluating the Role of 'Nothing to Lose' Attitudes on Risky Behavior in Adolescence." *Social Forces* 80(3):1005–39.
- Hathaway, Andrew D. 1997. "Marijuana and Lifestyle: Exploring Tolerable Deviance." *Deviant Behavior* 18(3):213–32.
- Hays, Sharon. 1996. *The Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood*. New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press.

- Heimer, Karen and Ross L. Matsueda. 1994. "Role-Taking, Role Commitment, and Delinquency: A Theory of Differential Social Control." *American Sociological Review* 59(3):365–90.
- Henry, Stuart and Dragan Milovanovic. 1996. *Constitutive Criminology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Herd, Denise. 1990. "Subgroup Differences in Drinking Patterns among Black and White Men: Results from a National Survey." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 51(3):221–32.
- Herd, Denise and Joel Grube. 1996. "Black Identity and Drinking in the US: A National Study." *Addiction* 91(6):845–57.
- Hill, Karl G., James C. Howell, J. David Hawkins, and Sara R. Battin-Pearson. 1999. "Childhood Risk Factors for Adolescent Gang Membership: Results from the Seattle Social Development Project." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 36(3):300–322.
- Hirschi, Travis. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. University of California Press.
- Hoffmann, John P. and S. Susan Su. 1997. "The Conditional Effects of Stress on Delinquency and Drug Use: A Strain Theory Assessment of Sex Differences." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34(1):46–78.
- Holloway, Katy and Trevor Bennett. 2007. "Gender Differences in Drug Misuse and Related Problem Behaviors among Arrestees in the UK." *Substance Use & Misuse* 42(6):899–921.
- Hollway, Wendy and Tony Jefferson. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research Differently: Free Association, Narrative and the Interview Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holm, Søren, Sveinung Sandberg, Torsten Kolind, and Morten Hesse. 2014. "The Importance of Cannabis Culture in Young Adult Cannabis Use." *Journal of Substance Use* 19(3):251–56.
- Holstein, James A. and Jaber F. Gubrium. 2000. *The Self We Live by: Narrative Identity in a Postmodern World*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hooks, Bell. 1992. *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Boston, M.A.: South End Press.
- Huberman, A. Michael and Matthew B. Miles. 1994. "Data Management and Analysis Methods." Pp. 428–44 in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hutton, Fiona. 2005. "Risky Business: Gender, Drug Dealing and Risk." *Addiction Research & Theory* 13(6):545–54.

- Ilan, Jonathan. 2013. "Street Social Capital in the Liquid City." *Ethnography* 14(1):3–24.
- Investigation, United States Department of Justice Federal Bureau of. n.d. "Crime in the United States, 2013." *Crime in the United States, 2017*.
- Jacobs, Bruce A. 1999. *Dealing Crack: The Social World of Streetcorner Selling*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Jacobs, Bruce A. and Jody Miller. 1998. "Crack Dealing, Gender, and Arrest Avoidance." *Social Problems* 45(4):550–69.
- Jacobs, Bruce A., Volkan Topalli, and Richard Wright. 2000. "Managing Retaliation: Drug Robbery and Informal Sanction Threats." *Criminology* 38(1):171–98.
- Jacques, Scott. 2010. "The Necessary Conditions for Retaliation: Toward a Theory of Non-violent and Violent Forms in Drug Markets." *Justice Quarterly* 27(2):186–205.
- Jacques, Scott and Richard Wright. 2011. "Informal Control and Illicit Drug Trade." *Criminology* 49(3):729–65.
- Jacques, Scott and Richard Wright. 2014. "A Sociological Theory of Drug Sales, Gifts, and Frauds." *Crime & Delinquency* 60(7):1057–82.
- Jacques, Scott and Richard Wright. 2015. *Code of the Suburb: Inside the World of Young Middle-Class Drug Dealers*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Järvinen, Margaretha and Jakob Demant. 2011. "The Normalisation of Cannabis Use among Young People: Symbolic Boundary Work in Focus Groups." *Health, Risk and Society* 13(2):165–182.
- Johnson, Byron R., David B. Larson, Spencer De Li, and Sung Joon Jang. 2000. "Escaping from the Crime of Inner Cities: Church Attendance and Religious Salience among Disadvantaged Youth." *Justice Quarterly* 17(2):377–91.
- Kadushin, Charles, Emily Reber, Leonard Saxe, and David Livert. 1998. "The Substance Use System: Social and Neighborhood Environments Associated with Substance Use and Misuse." *Substance Use & Misuse* 33(8):1681–1710.
- Kandel, Denise B. 1995. "Ethnic Differences in Drug Use." Pp. 81–105 in *Drug Abuse Prevention with Multiethnic Youth*, edited by J. G. Botvin, S. Schinke, and M. A. Orlandi. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kandel, Denise B., Kazuo Yamaguchi, and Kevin Chen. 1992. "Stages of Progression in Drug Involvement from Adolescence to Adulthood: Further Evidence for the Gateway Theory." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 53(5):447–57.

- Kaplan, Howard B. 1978. "Deviant Behavior and Self-Enhancement in Adolescence." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 7(3):253–77.
- Kaplan, Howard B. 1976. "Self-Attitudes and Deviant Response." *Social Forces* 54(4):788–801.
- Kaplan, Howard B. 1975. "Increase in Self-Rejection as an Antecedent of Deviant Responses." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 4(3):281–92.
- Karriker-Jaffe, Katherine J. 2013. "Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Substance Use by US Adults." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 133(1):212–21.
- Katz, Jack. 1988. *Seductions of Crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions in Doing Evil*. Basic Books.
- Kerley, Kent R., Heith Copes, and O. Hayden Griffin III. 2015. "Middle-Class Motives for Non-Medical Prescription Stimulant Use among College Students." *Deviant Behavior* 36(7):589–603.
- Kerley, Kent R., Lindsay Leban, Heith Copes, Leah Taylor, and Christine Agnone. 2014. "Methamphetamine Using Careers of White and Black Women." *Deviant Behavior* 35(6):477–95.
- Kertesz, Stefan G., Yulia Khodneva, Joshua Richman, Jalie A. Tucker, Monika M. Safford, Bobby Jones, Joseph Schumacher, and Mark J. Pletcher. 2012. "Trajectories of Drug Use and Mortality Outcomes among Adults Followed over 18 Years." *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 27(7):808–16.
- Kilpatrick, Dean G., Ron Acierno, Heidi S. Resnick, Benjamin E. Saunders, and Connie L. Best. 1997. "A 2-Year Longitudinal Analysis of the Relationships between Violent Assault and Substance Use in Women." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 65(5):834.
- Kilpatrick, Dean G. et al. 2000. "Risk Factors for Adolescent Substance Abuse and Dependence: Data from a National Sample." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 68(1):19.
- Klenowski, Paul M., Heith Copes, and Christopher W. Mullins. 2011. "Gender, Identity, and Accounts: How White Collar Offenders Do Gender When Making Sense of Their Crimes." *Justice Quarterly* 28(1):46–69.
- Koeppel, Maria D. H. and Kimberly A. Chism. 2018. "Substance Use and Sexual Orientation: A Test of Hirschi's Social Bonds Theory." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 43(2):278–93.

- Kornhauser, Ruth Rosner. 1978. *Social Sources of Delinquency: An Appraisal of Analytic Models*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press Chicago.
- Krug, Etienne G., James A. Mercy, Linda L. Dahlberg, and Anthony B. Zwi. 2002. "The World Report on Violence and Health." *The Lancet* 360(9339):1083–88.
- L. Flom Benny Jose, Richard Curtis, Peter, Samuel R. Friedman. 2001. "Peer Norms Regarding Drug Use and Drug Selling among Household Youth in a Low-Income 'drug Supermarket' Urban Neighborhood." *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 8(3):219–32.
- Lambert, Sharon F., Tamara L. Brown, Clarenda M. Phillips, and Nicholas S. Ialongo. 2004. "The Relationship between Perceptions of Neighborhood Characteristics and Substance Use among Urban African American Adolescents." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 34(3–4):205.
- Landolt, Sara. 2013. "Co-Productions of Neighbourhood and Social Identity by Young Men Living in an Urban Area with Delinquent Youth Cliques." *Journal of Youth Studies* 16(5):628–45.
- LeBel, Thomas P., Ros Burnett, Shadd Maruna, and Shawn Bushway. 2008. "The 'chicken and Egg' of Subjective and Social Factors in Desistance from Crime." *European Journal of Criminology* 5(2):131–59.
- Lemert, Edwin M. 1951. *Social Pathology: A Systematic Approach to the Theory of Sociopathic Behavior*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Li, X. and S. Feigelman. 1994. "Recent and Intended Drug Trafficking among Male and Female Urban African-American Early Adolescents." *Pediatrics* 93(6):1044–49.
- Li, Xiaoming, Bonita Stanton, Maureen M. Black, and Susan Feigelman. 1996. "Persistence of Drug Trafficking Behaviors and Intentions among Urban African American Early Adolescents." *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 16(4):469–87.
- Li, Xiaoming, Bonita Stanton, and Susan Feigelman. 1999. "Exposure to Drug Trafficking among Urban, Low-Income African American Children and Adolescents." *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine* 153(2):161–68.
- Liebllich, Amia, Rivka Tuval-Mashiach, and Tamar Zilber. 1998. *Narrative Research: Reading, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage.
- Linnemann, Travis. 2010. "Mad Men, Meth Moms, and Moral Panics: Gendering Meth Crimes in the Midwest." *Critical Criminology* 18(2):95–110.
- Lindegaard, Marie Rosenkrantz and Scott Jacques. 2014. "Agency as a Cause of Crime." *Deviant Behavior* 35(2):85–100.

- Little, Michelle and Laurence Steinberg. 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(2):357–86.
- Lo, Celia C., Young S. Kim, and Wesley T. Church. 2008. "The Effects of Victimization on Drug Use: A Multilevel Analysis." *Substance Use and Misuse* 43(10):1340–61.
- Longshore, Douglas, Eunice Chang, and Nena Messina. 2005. "Self-Control and Social Bonds: A Combined Control Perspective on Juvenile Offending." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 21(4):419–37.
- Loseke, Donileen R. 2007. "The Study of Identity as Cultural, Institutional, Organizational, and Personal Narratives: Theoretical and Empirical Integrations." *Sociological Quarterly* 48(4):661–88.
- Lyng, Stephen. 1990. "Edgework: A Social Psychological Analysis of Voluntary Risk Taking." *American Journal of Sociology* 95(4):851–86.
- Maddahian, Ebrahim, Michael D. Newcomb, and P. M. Bentler. 1986. "Adolescents' Substance Use." *Advances in Alcohol & Substance Abuse* 5(3):63–78.
- Maher, Lisa and Kathleen Daly. 1996. "Women in the Street-level Drug Economy: Continuity or Change?" *Criminology* 34(4):465–92.
- Maher, Lisa and Susan L. Hudson. 2007. "Women in the Drug Economy: A Metasynthesis of the Qualitative Literature." *Journal of Drug Issues* 37(4):805–26.
- Malouf, Elizabeth, Jeffrey Stuewig, and June Tangney. 2012. "Self-Control and Jail Inmates' Substance Misuse Post-Release: Mediation by Friends' Substance Use and Moderation by Age." *Addictive Behaviors* 37(11):1198–1204.
- Manning, Peter K. and Lawrence J. Redlinger. 1983. "Drugs as Work." Pp. 275–300 in *Research in the Sociology of Work*, edited by I. Haper Simpson and R. L. Simpson. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Marcos, Anastasios C., Stephen J. Bahr, and Richard E. Johnson. 1986. "Test of a Bonding/Association Theory of Adolescent Drug Use." *Social Forces* 65(1):135–61.
- Mars, Sarah G., Philippe Bourgois, George Karandinos, Fernando Montero, and Daniel Ciccarone. 2014. "'Every 'never' I Ever Said Came True': Transitions from Opioid Pills to Heroin Injecting." *International Journal of Drug Policy* 25(2):257–66.
- Martinez Jr, Ramiro, Richard Rosenfeld, and Dennis Mares. 2008. "Social Disorganization, Drug Market Activity, and Neighborhood Violent Crime." *Urban Affairs Review* 43(6):846–74.

- Maruna, Shadd. 2001. *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Maruna, Shadd and Heith Copes. 2005. "What Have We Learned from Five Decades of Neutralization Research?" *Crime and Justice* 32:221–320.
- Massey, Douglas S. 1994. "Getting Away with Murder: Segregation and Violent Crime in Urban America." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 143:1203.
- MacLeod, J. (2009). *Ain't No Makin' It*. New York: Routledge,
- McAdams, Dan P. 1995. "Introductory Commentary." *Journal of Narratives and Life History* 5:207–11.
- McCabe, Sean Esteban, Michele Morales, James A. Cranford, Jorge Delva, Melnee D. McPherson, and Carol J. Boyd. 2007. "Race/Ethnicity and Gender Differences in Drug Use and Abuse Among College Students." *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse* 6(2):75–95.
- McCarthy, Jennifer G. and Anna L. Stewart. 1998. "Neutralization as a Process of Graduated Desensitization: Moral Values of Offenders." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 42(4):278–90.
- McCurley, Carl and Howard N. Snyder. 2008. *Co-Occurrence of Substance Use Behaviors in Youth*. edited by J. R. Flores. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- McGloin, Jean Marie and Lauren O'Neill Shermer. 2009. "Self-Control and Deviant Peer Network Structure." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 46(1):35–72.
- McMahon, Martha. 1995. *Engendering Motherhood: Identity and Self-Transformation in Women's Lives*. New York, N.Y.: Guilford Press.
- McNeill, Fergus, Nicola Burns, Simon Halliday, Neil Hutton, and Cyrus Tata. 2009. "Risk, Responsibility and Reconfiguration: Penal Adaptation and Misadaptation." *Punishment & Society* 11(4):419–42.
- Measham, Fiona. 2002. "'Doing Gender'—'Doing Drugs': Conceptualizing the Gendering of Drugs Cultures." *Contemporary Drug Problems* 29(2):335–73.
- Menard, Scott, Herbert C. Covey, and Robert J. Franzese. 2015. "Adolescent Exposure to Violence and Adult Illicit Drug Use." *Child Abuse and Neglect* 42:30–39.
- Mieczkowski, Tom. 1994. "The Experiences of Women Who Sell Crack: Some Descriptive Data from the Detroit Crack Ethnography Project." *Journal of Drug Issues* 24(2):227–48.

- Miller, Walter B. 1958. "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency." *Journal of Social Issues* 14(3):5–19.
- Miller, Ted R., David T. Levy, Mark A. Cohen, and Kenya L. C. Cox. 2006. "Costs of Alcohol and Drug-Involved Crime." *Prevention Science* 7(4):333–42.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1940. "Situating Actions and Vocabularies of Motive." *American Sociological Review* 5(6):904–13.
- Minor, W. William. 1981. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Reconceptualization and Empirical Examination." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 18(2):295–318.
- Mitchell, Jim and Richard A. Dodder. 1980. "An Examination of Types of Delinquency through Path Analysis." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 9(3):239–48.
- Moffat, Barbara M., Joy L. Johnson, and Jean A. Shoveller. 2009. "A Gateway to Nature: Teenagers' Narratives on Smoking Marijuana Outdoors." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 29(1):86–94.
- Moloney, Molly and Geoffrey P. Hunt. 2012. "Consumption, Drugs and Style: Constructing Intra-Ethnic Boundaries in Asian American Youth Cultures." *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy* 19(6):462–73.
- Moore, Joan W. 1990. "Gangs, Drugs, and Violence." Pp. 160–76 in *Drugs and Violence: Causes, Correlates, and Consequences*, edited by M. De La Rosa, E. Y. Lambert, and B. Gropper. Rockville: National Institute of Drug Abuse Research.
- Moore, Rob. 2012. "Capital." Pp. 98–113 in *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts*, edited by M. Grenfell. Bristol, CT: Acumen Publishing Limited.
- Moore, Todd M., Gregory L. Stuart, Jeffrey C. Meehan, Deborah Rhatigan, Julianne C. Hellmuth, and Stefanie M. Keen. 2008. "Drug Abuse and Aggression between Intimate Partners: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Clinical Psychology Review* 28:247–74.
- Morgan, Patricia and Karen Ann Joe. 1996. "Citizens and Outlaws: The Private Lives and Public Lifestyles of Women in the Illicit Drug Economy." *Journal of Drug Issues* 26(1):125–42.
- Morselli, Carlo and Pierre Tremblay. 2004. "Criminal Achievement, Offender Networks and the Benefits of Low Self-control." *Criminology* 42(3):773–804.
- Murphy, Sheigla, Dan Waldorf, and Craig Reinerman. 1990. "Drifting into Dealing: Becoming a Cocaine Seller." *Qualitative Sociology* 13(4):321–43.

- Neuman, W. Lawrence. 2011. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 7th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Neuman, William Lawrence. 2012. *Basics of Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Sage.
- Nicholson, Thomas, John White, Robin Cline, Patricia Minors, and David Duncan. 2001. "Parents Who Report Using Illicit Drugs: Findings and Implications from the DRUGNET Study." *Psychological Reports* 88(1):245–51.
- NIDA. 2015. "Nationwide Trends." Retrieved October 1, 2018 (<https://www.drugabuse.gov/publications/drugfacts/nationwide-trends>).
- Nieri, Tanya, Cecilia Ayón, Min Yoo, and Megan Webb. n.d. "Perceived Ethnic Discrimination, Ethnic-Racial Socialization, and Substance Use among Ethnic Minority Adolescents." *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse* 1–20.
- Nolin, Pierre Claude and Colin Kenny. 2003. *Cannabis: Report of the Senate Special Committee on Illegal Drugs*. University of Toronto Press: Toronto.
- Olate, René, Christopher Salas-Wright, and Michael G. Vaughn. 2012. "Predictors of Violence and Delinquency among High Risk Youth and Youth Gang Members in San Salvador, El Salvador." *International Social Work* 55(3):383–401.
- Osborne, Geraint B. and Curtis Fogel. 2008. "Understanding the Motivations for Recreational Marijuana Use among Adult Canadians." *Substance Use and Misuse* 43(3–4):539–72.
- Ousey, Graham C. and Matthew R. Lee. 2002. "Examining the Conditional Nature of the Illicit Drug Market-homicide Relationship: A Partial Test of the Theory of Contingent Causation." *Criminology* 40(1):73–102.
- Paternoster, Raymond and Shawn Bushway. 2009. "Desistance and the "Feared Self": Toward an Identity Theory of Criminal Desistance." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 99(4):1103–56.
- Pearson, Geoffrey. 2001. "Normal Drug Use: Ethnographic Fieldwork among an Adult Network of Recreational Drug Users in Inner London." *Substance Use and Misuse* 36(1–2):167–200.
- Pedersen, Willy. 2009. "Cannabis Use: Subcultural Opposition or Social Marginality? A Population-Based Longitudinal Study." *Acta Sociologica* 52(2):135–48.
- Pedersen, Willy, Sveinung Sandberg, and Heith Copes. 2015. "High Speed: Amphetamine Use in the Context of Conventional Culture." *Deviant Behavior* 36(2):146–65.

- Peebles, Faith and Rolf Loeber. 1994. "Do Individual Factors and Neighborhood Context Explain Ethnic Differences in Juvenile Delinquency?" *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 10(2):141–57.
- Pennay, Amy and David Moore. 2010. "Exploring the Micro-Politics of Normalisation: Narratives of Pleasure, Self-Control and Desire in a Sample of Young Australian 'Party Drug' Users." *Addiction Research and Theory* 15(5):557–71.
- Petraitis, John, Brian R. Flay, and Todd Q. Miller. 1995. "Reviewing Theories of Adolescent Substance Use: Organizing Pieces in the Puzzle." *Psychological Bulletin* 117(1):67–86.
- Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1988. *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Pomazal, Richard J. and James D. Brown. 1977. "Understanding Drug Use Motivation: A New Look at a Current Problem." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 18(2):212–22.
- Pratt, Travis C. and Francis T. Cullen. 2005. "Assessing Macro-Level Predictors and Theories of Crime: A Meta-Analysis." *Crime and Justice* 32:373–450.
- Preble, Edward and John J. Casey. 1969. "Taking Care of Business - the Heroin User's Life on the Street." *Substance Use and Misuse* 4(1):1–24.
- Presser, Lois. 2009. "The Narratives of Offenders." *Theoretical Criminology* 13(2):177–200.
- Presser, Lois. 2013. *Why We Harm*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Priest, Thomas Brian and John H. McGrath III. 1970. "Techniques of Neutralization: Young Adult Marijuana Smokers." *Criminology* 8(2):185–94.
- Pugh, Lisa A. and Brenna H. Bry. 2007. "The Protective Effects of Ethnic Identity for Alcohol and Marijuana Use among Black Young Adults." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 13(2):187.
- Ravn, Signe. 2012. "Contested Identities: Identity Constructions in a Youth Recreational Drug Culture." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 15(4):513–27.
- Rhodes, Tim et al. 2007. "Risk, Shame and the Public Injector: A Qualitative Study of Drug Injecting in South Wales." *Social Science and Medicine* 65(3):572–85.
- Ricardo, Izabel B. 1994. "Life Choices of African-American Youth Living in Public Housing: Perspectives on Drug Trafficking." *Pediatrics* 93(6):1055–59.

- Richard, Dembo et al. 1990. "The Relationship between Cocaine Use, Drug Sales, and Other Delinquency among a Cohort of High-Risk Youths over Time." Pp. 112–35 in *Drugs and Violence: Causes, Correlates, and Consequences*, edited by M. De La Rosa, E. Y. Lambert, and B. Gropper. Rockville: National Institute of Drug Abuse Research.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1988. *Time and Narrative Volume 3*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1992. *Oneself as Another*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Riessman, Catherine Kohler. 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kohler Riessman, Catherine. 2002. "Analysis of Personal Narratives." Pp. 695–710 in *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*, edited by J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein. London: Sage Publications.
- Robins, Lee N. 1978. "Sturdy Childhood Predictors of Adult Antisocial Behavior: Replications from Longitudinal Studies." *Psychological Medicine* 8(4):611–22.
- Rødner, Sharon. 2005. "'I Am Not a Drug Abuser, I Am a Drug User': A Discourse Analysis of 44 Drug Users' Construction of Identity." *Addiction Research and Theory* 13(4):333–46.
- Ross, Catherine E. 2000. "Walking, Exercising, and Smoking: Does Neighborhood Matter?" *Social Science & Medicine* 51(2):265–74.
- Ryan, William. 1976. *Blaming the Victim*. Vol. 226. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Salas-Wright, Christopher P., Michael G. Vaughn, Jelena Todicevic, David Córdova, and Brian E. Perron. 2015. "Trends in the Disapproval and Use of Marijuana among Adolescents and Young Adults in the United States: 2002–2013." *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* 41(5):392–404.
- Saldana, Johnny. 2013. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Sampson, Robert J. and W. Byron Groves. 1989. "Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social-Disorganization Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 94(4):774–802.
- Sampson, Robert J. and William Julius Wilson. 1995. "Towards a Theory of Race, Crime and Urban Inequality." Pp. 37–54 in *Crime and Inequality*, edited by J. Hagan and R. D. Peterson. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sandberg, Sveinung. 2016. "The Importance of Stories Untold: Life-Story, Event-Story and Trope." *Crime, Media, Culture* 12(2):153–71.

- Sandberg, Sveinung. 2008. "Black Drug Dealers in a White Welfare State: Cannabis Dealing and Street Capital in Norway." *The British Journal of Criminology* 48(5):604–19.
- Sandberg, Sveinung. 2013. "Cannabis Culture: A Stable Subculture in a Changing World." *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 13(1):63–79.
- Sandberg, Sveinung. 2012. "Is Cannabis Use Normalized, Celebrated or Neutralized? Analysing Talk as Action." *Addiction Research & Theory* 20(5):372–81.
- Sandberg, Sveinung. 2012. "The Importance of Culture for Cannabis Markets: Towards an Economic Sociology of Illegal Drug Markets." *British Journal of Criminology* 52(6):1133–51.
- Sandberg, Sveinung. 2009. "Gangster, Victim or Both? The Interdiscursive Construction of Sameness and Difference in Self-presentations." *The British Journal of Sociology* 60(3):523–42.
- Sandberg, Sveinung. 2008. "Street Capital: Ethnicity and Violence on the Streets of Oslo." *Theoretical Criminology* 12(2):153–71.
- Sandberg, Sveinung and Willy Pedersen. 2011. *Street Capital: Black Cannabis Dealers in a White Welfare State*. Policy Press.
- Sanders, Bill. 2006. *Drugs, Clubs and Young People*. London: Routledge.
- Schaefer, Brian P., Anthony G. Vito, Catherine D. Marcum, George E. Higgins, and Melissa L. Ricketts. 2015. "Examining Adolescent Cocaine Use with Social Learning and Self-Control Theories." *Deviant Behavior* 36(10):823–33.
- Schreiber, Klaus. 1992. "The Adolescent Crack Dealer: A Failure in the Development of Empathy." *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis* 20(2):241–49.
- Scott, Marvin B. and Stanford M. Lyman. 1968. "Accounts." *American Sociological Review* 33(1):46–62.
- Seffrin, Patrick M. and Bianca I. Domahidi. 2014. "The Drugs–Violence Nexus: A Systematic Comparison of Adolescent Drug Dealers and Drug Users." *Journal of Drug Issues* 44(4):394–413.
- Semple, Shirley J., Steffanie A. Strathdee, Tyson Volkmann, Jim Zians, and Thomas L. Patterson. 2011. "'High on My Own Supply': Correlates of Drug Dealing among Heterosexually Identified Methamphetamine Users." *The American Journal on Addictions* 20(6):516–24.

- Semple, Shirley J., Steffanie A. Strathdee, Jim Zians, and Thomas L. Patterson. 2013. "Correlates of Drug Dealing in Female Methamphetamine Users." *Journal of Urban Health* 90(3):529–41.
- Shammas, Victor L. and Sveinung Sandberg. 2016. "Habitus, Capital, and Conflict: Bringing Bourdieusian Field Theory to Criminology." *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 16(2):195–213.
- Sharp, Susan F., B. Mitchell Peck, and Jennifer Hartsfield. 2012. "Childhood Adversity and Substance Use of Women Prisoners: A General Strain Theory Approach." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 40(3):202–11.
- Shaw, Clifford Robe and Henry Donald McKay. n.d. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shiner, Michael. 2009. *Drug Use and Social Change: The Distortion of History*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Shiner, Michael and Tim Newburn. 1997. "Definitely, Maybe Not? The Normalisation of Recreational Drug Use amongst Young People." *Sociology* 31(3):511–29.
- Shook, Jeffrey J., Michael G. Vaughn, and Christopher P. Salas-Wright. 2013. "Exploring the Variation in Drug Selling Among Adolescents in the United States." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 41(6):365–74.
- Shook, Jeffrey J., Michael Vaughn, Sara Goodkind, and Heath Johnson. 2011. "An Empirical Portrait of Youthful Offenders Who Sell Drugs." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 39(3):224–31.
- Shover, Neil. 1996. *Great Pretenders: Pursuits and Careers of Persistent Thieves*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Shover, Neal. 2012. "Life Histories and Autobiographies as Ethnographic Data." Pp. 11–22 in *The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods*, edited by D. Gadd, S. Karstedt, and S. F. Messner. London: SAGE Publications.
- Skolnick, Jerome H., Theodore Correl, Elizabeth Navarro, and Roger Rabb. 1990. "The Social Structure of Street Drug Dealing." *American Journal of Police* 9(1):1–42.
- Slocum, Lee Ann. 2010. "General Strain Theory and the Development of Stressors and Substance Use over Time: An Empirical Examination." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38(6):1100–1112.
- Smith, Brett. 2007. "The State of the Art in Narrative Inquiry." *Narrative Inquiry* 17(2):391–98.

- Soller, Brian and Juliet P. Lee. 2010. "Drug-Intake Methods and Social Identity: The Use of Marijuana in Blunts Among Southeast Asian Adolescents and Emerging Adults." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 25(6):783–806.
- Somers, Margaret R. 1994. "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach." *Theory and Society* 23(5):605–49.
- Stanforth, Evan T., Marisa Kostiuk, and Patton O. Garriott. 2016. "Correlates of Engaging in Drug Distribution in a National Sample." *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 30(1):138.
- Stanton, Bonita and Jennifer Galbraith. 1994. "Drug Trafficking among African-American Early Adolescents: Prevalence, Consequences, and Associated Behaviors and Beliefs." *Pediatrics* 93(6):1039–43.
- Steinman, Kenneth J. 2005. "Drug Selling among High School Students: Related Risk Behaviors and Psychosocial Characteristics." *The Journal of Adolescent Health* 36(1):71–76.
- Stokes, Randall and John P. Hewitt. 1976. "Aligning Actions." *American Sociological Review* 41(5):838–49.
- Stryker, Sheldon. 1968. "Identity Salience and Role Performance: The Relevance of Symbolic Interaction Theory for Family Research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30(4):558–64.
- Stryker, Sheldon and Peter J. Burke. 2000. "The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63(4):284–97.
- Sullivan, Mercer L. 1989. *Getting Paid: Youth Crime and Work in the Inner City*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Sutherland, Edwin. 1973. *On Analyzing Crime*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Edwin Hardin Sutherland and Donald Ray Cressey. 1974. *Criminology* (9th ed). Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott
- Svensson, Robert. 2003. "Gender Differences In Adolescent Drug Use: The Impact of Parental Monitoring and Peer Deviance." *Youth & Society* 34(3):300–329.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action." *American Sociological Review*. 51:273-286.
- Sykes, Gresham M. and David Matza. 1957. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 22(6):664–70.

- Sykes, Gresham M. and David Matza. 2017. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." in *Delinquency and Drift Revisited: The Criminology of David Matza and Beyond*.
- Thornberry, Terence P. 1987. "Toward an Interactional Theory of Delinquency." *Criminology* 25(4):863–92.
- Tiffany, Stephen T. 1990. "A Cognitive Model of Drug Urges and Drug-Use Behavior: Role of Automatic and Nonautomatic Processes." *Psychological Review* 97(2):147.
- Topalli, Volkan. 2005. "When Being Good Is Bad: An Expansion of Neutralization Theory." *Criminology* 43(3):797–836.
- Topalli, Volkan, Richard Wright, and Robert Fornango. 2002. "Drug Dealers, Robbery and Retaliation. Vulnerability, Deterrence and the Contagion of Violence." *British Journal of Criminology* 42(2):337–51.
- Townsend, Tiffany G. and Faye Z. Belgrave. 2000. "The Impact of Personal Identity and Racial Identity on Drug Attitudes and Use Among African American Children." *Journal of Black Psychology* 26(4):421–36.
- Tutenges, Sébastien, Torsten Kolind, and Alfred Uhl. 2015. "Explorations into the Drug Users Perspectives." *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 173–74.
- Tutenges, Sébastien and Sveinung Sandberg. 2013. "Intoxicating Stories: The Characteristics, Contexts and Implications of Drinking Stories among Danish Youth." *International Journal of Drug Policy* 24(6):538–44.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. 2013. *Results from the 2012 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Summary of National Findings*.
- Uribe, Victor M. and Eric Ostrov. 1989. "Correlations of Substance Abuse and Self-Image among Socially Diverse Groups of Adolescents and Clinical Implications." *Hillside Journal of Clinical Psychiatry* 11(1):25–34.
- Valdez, Avelardo and Stephen J. Sifaneck. 2004. "'Getting High and Getting by': Dimensions of Drug Selling Behaviors among American Mexican Gang Members in South Texas." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 41(1):82–105.
- Van Kammen, Welmoet B. and Rolf Loeber. 1994. "Are Fluctuations in Delinquent Activities Related to the Onset and Offset in Juvenile Illegal Drug Use and Drug Dealing?" *Journal of Drug Issues* 24(1):9–24.
- VanNostrand, Lise Marie and Richard Tewksbury. 1999. "The Motives and Mechanics of Operating an Illegal Drug Enterprise." *Deviant Behavior* 20(1):57–83.

- Vaughn, Michael G., Christopher P. Salas-Wright, Matt DeLisi, Jeffrey J. Shook, and Lauren Terzis. 2015. "A Typology of Drug Selling among Young Adults in the United States." *Substance Use & Misuse* 50(3):403–13.
- Vaughn, Michael G., Christopher P. Salas-Wright, David Cordova, Erik J. Nelson, and Lisa Jaegers. 2017. "Racial and Ethnic Trends in Illicit Drug Use and Binge Drinking among Adolescent and Young Adult Offenders in the United States." *Journal of Criminal Justice* In Press.
- Venkatesh, Sudhir Alladi. 2008. *Gang Leader for a Day: A Rogue Sociologist Takes to the Streets*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Verdejo-García, Antonio, Andrew J. Lawrence, and Luke Clark. 2008. "Impulsivity as a Vulnerability Marker for Substance-Use Disorders: Review of Findings from High-Risk Research, Problem Gamblers and Genetic Association Studies." *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* 32(4):777–810.
- Vryan, Kevin D., Patricia A. Adler, and Peter Adler. 2003. "Identity." Pp. 367–90 in *Handbook of symbolic interactionism*, edited by L. T. Reynolds and N. J. Herman-Kinney. Rowman Altamira.
- Vuolo, Mike, Brian C. Kelly, Brooke E. Wells, and Jeffrey T. Parsons. 2014. "Correlates of Prescription Drug Market Involvement among Young Adults." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 143:257–62.
- Wallace, John M. 1999. "The Social Ecology of Addiction: Race, Risk, and Resilience." *Pediatrics* 103.5:1122–27.
- Walters, Glenn D. 2014. *Drugs, Crime, and Their Relationships: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*. Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Ward, Tony and Bill Marshall. 2007. "Narrative Identity and Offender Rehabilitation." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 51(3):279–97.
- Weinfurt, Kevin P. and Patricia J. Bush. 1995. "Peer Assessment of Early Adolescents Solicited to Participate in Drug Trafficking: A Longitudinal Analysis 1." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 25(24):2141–57.
- Weisheit, Ralph A. 2015. "Research Drug Crime Using Qualitative Methods." Pp. 191–203 in *The Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Criminology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Weisheit, Ralph A. 1991. "The Intangible Rewards from Crime: The Case of Domestic Marijuana Cultivation." *Crime & Delinquency* 37(4):506–27.

- Weisman, Gilbert K. 1993. "Adolescent PTSD and Developmental Consequences of Crack Dealing." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 63(4):553–61.
- West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2):125–51.
- White, Helene Raskin, Angela Aidala, and Benjamin Zablocki. 1988. "A Longitudinal Investigation of Drug Use and Work Patterns among Middle-Class, White Adults." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 24(4):455–69.
- White, Helene Raskin, Peter C. Tice, Rolf Loeber, and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber. 2002. "Illegal Acts Committed by Adolescents under the Influence of Alcohol and Drugs." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 39(2):131–52.
- Whitehead, T. L., J. Peterson, and L. Kaljee. 1994. "The 'Hustle': Socioeconomic Deprivation, Urban Drug Trafficking, and Low-Income, African-American Male Gender Identity." *Pediatrics* 93(6):1050–54.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Random House
- Wilson, James Q. and Richard J. Herrnstein. 1985. *Crime Human Nature: The Definitive Study of the Causes of Crime*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Wolfgang, Marvin E. and Franco Ferracuti. 1967. *The Subculture of Violence: Towards an Integrated Theory in Criminology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- World Drug Report 2018 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.18.XI.9).
- Wortley, Richard. 1986. "Neutralizing Moral Constraint." *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 19(4):251–58.
- Wright, Douglas A., Georgiy Bobashev, and Ralph Folsom. 2007. "Understanding the Relative Influence of Neighborhood, Family, and Youth on Adolescent Drug Use." *Substance Use and Misuse* 42(14):2159–71.
- Yacoubian Jr, George S., Blake J. Urbach, Kristine L. Larsen, Regina J. Johnson, and Ronald J. Peters Jr. 2001. "A Comparison of Drug Use between Prostitutes and Other Female Arrestees." *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education* 46(2):12-26.
- Yanovitzky, Itzhak. 2005. "Sensation Seeking and Adolescent Drug Use: The Mediating Role of Association with Deviant Peers and pro-Drug Discussions." *Health Communication* 17(1):67–89.

APPENDIX. IRB APPROVAL MEMO



Institutional Review Board
Office for Responsible Research
Vice President for Research
2420 Lincoln Way, Suite 202
Ames, Iowa 50014
515 294-4566

Date: 04/12/2018

To: Jacob Erickson

From: Office for Responsible Research

Title: Drugs and Identity - A Narrative Approach

IRB ID: 18-145

Submission Type: Initial Submission

Review Type: Full Committee

Approval Date: 04/12/2018

Date for Continuing Review: 03/19/2020

The project referenced above has received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Iowa State University according to the dates shown above. Please refer to the IRB ID number shown above in all correspondence regarding this study.

To ensure compliance with federal regulations (45 CFR 46 & 21 CFR 56), please be sure to:

- **Use only the approved study materials** in your research, including the **recruitment materials and informed consent documents that have the IRB approval stamp**.
- **Retain signed informed consent documents for 3 years after the close of the study**, when documented consent is required.
- **Obtain IRB approval prior to implementing any changes** to the study.
- **Inform the IRB if the Principal Investigator and/or Supervising Investigator end their role or involvement with the project** with sufficient time to allow an alternate PI/Supervising Investigator to assume oversight responsibility. Projects must have an **eligible PI** to remain open.
- **Immediately inform the IRB of (1) all serious and/or unexpected adverse experiences involving risks to subjects or others; and (2) any other unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.**
- **Stop all human subjects research activity if IRB approval lapses**, unless continuation is necessary to prevent harm to research participants. Human subjects research activity can resume once IRB approval is re-established.
- **Submit an application for Continuing Review** at least three to four weeks prior to the **date for continuing review** as noted above to provide sufficient time for the IRB to review and approve continuation of the study. We will send a courtesy reminder as this date approaches.

- Please be aware that IRB approval means that you have met the requirements of federal regulations and ISU policies governing human subjects research. **Approval from other entities may also be needed.** For example, access to data from private records (e.g. student, medical, or employment records, etc.) that are protected by FERPA, HIPAA, or other confidentiality policies requires permission from the holders of those records. Similarly, for research conducted in institutions other than ISU (e.g., schools, other colleges or universities, medical facilities, companies, etc.), investigators must obtain permission from the institution(s) as required by their policies. **IRB approval in no way implies or guarantees that permission from these other entities will be granted.**
- Please be advised that your research study may be subject to [post-approval monitoring](#) by **Iowa State University's Office for Responsible Research**. In some cases, it may also be subject to formal audit or inspection by federal agencies and study sponsors.
- Upon completion of the project, transfer of IRB oversight to another IRB, or departure of the PI and/or Supervising Investigator, please initiate a Project Closure to officially close the project. For information on instances when a study may be closed, please refer to the [IRB Study Closure Policy](#).

Please don't hesitate to contact us if you have questions or concerns at 515-294-4566 or IRB@iastate.edu.