Copyright by

Oren M. Gur

2015

Degrees of Separation:

Drug Use by Graduate and Professional School Students

BY

OREN M. GUR
B.A., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 2006
M.S., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 2007

DISSERTATION

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Criminology, Law, and Justice
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Chicago, 2015

Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

Defense Committee:

Peter R. Ibarra, Chair and Advisor, Criminology, Law, and Justice
Lisa Frohmann, Criminology, Law, and Justice
Paul J. Goldstein, School of Public Health, Division of Epidemiology
Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Criminology, Law, and Justice
Amy C. Watson, Jane Addams College of Social Work

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe many thanks to individuals and institutions who have helped me in completing this dissertation. I am thankful for the learning environment at The University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) and the exposure I got to such diverse, talented, and dedicated faculty, students, and staff. First and foremost, I thank my advisor and the chair of my dissertation committee, Peter R. Ibarra: this effort grew out of a project in his Qualitative Methods course, and would not have been possible without his constant mentorship, support, and generosity of time and wisdom over the years. He helped me enjoy and learn to appreciate the process.

To my preliminary examination and dissertation committee—Drs. Ibarra, Lisa Frohmann, Paul J. Goldstein, Dennis P. Rosenbaum, and Amy C. Watson—I owe gratitude for extended and patient feedback and for pushing me to always improve. I was fortunate to take classes with almost every committee member, and have been inspired by their teaching, research, and dedication to advancing their respective fields of knowledge. Each provided valuable memories and lessons and these will forever be incorporated into how I think about research and life.

I wish to thank Edna Erez, Matthew R. Lippman, Paul A. Schewe, and Amie M. Schuck for their academic guidance and support during my time in Criminology, Law, and Justice (CLJ) program, and I have an enormous debt of gratitude to Sharon Casillas for always being there as a kind and knowledgeable friend. CLJ colleagues—including Meghna, Nijinsky, Brett, Ivan, Aubri, Jordan, Aaron, and Aimee—also helped and supported my work while at UIC. I would also like to thank the Graduate College for recognizing this research effort with a Dean's Scholar Award, my first supervisor at UIC, Dr. Sarah K. Keedy, for her willingness to train someone with my background, and those who have provided opportunities along the way, including Drs. Robert H. DeFina and Joel M. Caplan, and The Pennsylvania State University, Abington College.

I would not have been able to accomplish any of this without the positive support and influence of my family and friends. Profound love to my parents, Raquel and Ruben, who arrived

in the U.S. as students, with very little, and worked hard to provide their kids with everything (or at least offered to put it on the list); to my siblings, Tamar and Alon, for their inspiration, dinner table discussions, and being there to laugh with (and at); to my family the world over, for helping me gain and keep perspective; and to my friends, for still being my friends after all these years. Cheers to the unconditional acceptance provided by dogs: the late Amit, Oz, Adi, and Baraq, and the loving Abir, Nessie, Oogi, and Zik. Thanks to all who with whom I have shared laughs and smiles.

The most love and special thanks go to my wife, Arona. We got married a few weeks after I received IRB approval to conduct this research, and now you have helped me push this out less than a month after creating our life's work: a baby boy named Nadav. These have been the happiest years of my life, and the future is now.

And finally, this effort would not have been possible without the participation of 27 graduate and professional school students who shared their time and experience—I hope you feel your stories and perspectives are done justice in the following pages.

CONTRIBUTION OF AUTHORS

Chapter 1 is an introduction that places the dissertation in the context of interdisciplinary studies on substance use, highlighting the significance of the research question. Chapter 2 is a literature review that further elaborates on aspects of the societal response to substance use across time and place. In Chapter 2, the section on “Drugs and discourse” includes sub-sections on “Sociological theories of discourse” and “Conducting and analyzing ‘active’ interviews,” and this work grew out of discussions with my research mentor and advisor, Dr. Peter Ibarra, and conference presentations given over the past several years. Chapter 3 describes the methods of the current study, which originated in a Qualitative Research Methods course taught by my research advisor, Dr. Peter Ibarra. That class required students to conduct a research project involving interviews on some kind of “doing.” As developed in class, this was originally a study of women who were graduate and professional schools students, but the Institutional Review Board suggested men should not be excluded, and I am grateful for this contribution. Chapter 4 is the first data chapter, and is an original contribution. The section in Chapter 5 on “Professional socialization” draws on concepts developed in applying for a local funding opportunity in honor of Rue Bucher, and presented at conferences with Dr. Peter Ibarra. The section in Chapter 6 on “Professional discourse and leveraged expertise” similarly expounds upon concepts previously developed and presented at conferences with Dr. Ibarra. Chapter 7 concludes with a discussion synthesizing the implications of this research for the research questions and work in the field more generally. The present author was solely responsible for data collection and analysis, and the writing of the entirety of the dissertation text.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ..... **VII**

GLOSSARY ..... **VIII**

SUMMARY ..... **IX**

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION **1**
1.1 Statement of the problem 3
1.2 Significance of the problem 8
1.3 Approach to the study and chapter outline 12

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW **21**
2.1 Deviance and drugs 24
2.1.1 Sociological theories of drug use 26
2.1.2 Patterns in drug use: People do it 29
2.2 ”Deviant” drug use and arrest 34
2.2.1 Drug laws as social control 35
2.2.2 Policing practices and marijuana possession 41
2.3 Privileged drug use without arrest 47
2.3.1 High school 50
2.3.2 College 55
2.3.3 After college 59
2.4 Drugs and discourse 70
2.4.1 Sociological theories of discourse 72
2.4.2 Conducting and analyzing “active” interviews 79
2.5 Conclusion 84

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY **86**
3.1 Research design 88
3.1.1 Recruitment 91
3.1.2 The research interview 92
3.2 Setting 99
3.3 Sample 101
3.3.1 Selection criteria 103
3.3.2 Selection strategy 103
3.3.3 Demographics 105
3.4 Data collection 106
3.4.1 Procedures 107
3.4.2 Interview guide 109
3.4.3 Data management and protection of human subjects 112
3.5 Data analysis 113
3.5.1 Study variables 115
3.5.2 Limitations 116

CHAPER IV. EARLY SOCIALIZATION AND PRIVILEGE: FIRST EXPERIENCES WITH DRUGS **119**
4.1 Family contexts 120
4.2 Adolescent social circles 131
4.3 Waiting until college or graduate school 146
4.4 Conclusion 157

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER V. PRIVILEGED SPACES AND SOCIAL CONTROL 159
5.1 Alcohol's ebb and flow after college 161
5.2 Professional socialization 172
5.2.1 Initial discovery and occasions 173
5.2.2 Orientation to school-sponsored drinking 176
5.2.3 "Folklore" of substance use in profession 180
5.2.4 Additional discoveries and occasions 183
5.2.5 Marijuana with colleagues and mentors 185
5.2.6 Cocaine with colleagues and mentors 192
5.2.7 Hallucinogens with colleagues and alone 200
5.2.8 Colleagues as open books 202
5.3 Segmented identities 203
5.4 Conclusion 228

CHAPTER VI. HIGH-FUNCTIONING USERS 230
6.1 Privilege as a process 231
6.2 Professional discourse and leveraged expertise 243
6.3 Conclusion 267

CHAPTER VII. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS 270

CITED LITERATURE 282

APPENDICES 310
Appendix A 310
Appendix B 311
Appendix C 312
Appendix D 313
Appendix E 316

CURRICULUM VITAE 317

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Academic concentrations, descriptive monikers, and demographics (N=27)..... 102
Table 2. Selection criteria: Graduate or professional school student drug users 103

GLOSSARY

AA	Alcoholics Anonymous
AAMC	Association of American Medical Colleges; provides "Facilitated Criminal Background Checks" for students applying to medical school
ACLU	American Civil Liberties Union
ADAM	Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring; records substance use among arrestees admitted to booking facilities in several cities across the U.S. via questionnaire and urinalysis; after hiatus, re-launched as ADAM II in 2007, funded by ONDCP
BJS	Bureau of Justice Statistics
CA	Cocaine Anonymous
CRAN	Collaborative Research on Addiction at NIH
DAWN	Drug Abuse Warning Network; measures substance use among people seen in emergency rooms
GAPSS	Graduate and professional school students
JD	Juris Doctor
LEAP	Law Enforcement Against Prohibition
MA	Master of Arts
MBA	Master's of Business Administration
MBE	Multistate Bar Examination, i.e., "the Bar"
MD	Doctor of Medicine
MS	Master of Science
MTF	Monitoring the Future; longitudinal-design survey of substance use among 50,000 students in 8th, 10th, and 12th grades at public and private schools; sponsored by the NIDA; administered annually since 1975
NA	Narcotics Anonymous
NIDA	National Institute on Drug Abuse
NIH	National Institute of Health
NORML	National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws
NSDUH	U.S. National Survey on Drug Use and Health; sponsored by SAMHSA, "gold standard" self-report survey featuring yearly multi-stage probability sampling of 68,000 respondents age 12 and over
ONDCP	Office of National Drug Control Policy
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
SAMHSA	Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
UCR	Uniform Crime Report
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

SUMMARY

The consumption of psychoactive substances is of interest across many disciplines, as using “drugs," including alcohol, can influence internal processes and social behaviors. In the U.S., the use and procurement of mind-altering drugs is one of the more common forms of behavior pursued in contravention to the law, yet extant criminal justice research and theory on substance use incorporates few studies of people who use drugs while avoiding sanctions or treatment, such as educated middle-to-upper class users pursuing careers and maintaining conventional lifestyles. The present study addresses a gap in the literature by investigating a population of users who do not typically come to the attention of the criminal justice system and describing attendant processes that have yet to be characterized fully. Utilizing snowball and convenience sampling frameworks, graduate and professional school students (N=27) who engaged in substance use while attending their respective programs (MA, MS, MBA, JD, MD, PhD) were recruited for in-depth semi-structured interviews. Audio-recorded interviews were conducted in the participant’s place of choice (e.g., at home, in a bar, on campus), transcribed, and analyzed. The data indicate processes unique and common to participants, settings, and types of programs. Initial exposure to drinking and drugs occurred in the home, with adolescent peers, or after arriving at college or graduate school. For most, substance use peaked during college, particularly alcohol consumption. Enrollment in graduate or professional programs offered, and sometimes even encouraged, opportunities to use substances in professional settings, which necessitated decisions about how to integrate what had been a mostly social activity into other realms; some preferred to maintain segmented identities, and were able to do so in spite of occasional contact with law enforcement, while others incorporated social use in professional spheres. The accounts of students involved in substance use demonstrate how academic understandings are leveraged in social processes associated with using and talking about drugs. The findings underscore the role of educational privilege in shaping the pursuit and ramifications of substance use, and may generalize to other forms of privilege and criminality.

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

> … when we actually observe everyday social activities we find that the members of our society do not, in fact, find it easy to agree on what is right and wrong, moral and immoral, in concrete situations (Douglas, 1970: 15).

> … it was one of those situations where I was like, “wow, if I didn’t have an ounce of marijuana in my bag right now I would be asking for your badge number.”
> –Neuroscience Postdoctoral student

The consumption of psychoactive substances is of interest across many disciplines, as using “drugs," including alcohol, can influence internal processes and social behaviors. Researchers trained in medicine or psychology often focus on the internal processes, while social scientists in disciplines including criminology, sociology, and public health consider social behaviors (e.g., Jacques & Wright, 2015; Bourgois, 2003; Lankenau, Teti, Silva, Bloom, Harocopos, & Treese, 2012). Given the oft-reported and readily apparent risks accompanying some forms of substance use, including loss of control and disinhibition, unanticipated effects and overdose, violence and victimization (e.g. Goldstein, 1985; cf. Jacques, 2010), and criminal sanctions and the resultant stigma (Goffman, 1963), theories have addressed why and how people come to be involved with drinking and drugs. The medical approach to studying drugs tends to focus on genetic inborn differences that create metabolic imbalances causing some to be more susceptible to drug use, while psychological theories are generally based on individual personality traits that lead some to greater involvement with such behaviors (e.g., compulsivity, risk-taking, pleasure-seeking, escaping or avoiding pain, low self-esteem) (see Goode, 2007; Hart & Ksir, 2013). Sociological theories and methods are uniquely situated to explore how drug use and language are products of social learning within subcultures. Social drug using practices have implications for identity construction (Mead, 1934), and the societal response influences behaviors and reasoning associated with unique drug-using subgroups (Hagan, 1991; Maruna & Copes, 2005).

Diverse approaches to the study of substance use can be similar in their focus on the etiology of *why* people use drugs in relation to concomitant social issues (e.g., mental health,

homelessness, communicable diseases, trauma), including disregard for the rule of law. Whereas viewing substance use as a disease eschews moral prescriptions (cf. Courtwright, 2010), its criminalization in the United States as *mala prohibita* reflects *The Legislation of Morality* (Duster, 1970), placing it in a legal realm where people are often asked "why did you do this?"—i.e., engage in objectionable behavior. Research suggests that drug use by some is constructed as more problematic (e.g., Goode & Ben-Yehuda, 1994; Covington, 1997; Reinarman & Levine, 1997; Glasser, 2000; Geller & Fagan, 2010; Inciardi, Surratt, & Kurtz, 2011; Alexander, 2012), creating "moral panic" (Young, 1971; Cohen, 2002/1972; Reinarman, 1994, 2011). Drug laws have been enforced in a way that has produced racial disparities between frequency rates of those who use substances more generally,[1] and those whose use tends to be criminalized (e.g., Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring [ADAM]; Uniform Crime Report [UCR], 2013). Disproportionate enforcement in some communities (e.g., minority, urban) implies underenforcment in others (Kennedy, 1997; Barlow & Barlow, 2000), yet less is known about how spaces where people may feel freer to use illicit drugs without sanction are socially constructed (cf. Becker, 1953; Jackson-Jacobs, 2001, 2004; Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2006, 2010; Perrone, 2009).

Research that measures substance use relies on self-report surveys and aggregated data, but the interactive, discursive, and observable nature of experiences involving drinking and drugs are better suited to qualitative fieldwork. Interview-based research has the potential to document the discourse and speech patterns associated with distinct subcultural practices (cf. Sykes, 1958; Wieder, 1974; Anderson, 1999), including those involving drug use, complementing discoveries offered by disciplines better positioned to address the "brain disease paradigm" (Courtwright, 2010). Lemert, in an interview with Laub (1983), attempted to convey Donald Cressey's understanding of interviews:

---

[1] Such frequency rates are based on self-report surveys (e.g., Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA], National Survey on Drug Use and Health [NSDUH]),

> Listening to people tell you why they did it does not give you explanations of why they did it. When you ask people why they commit crime, they make sounds. I call them verbalizations. These are data. You study them (Laub, 1983: 139).

Interview-based scholarship can focus on *how* subgroups of offenders involve themselves with distinctive types of drugs and associated considerations, *what* they do when using and the impact on their lives, and *who* calls their behavior into question, rather than merely *why* (i.e., genetically, psychologically, morally).

1.1 Statement of the problem

Extant criminal justice research and theory on substance use incorporates few studies of people who use drugs while avoiding sanctions or treatment, such as educated middle-to-upper class users pursuing careers and maintaining conventional lifestyles. Aside from population-based surveys, criminological research on substance use tends to focus on those who have come into contact with the criminal justice system by way of the War on Drugs, minimizing the influence of "uncaught" users on deviance scholarship and related policy (Polsky, 1969: 123). Research tends to depict people who are poor, unemployed, unmarried, living unstructured lives, lacking formal education, and racial/ethnic minorities with a history of subjection to law (Jacques & Wright, 2010a; Black, 1976). However, as drug use involves social learning and subcultures, interactions between individuals and subgroups of users (Becker, 1953), and reactions to their use (Lemert, 1951), likely impact how they experience drugs socially and as a feature of their identity (Mead, 1934). Years of differential enforcement of drug laws and uneven responses to substance use have rendered the same behaviors less acceptable in some populations and more tolerable in others, in effect conferring the *privilege* of unencumbered illicit drug use to some but not others. Subcultural practices (Wieder, 1974; Sykes, 1958; Anderson, 1999) evolve in response to individual and group perceptions of how society responds to different "types" of

---

and as recorded in emergency rooms (i.e., Drug Abuse Warning Network [DAWN]).

users and associated processes. These phenomena have not been adequately researched among high-status users (e.g., credentialed, wealthy, educated).

There is a need for more knowledge regarding how individuals seemingly buffered from the criminal justice system procure, use, interpret, and depict their involvement with drugs. Students attending graduate and professional schools appear to be one such group that has not received attention commensurate with their rates of use; little is known regarding how illicit substances are consumed while building or launching a career. That advanced credential-seeking individuals continue to use illicit substances suggests that, for some, participation has not been noticeable to the extent that merits external sanction or social control by loved ones, colleagues and supervisors, or law enforcement—regardless of more or less successful efforts at self-restriction. Therefore, subcultural practices and processes unique to this phase of life merit further scrutiny, as academic, professional, social, and personal circles overlap in new ways that may alternatively create social spaces that facilitate or provide turning points away (Sampson & Laub, 2005) from routine or occasional use. Such experiences are likely to emerge in the accounts (Scott & Lyman, 1968) of students who are asked to consider how drugs are pursued at different times and places, for various reasons, and in relation to the situations and people in their lives, including those affiliated with academic institutions. When describing drug using practices and telling stories about “the scene” and associated activities, educated users who have not experienced punitive social control or stigmatizing repercussions (Polsky, 1969) may leverage particular forms of discourse reflective of their exposure to professional socialization (Bucher, 1965), training, and knowledge. Professional considerations and socialization may underwrite criminogenic behavior, be downplayed in decisions about drugs, or make some risks untenable, informing theories on the relationship between education, employment, class, and rule-breaking. In addition to offering new opportunities and strategies for drug use, the graduate or professional student status of informants may increase the likelihood that recently-acquired insights will be integrated in the presentation of self during the

research interview (Goffman, 1959), and potentially in other documentable interactions (Gur & Ibarra, 2013).

The purpose of this research is to develop a grounded theory of the situated nature of drug-related discourse and involvement by analyzing how a cohort of substance users leverage experiential and academic knowledge to maintain status or achieve distance (e.g., from stigmatized use and users, or those who may not approve). Grounded theory is characterized by an inductive approach to data collection and analysis involving ongoing transcription, close reading, coding and memoing; this process allows for constant comparison and, in turn, the identification and appreciation of negative cases that emerge during interviews, and which modify emergent conceptual categories. These can involve divergent or heterogeneous pathways, practices, interactions, experiences, or styles of discourse not previously documented in the data. The search for negative cases requires further refinement of core social processes until all can be subsumed in reconceptualized themes that offer contrasting contingencies and intricacies (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978; Strauss, 1987; Charmaz, 2012/2006). Accordingly, this study explores the following questions as they pertain to graduate and professional school students (GAPSS):

1. How do issues associated with substance use emerge and intersect for these students (e.g., education, employment, gender, race, class, legal issues, procurement, violence)?
2. How is substance use socially organized, understood, and portrayed by individuals aspiring to join or maintain membership in “respectable” classes (Thompson, 1967; Douglas, 1970)?
3. How do environments for advanced and professional studies furnish distinct spaces and occasions for use outside the purview of the criminal justice system?
4. What are the meanings of substance use among would-be professionals?

The comparative nature of the first research question calls attention to similarities and differences between the experiences of users depicted in the literature and those involved in the present effort, while the others focus more on unique aspects of the targeted sample. The rest of this section briefly introduces theoretical implications of use by GAPSS, indicating a range of dynamics that may emerge among middle-to-upper class drug users who ostensibly conform to

culturally prescribed and institutional means of attaining status (Merton, 1938). These issues are elaborated on in the literature review and methods, and further developed through the original findings reported in the data chapters and in the conclusion.

Substance use occurring in some social spaces is difficult to detect, for law enforcement and researchers alike. The present research effort sought to have GAPSS describe the physical contexts and social situations in which they drink alcohol and use drugs. Criminological investigations of middle-to-upper class individuals engaged in non-violent rule-breaking have generally been limited to those caught perpetrating “white-collar crime” (Sutherland, 1940)—which is commonly defined as occupational deviance by privileged classes (Shover & Wright, 2001). However, research on the experiences of high-status educationally or socioeconomically “privileged” individuals engaging in unlawful behaviors commonly associated with “street crime” (Fishman, 1978) remains sparse. Findings of deviance and criminality among “respectable” (Thompson, 1967; Douglas, 1970) populations call into question prevailing views regarding the relationship between crime and poverty (Sutherland, 1940: 2). Furthermore, such behavior among the highly educated challenges the notion that institutions facilitate supervision, commitments, routines, and transformations that are likely to reduce criminal involvement (Sampson & Laub, 2005: 34). Rather, ascendant students may use because they perceive there to be little risk in doing so, or, contrary to being sanctioned, their use is implicitly rewarded with good grades, publications, internships, and jobs.

The disproportionate societal and scholarly emphasis on substance use by those who come into contact with the criminal justice system reproduces attendant inequalities. The second and third research questions recognized that, though explicitly illegal behavior was of interest, as a by-product of how and where they use, most high-status participants would have limited criminal records or experience interacting with police and the criminal justice system, or different kinds of contact. Rather, as “education is part of a system of cultural stratification” (Collins, 1979: 192), students in advanced academic programs might navigate unique issues

they regularly confront as users attempting to “fly under the radar” while accruing status, such as: a) logistical considerations of procurement, ingestion, and the development of routines or precautions to manage their substance use, including who knows about it (e.g., being surreptitiously high at school or work, use with mentors or classmates); b) understanding the implications of their substance use within the context of launching or maintaining a professional identity; and c) developing repertoires of navigating practices that allow them to handle different kinds of potentially risky situations that arise in the course of using drugs (e.g., drug effects, interactions with dealers and police, drug tests). The lack of research on people with academic, social, informational, and institutional capital who break the law poses a problem for understanding how structural aspects of social space (Black, 1976) shape interactions between high-status drug users and forms of social control, including researchers (Jacques & Wright, 2008a, 2010a).

Conceptually, regarding the fourth research question—the meanings of substance use among would-be professionals—professional socialization (Bucher, 1965) and immersion in a new profession (Bucher & Strauss, 1961) might have an influence on how one understands and portrays their involvement with substances discursively. Conducting interviews that chronicle how students attending a range of professional (law, medicine, business) and graduate (social and life sciences, the humanities) schools go about using psychoactive substances might allow for an analysis of discourse relevant to distinct professions. It is further hypothesized that student-to-student interviews will create a social space similar to others in which the informant is comfortable speaking, where those involved have relatedly equal status and interviewees can feel as if they are talking with a colleague about their program and profession (see Platt, 1981; Coar & Sim, 2006), rather than engaging in a “clinical” or more rigidly structured interaction. Shifting the interview from their public professional career to the relatively private pursuit of substance use, by then asking informants to reflect on experiences and issues pertaining to drug use—a topic some may regularly discuss with colleagues—the likelihood might increase

that expertise and curriculum-based knowledge would be brought to bear in descriptions and portrayals of substance use. Analytically, proffered statements are understood as products of being in school, professional socializations, and differentially adapting and practicing academic understandings or perspectives, all of which may have implications for discourse, decision-making, and substance use "careers" (Hser, Anglin, Grella, Longshore, & Prendergast, 1997; Hser, Longshore & Anglin, 2007; Teruya & Hser, 2010). Therefore, in addition to documenting levels of drug use, discipline-specific vocabularies and curricular knowledge are of analytical interest for how they are invoked, which may entail moral or other forms of reasoning. These issues are explicated further in the literature review, methods section, and Chapter 6.

1.2 Significance of the problem

In the U.S., the use and procurement of psychoactive substances is one of the more common forms of behavior pursued in contravention to the law. Akin to theories of deviance and conflict (Durkheim, 1982/1895, 1947; Mead, 1918; Mead, 1928; Erikson, 1966; Douglas, 1970), over time[2] substance use has evolved into a normal social process (Weil, 2011/1972): some "fairly constant" amount (Erikson, 1966: 23) can be expected in a society that promulgates the conflicting values of conformity and diversity (Erikson, 1966: 7-19). Society's response to deviance has been described as "a kind of inverted Parkinson's law" (Erikson, 1966: 25)—where "Work expands so as to fill the time available for its completion" (Parkinson, 1957: 2)—such that as one kind of deviance becomes less important, another emerges to take its place. In this way:

> When the community tries to assess the size of its deviant population, then, it is usually measuring the capacity of its own social control apparatus and not the inclinations towards deviance among its members (Erikson, 1966: 25).

[2] Alcohol was likely discovered during the Neolithic age (Siegal & Inciardi, 2011), opium used in Mesopotamia in roughly 5,000 B.C.E. (Lindesmith, 1968), and "ma[rijuana]" in China in roughly 2,800 B.C.E. (Abel, 1980).

As not all are able to attain culturally defined goals (e.g., wealth, power, status) through institutionalized means, failed attempts to achieve these ends may cause some to retreat or escape through drug use, while others "strain toward innovational practices" (Merton, 1938: 678) or engage in "illicit attempts to acquire the dominant values" (Merton, 1938: 680)—of which selling drugs at prices artificially inflated due to their illegal status is one form. Rates of incarceration and community supervision in the U.S. at the turn of the 21st century might indicate that the modern system is highly functional and efficient. Yet the demand for and availability of drugs suggests the overall impact has been blunted, chiefly for "soft" drugs like marijuana, the most widely used illegal intoxicant (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 7.44B).

The process of calling others to account for their conduct establishes cultural boundaries (Becker, 1963: 13). At the federal, state, and local levels, substantial criminal justice resources in the U.S. have been expended in an attempt to locate and respond to users and dealers.[3] Surveys quantifying the extent of substance use indicate that, *in the past month*, fewer than one in ten Americans had used an illegal drug (SAMHSA, 2014a: 2).[4] Nearly half (48.6 percent) of U.S. residents had used an illicit drug *in their lifetime* (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 1.9B).[5] While abuse or dependence were more than twice as likely for alcohol (6.6 percent) than illicit drugs[6] (2.6 percent) (NSDUH, 2013a),[7] drug users and dealers are often responded to punitively. In

---

[3] Roughly $51 billion is spent annually and over $1 trillion has been spent since 1970 (Office of National Drug Control Policy, 2014; Drug Policy Alliance, 2015a).

[4] That is, among those above the age of twelve living in the U.S. (SAMHSA, 2014a: 2). One in twenty people aged 15 to 64 the world over reported drug use in the past month (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime [UNODC], 2011).

[5] This figure reflects use by *noninstitutionalized* U.S. residents who were above the age of twelve when they responded to the survey (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 1.9B).

[6] "Illicit Drugs include marijuana/hashish, cocaine (including crack), heroin, hallucinogens, inhalants, or prescription-type psychotherapeutics used nonmedically," and methamphetamines (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 5.3B).

[7] These figures reflect rates of abuse or dependence among those twelve or older (NSDUH, 2013a). Such findings imply that drug use is prevalent in the general population, legal drugs can also be abused, and investigating the onset of substance use should begin in even younger cohorts (cf. Weil, 2011), as some start to use before turning 12. The Collaborative Research on Addiction at the [National Institute of Health] NIH (CRAN) is working with the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) and others to fund such research, with $30 million available in 2015 to study

spite of there being a "War on Drugs," not all drug users are deviantized, as behavior associated with using and selling drugs is not inherently immoral and must be conferred as such through *human interactions* (Becker, 1963; Blumer, 1986/1969). Some locations are less likely to be policed, e.g., for narcotics enforcement. Interactions at the points where boundaries are pushed create cohesion among people on various sides of struggles, including among the "dangerous classes" (Silver, 1967: 3) who receive disproportionate attention from "a relatively constant number of control agents" (Erikson, 1966: 24) serving "the state and propertied classes" (Silver, 1967: 14). The "moral cooperation of civil society" is required to "lower long-term costs of official coercion" (Silver, 1967: 14), and is provided in part because less attention to these zones of conflict would entail greater scrutiny of higher status enclaves. Generally, processes associated with the (public) criminal justice and social service systems determine that some people who use drugs need treatment, others punishment, which is also more likely for those who distribute, thus exemplifying how physical boundaries are created between some users and society through two basic forms of external control.

In certain places but not others, policing has become as much a part of the drug scene as dealing or using. Though "not explicitly based on race" (Alexander, 2012: 184; Mandel, 1988), the enforcement of drug laws produces wide racial disparities in drug-related encounters between police and civilians that cannot be explained by different rates of drug use in any particular group (e.g., King, 2008; Alexander, 2012; ACLU, 2013).[8] The police serve as

---

how substance use affects the cognitive development of adolescent brains (Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development [ABCD] Study, 2015). As the experiences and attitudes of adults likely influence the social contexts and messages to which younger generations are exposed, their investigation complements efforts to better understand the etiology of substance use in younger populations. For example, among adults who graduated high school in 1978, nearly nine in ten reported having tried an illicit drug at some point in their lives, including 80 percent marijuana and 45 percent cocaine (Johnson, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2011: 81). Higher rates of use in some now-adult cohorts may have implications for future waves, i.e., their children.

[8] Awareness of such disparities has deleterious ramifications for the perceived legitimacy of police (e.g., cf. Vollmer, 1936; Manning, 1980; Kelling & Moore, 1988; Brave New Films, 2014; Clift, 2015; Law Enforcement Against Prohibition, 2015). Animosity has been generated by the increasing realization that, "Despite the demise *of de jure* segregation and discrimination, de

"gatekeepers" to the criminal justice system for those arrested in "the roundup" (Alexander, 2012: 185) associated with the War on Drugs, which has been aptly criticized for its disproportionately negative impact on urban young black men, their families, and communities (Alexander, 2012; Glasser, 2000; Mandel, 1988; Beatty, Petturiti, & Ziedenberg, 2007, Tonry, 1995; Tonry & Melewski, 2008). Laws and police have been mobilized to target and punitively respond to crime and substance use that occurs in some places more than others, particularly those operating in cities and public places (e.g., Beckett, Nyrop, & Pfingst, 2006; Beckett, 2012; Fagan, Davies, & Carlis, 2012; cf. Massey & Denton, 2001[9]; Wacquant, 2001; Beatty et al., 2007; King, 2008). For some types of offenses (e.g., domestic violence), police exercise great discretion in deciding whether to make a formal arrest, handle the situation informally, or otherwise (e.g., Bittner, 1967a, 1967b; Black, 1980), and this is especially true for drug law enforcement (Goldstein, 1960: 562; cf. Manning, 1980; Bass, 2001).[10] Selective enforcement practices influence the types of drug users processed through the system, and in turn the "official statistics" (Kitsuse & Cicourel, 1963) that are sometimes misrepresented as reflecting

---

facto discriminatory policies and practices perpetuate a substantially authoritarian, regulatory, and punitive relationship between racial minorities and the police" (Bass, 2001: 156). Perhaps this is in part why Vollmer (1936), in the wake of failed alcohol prohibition and on the eve of the Marihuana Tax Act, suggested that "Drug addiction, like prostitution, and like liquor, is not a police problem; it never has been, and never can be solved by policemen. It is first and last a medical problem" (p. 118).

[9] If the segregation of black and minority populations in urban settings was a purposeful endeavor by those with power (Massey & Denton, 2001), this may have been influenced by implications of such a policy for policing (i.e., it is easier to surveil a group if they are all in the same place).

[10] Goldstein (1960) described how the use of informants in drug enforcement involves multiple forms of discretion: "Trading enforcement against a narcotics suspect for information about another narcotics offense or offender may involve" (p. 562), first, disregarding the initial offense to gain potentially helpful information and, second, overlooking potential future offenses to maintain the flow of information. For more on the role of informants in the war on drugs and more generally, see: Chapters 6 and 7 of Skolnick (2011/1994), Miller (2011), and Stillman (2012). A growing body of literature on civil asset forfeiture also has implications for discretion (e.g., Benson, Rasmussen, & Sollars, 1995; Benson & Rasmussen, 1997; Blumenson & Nilsen, 1998; Worrall, 2001; Baicker & Jacobson, 2004; Williams, Holcomb, Kovandzic, & Bullock, 2010). For example, there is evidence that police departments that are able to keep what they seize—as opposed to sharing some portion with other local government agencies—tend to seize more (Baicker & Jacobson, 2004).

actual levels of deviance or drug use (Mandel, 1969). Racial and socioeconomic disparities exist whereby those who are arrested and incarcerated for drug crimes tend to be people who earn low wages (e.g., Lyons & Pettit, 2011), spurring efforts to examine the policies, practices and processes that take such a large human and financial toll (e.g., Gray, 1991; Covington, 1997; Glasser, 2000; Bass, 2001; Wacquant, 2001; Gould & Mastrofski, 2004; Golub, Johnson, & Dunlap, 2006; Hagan & Foster, 2006; Beatty et al., 2007; King, 2008; Geller & Fagan, 2010; Ferguson, 2011; Alexander, 2012; Fagan et al., 2012; Brave New Films, 2014). Less attention has been given to drug users who have not come into contact with systems of social control.

1.3 Approach to the study and chapter outline

The title of this dissertation—*Degrees of Separation*—refers both to the pursuit of academic credentials that set the individuals involved in the present research effort apart from other drug users, and to the close proximity of discrete units of measurement that recognize relatively small differences that may otherwise seem meaningless (e.g., from 82°F to 84°F, or 33°F to 31°F). On the one hand, GAPSS are distinguishable from other drug users due to their status as degree-seeking former, current, or future professionals. In contrast to most users represented in the literature, those in the sample analyzed herein were likelier to be some combination of affluent, employed, married, organized, educated, and racial/ethnic majorities with no history of subjection to the law (Jacques & Wright, 2010a); their rule breaking has been systematically downplayed in legislation, policing, the courts, and scholarship. On the other hand, the fundamental behaviors of GAPSS users may not be so different—ingesting, procuring, experiencing use as positive precipitating sustained involvement (Becker, 1953)—though peripheral activities (see Goldstein, 1985) and the substances ingested may vary (i.e., fewer “hard” drugs). This effort is conceptualized as a corrective to the literature in that it samples a hard-to-reach population to document processes associated with conduct commonly

studied and sanctioned among some, but not others. The focus on processes helps make reported stories more relatable to those that consider similar patterns in other populations.

A review of the literature (see Chapter 2) and methodological approach (see Chapter 3) further establishes the significance of the present effort. First, scholarship that informs the relationship between deviance and drugs is considered, including sociological theories and patterns of use in the U.S. by race/ethnicity, age, drug, level of education, and employment status. Next, historical and contemporaneous legal processes through which drug use is deviantized and used for social control are characterized, with a section dedicated to police practices surrounding marijuana possession. The third section then illustrates how drug laws are differentially enforced, such that privileged drug users in high school, college, and beyond do not experience arrest and associated labeling. Finally, sociological theories of offender discourse are engaged to inform the approach taken to interpreting the meaning of statements pertaining to illegal behavior that are offered during research interviews. The implications of conducting “active” interviews (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, 1997) with “active” offenders (Polsky, 1969) are described, setting up the methods section by highlighting the concepts that informed the research strategy, data collection, and analysis. The methods section further discusses the present approach to interviewing “elite” (Kezar, 2003; Costa & Kiss, 2011) respondents who may be reluctant to participate or disclose involvement in illegal behavior (Adler & Adler, 2003), even to peers (Platt, 1981).

Each focusing on different aspects of substance use, the three data chapters present findings from the current study, and can respectively be conceptualized as representing the diverse experiences with various *drugs* across *settings* noted in the sample, with the last chapter considering the unique *sets* of high functioning users able to leverage their knowledge in discourse and while doing drugs (Zinberg, 1984). Expressly, Chapter 4 emphasizes first experiences with drinking and drugs, Chapter 5 the settings in which informants had used with graduate or professional school colleagues (e.g., at school, bars, apartments, and in cars), and

Chapter 6 how students in different professions integrate academic perspectives when talking about their use.

Data analysis brought the role of “privilege” to the fore, and the term merits further treatment before reviewing how it is discussed in the data chapters. Privilege can be defined as “unearned power conferred systematically” that provides “permission to escape or to dominate,” amounting to “unearned advantages and conferred dominance” (McIntosh, 1988: 13-4). Some forms of privilege can be attained over time, yet others are bestowed before the age where people are reasonably expected to create their own chances or be in control of what they are exposed to; being born into educated or wealthy families provides associated opportunities, such as the ability to travel and experience different cultures, places, people, and perspectives. Generally, the concept of privilege has most frequently been applied to help understand the implications of skin color, including the “special circumstances and conditions” afforded to white people that are not earned and sometimes unacknowledged (McIntosh, 1988: 5), “white spaces” defined by the “overwhelming presence of white people” and “absence of black people” and their implications for black and brown people who enter them (Anderson, 2015: 13), the notion of a colorblind society as a tool used to “attribute racial inequities to the individual shortcomings of blacks” (Gallagher, 2003: online; cf. Alexander, 2012), and as a mechanism of social control that effectively protects white privilege by facilitating “the disproportionate incarceration of African American and Hispanic men and women” (Pewewardy & Severson, 2003: 53). Privileges associated with pigmentation are “intricately intertwined” (McIntosh, 1988: 5) with “class, religion, ethnic status, or geographical location” (McIntosh, 1988: 5), “music, dress, or vernacular” (Gallagher, 2003: online), “education, employment… prestige, money, and the promise of acceptance” (Anderson, 2015: 16), as well as leisure time activities such as tennis or golf (Anderson, 2015: 11; Veblen, 1994/1899). Education is consistently noted as a privilege (McIntosh, 1988; Gallagher, 2003; Anderson, 2015), as not all have an equal opportunity to access or spend time and money learning. *Due to the population of interest—GAPSS—the*

focus here will be on explicating how educational privilege and emergent academic knowledge are incorporated when pursuing or talking about illegal behavior, for "School graduates are reminded they are privileged and urged to use their (enviable) assets well" (McIntosh, 1988: 12). Academic institutional privilege shares some features with that associated with skin color, but can also be differentiated from other forms because certain degrees and professions confer status and credibility based on accomplishments achieved—which are relatively fluid—rather than the skin color one is born with.

So far, the term privilege has been used in the introduction to suggest that: 1) engaging in illegal behavior without getting in trouble is a privilege, which in turn 2) allows some to avoid negative labels associated with behaviors others are tainted by, and that 3) white-collar crimes tend to be committed by people in positions of power (i.e., by privileged persons), whereas 4) educated and well-to-do people who engage in street crime without being arrested are infrequently studied (i.e., the privilege of avoiding scrutiny). Borrowing from Anderson's (2015) analysis of "white spaces," it can be said that white-collar crimes tend to be studied in white spaces, whereas street crimes are observed in black or brown spaces. Similarly, drug use in private and public white spaces has not received the same attention (e.g., corporate offices or cul de sacs, respectively; cf. Jacques & Wright, 2015), and thus not been constructed as problematic to the same extent that it has in minority communities (e.g., public housing). Yet, just as black skin as a master status has come to signify that someone is "from the ghetto" (Anderson, 2015: 12), drug use is generally considered an "abnormal" behavior, i.e., regardless of where use occurs. By and large, most educational institutions and academic departments are white spaces and, though drug use is associated with both abnormal behavior and minority communities—due to the media, policing practices, research, and other social forces—those who use in such privileged places may not have to "pass inspection" (Anderson, 2015: 13) or be "on" (Anderson, 2015: 14) in spite of their drug use seemingly being "out of place." The implication is that student status and the process of obtaining an advanced education may be a

“master privilege” in the sense that it can help overcome the absence of most other privilege-granting identities, such that access to and socialization into places and practices of learning can shelter students from negative processes. Essentially, drug use may not be viewed as abnormal when educated people in white spaces are doing it. The student status and associated insights of informants offered the most readily apparent and accessible indicators of their developing power and prestige, though other aspects of privilege were also conveyed through the stories that were told, including some conferred long before graduate school (e.g., parental education and occupation, international travel, communities in which they were raised).

“Early socialization and privilege” are considered in Chapter 4, which details how the drug-using careers of users in the GAPSS sample began. Participants were heterogeneous, ranging from a few who rarely dabbled in illicit drug use, to a larger subgroup who had used regularly in the past but did so less frequently at the time of the interview, to the majority, who reported regularly using drugs, at the time of the interview, including those pursuing polysubstance use (i.e., as opposed to more passively accepting drugs when offered). Most everyone had used with colleagues in their current program, or in a previous graduate program. Yet they all had first experiences with alcohol and illicit substances, and these events were organized based on how they came about: either stemming from interactions with family, adolescent peers, or, for some, at college or in graduate school. Many of these initial events took place in locations indicative of financially privileged upbringings or opportunities to extend their geographical boundaries, such as on a boat while vacationing or at a friend’s summer home. Therefore, those who eventually end up attending graduate or professional school were exposed to various substance using practices at different points in their lives and developed dissimilar strategies, demonstrating the variety of ways people can come to use drugs on occasion, more regularly, and for extended periods of time while maintaining an upward professional and social trajectory. This chapter describes the social situations in which they were introduced to drinking and drugs.

Graduate and professional schools provide environments where students can become socialized within a profession or field of interest in which they plan to establish a career. The dichotomy between “Privileged spaces and social control,” which using illegal substances while pursuing credentials entails, is described in Chapter 5. First, the role of alcohol is brought to the fore in the beginning of the chapter, as all participants had been drinking for some time, shared stories of embarrassing or excessive consumption, and continued to drink with colleagues. Next, substance use that is socially sanctioned or safeguarded by academic institutions (or their representatives) is considered for how it allows for ongoing use during graduate and professional school, such that occasions and settings for use inform its practice and meaning (Ibarra & Gur, 2014; Gur & Ibarra, 2014). Themes include initial discovery and occasions of substance use in the profession, including at school sanctioned events where they develop awareness that professors and peers are doing it, and then experiences using with others affiliated with their school or program, or in academia. As evidenced by the general lack of external reproach or application of mechanisms of control, use in these places can be somewhat cloistered. However, the privileged nature of the educational institutions that buttress the social spaces in which students tend to use during graduate and professional school can be contrasted with distal and proximal interactions with potential agents of control (e.g., police, parents, peers) that similarly may not have generated a punitive response or deterred use. For these students, the process of obtaining advanced degrees can further buffer their use, providing additional “cover” that allows for continued involvement and immersion, or returning to school may entail novel risks, providing reasons to reconsider the implications of one’s substance use within a fresh framework of knowledge and career opportunities. While participating in various events beyond the classroom during which professional socialization with colleagues and mentors can provide “extra-curricular” knowledge that informs decision-making and may facilitate use, efforts might also be undertaken to create boundaries and segmented identities to limit or control what others see, hear, smell or think.

Chapter 6 focuses on unique features of the interview-based accounts of “High-functioning users” (Gur & Ibarra, 2010, 2011), as students made evident and practiced strategies for the presentation of self (Goffman, 1959). The manner in which use is portrayed in the interview by employing particular forms of discourse germane to distinct professions is examined, as are more general assertions and “reasons” for involvement with drugs (Mills, 1940: 910). Access to educational institutions—many of them preeminent—and the ability to in turn convey intricate knowledge were the privileges most readily observable in the present study. The final data chapter, therefore, focuses on the leveraging of academic understanding and emergent expertise by participants when talking about and using drugs, concentrating on how educated substance users employ language and knowledge in the interview setting and during other social interactions concerning drugs (Gur, 2013; Gur & Ibarra, 2014). Most had very rarely if ever been directly asked to portray aspects of their drug using and professional careers in the same conversation, and the resultant integration blended terminology and issues relevant to both pursuits (e.g., stress, abstract thinking, time management). As their professional aspirations and social status might be jeopardized if their drug use were to become widely known, expertise was also leveraged in deciding how and when to use, and how to disguise use. High-functioning users demonstrate reflexivity in identifying past behaviors that in hindsight seemed to be problematic and distinctions between their own understandings and those of other users, e.g., in light of new knowledge or continued success in spite of use.

Collectively, relative to other drug users portrayed in the literature, these students reported aspects of their biography indicative of privilege, including pertaining to their own schooling and work experiences, those of their parents, and family background more generally. Examples of its manifestations are interspersed throughout the data chapters, providing contrast and mimicking their inclusion in passing during the interviews. While a few informants were upfront in acknowledging that material or social wealth had played a role in their career path or would be useful if they encountered problems associated with drug use (e.g., being able to

afford more drugs, hire lawyers if arrested, receive treatment, or have a social support system), most did not unequivocally indicate that their narratives were indicative of privileged access to drug use that enabled them to use with relative impunity—indeed, privileges are often underappreciated by those who have them (McIntosh, 1988). Issues pertaining to privilege are addressed more directly in the discussion of use in graduate school and past experiences with social control, e.g., contacts with the criminal justice system (see Chapter 5). Privilege also emerged in how some portrayed themselves as different from typical users (see Chapter 6). Therefore, the social organization of privilege permeates the analysis, as it provides opportunities for continued use while diminishing the likelihood of negative sanctions—creating a foundation upon which students can accumulate leverageable expertise.

The experiences of the recruited sample inform how an erstwhile hidden population of users can integrate newly acquired knowledge from classes, academic literature, conversations with colleagues, internships, work, and other sources (e.g., the media) into how they talk about and do drugs. Research on substance use by GAPSS is generally limited to surveys, and has not been described in the same detail as use by other students (e.g., high school, college) or professionals (e.g., nurses, pharmacists, lawyers), creating a knowledge gap: how do years spent immersed in the academic study and discourse of a discipline or profession influence substance use "careers" (Hser et al., 1997, 2007; Teruya & Hser, 2010)? By documenting the stories of GAPSS who use psychoactive substances, do not conform to popular stereotypes, and are rarely stigmatized through criminalization, this study contributes to the literature by:

1. Addressing higher-status "privileged" individuals who use drugs while maintaining "upward mobility";
2. Featuring a "hidden population" (Watters & Biernacki, 1989; Adler, 1990; Wiebel, 1990) whose education, social and economic status may buffer them physically and psychologically from repercussions of use while helping them avoid sanction and resultant stigma;
3. Revealing patterns not counted in criminal justice agencies' "official statistics" (Kitsuse & Cicourel, 1963);
4. Researching post-baccalaureate use, in contrast to the common focus on drug use among high school or college students;

5. Involving in-depth interviews (rather than surveys) to capture the interactional nature of use and user networks;

The findings on professionalization and high-functioning users provide specification by elaborating on how these concepts relate to a particular sample, yet may reflect general social dynamics relevant for other areas of study. The implications of the research presented here might extend beyond substance use, informing how social processes operate in the context of privilege and when leveraging academic knowledge in rule-breaking.

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

It is generally accepted that people of all social strata engage in illicit substance use, which entails involvement with illegal drugs or the consumption of legal drugs in a manner that violates local, state, or federal law. Yet, as this literature review will demonstrate, some are far likelier to interact with police and face arrest and criminal justice sanction for possessing or using drugs, as indicated by "official statistics" produced by rate-generating agencies such as police departments (Kitsuse & Cicourel, 1963). Rather than revealing the total amount of illegal behavior in a given population, police data and survey-based estimates provide a partial (and therefore potentially biased) picture of substance use patterns, including how many individuals might be involved with drinking and drugs, and changing or emergent trends in substance use and the societal response over time (Mandel, 1969). Widespread illicit substance use and enforcement efforts notwithstanding, relatively little is known about use by those who are less likely to come into contact with the criminal justice system (Biderman & Reiss, 1967; cf. Polsky, 1969), such as how they talk and think about drugs, are or are not affected by stereotypes about drug use, consume drugs, and portray involvement with drugs as functioning in their lives. People who use drugs tend to be studied in populations, communities, and in relation to certain events such as violence (e.g., Goldstein, 1985; cf. Jacques, 2010; Jacques & Wright, 2008b), street crimes (Fishman, 1978), or other social problems (e.g., homelessness, mental health, diversion, re-entry).

The following review will address issues relevant to a consideration of drug use by respectable populations, such as graduate and professional school students (GAPSS). Research on those involved in substance use tends to mirror patterns of enforcement, with users likelier to be criminalized also disproportionately represented in offender-based research. Generally, this includes people who are "poor, unemployed, unmarried, unorganized, lack formal education," and racial or ethnic minorities with a "history of subjection to law" (Jacques & Wright, 2010a: 392). "Hidden populations" (Watters & Biernacki, 1989; Adler, 1990; Lambert,

1990) of drug users merit investigation, including affluent, employed, married, organized, educated, racial and ethnical majorities who are less subjected to law (Jacques & Wright, 2010a; cf. Mills, 2000/1956; Galliher, 1980). As an actor's radial, symbolic, corporate, vertical, and normative social status[11] increases, they are less likely to be recruited to participate in research, or to be questioned regarding their behavior (Jacques & Wright, 2010a; cf. Black, 1976, 1995). Therefore, little is known about these types of users, "privileged" in their ability to avoid sanctions and scholarly scrutiny, and the implications of their involvement for theories of drug use, deviance, and discourse.

The social space in which degree-seeking students operate allows for a study of privilege and drug use with mitigated stigma and legal repercussions. To date, no study has been organized to portray how academic training and knowledge emerge in the discursive accounts of one such "hidden" population: students currently working towards advanced degrees engaged in ongoing drug use who have either not been caught or processed by the criminal justice system, or have come into contact with authorities and nonetheless maintained a path towards credentialization and professional status (Collins, 1979). As a subgroup of users, GAPSS likely have unique issues they regularly confront, and those commonly studied in relation to substance use, such as the impact of class, race, gender, and the law, may intersect and emerge distinctively. Describing the involvement of high-status student users will complement a review of those most impacted by punitive policies and police practices, and the observation that some manage to engage in similar behaviors without external sanction stemming from use grounds the present approach. A lack of attention to or the absence of negative interactions can render some use less problematic, particularly absent a punitive reproach, a process GAPSS who drink and use illegal drugs can help elucidate.

---

[11] Forms of social status include radial (e.g., employment, marriage), symbolic (e.g., education, socialization, information), corporate (e.g., quantity of memberships), vertical (e.g., wealth, rank, money), and normative (e.g., respectability, freedom from social control) (Jacques & Wright, 2010a; cf. Black, 1976, 1995).

Ongoing substance use by current GAPSS has not been described in a way that can appreciate how time spent immersed in the academic study and discourse of a discipline or profession may influence depictions of substance use, or professional and substance-using careers. Perhaps especially for erudite or articulate subgroups of users (e.g., Kezar, 2003; Coar & Sims, 2006), interviews and ethnographic data can generate "thick" descriptions (Geertz, 1983) that help in "develop[ing] a fuller picture of multiple realities and … the most complex picture as possible" (Kezar, 2003: 398). In the present case, stories richly convey how young adults aspiring to or already members of the professional classes portray and make sense of their drug using experiences and professional socializations (Bucher, 1965), allowing for the development of a grounded theoretical framework (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978; Strauss, 1987; Charmaz, 2012/2006). Drug use during immersion in a new profession (Bucher & Strauss, 1961) may occasion the leveraging of expertise and curriculum-based knowledge in use of and talk about drugs, thus interviews provide a context conducive to eliciting "*professional*… systems of thought" (Bucher & Schatzman, 1962: 337, emphasis in original)—as opposed to "lay." Interviews with GAPSS can explore hypotheses, research questions, and topics pertaining to substance use and professional socialization by discussing both academic pursuits and the social life of the profession. Just as students and academics interact with their discipline, department, institution, profession, and one another across multiple settings, "mechanisms of socialization … embedded within the experiences of the training program" (Bucher, 1965: 206) might facilitate meaningful relationships that extend beyond the physical walls of a department (Bucker, 1965: 197). Some of these people and places may facilitate substance use, and what is learned in school and by observing and interacting with classmates can in turn influence how substance use is pursued, understood, and explained.

The literature review proceeds as follows. First, it surveys sociological conceptions of substance use as behavior that is not inherently deviant, and provides quantitative indicators of what is known about patterns of use in the U.S. Next, the second section considers the history

of drug laws in the U.S. since the turn of the 20th century, and provides an example of its most recent incarnation. By contrast, the third section offers three examples of "Privileged drug use without arrest," as it occurs in educational and work settings. The final section situates the logic of the present interview-based study and foregrounds the methods chapter by discussing classic and more recent approaches to interpreting and portraying how people describe their involvement in social behaviors that subject them to potential arrest.

2.1 Deviance and drugs

In the history of the United States, many legal policies and criminal justice practices attempting to regulate substance use have targeted or disproportionately affected certain groups (e.g., Lindesmith, 1965; Bonnie & Whitebread, 1970; Duster, 1970; Brecher et al., 1972; Musto, 1973, 1991; Galliher & Walker, 1977; Zinberg, 1984; Peterson, 1985; Mandel, 1988; Gray, 1991; DiChiara & Galliher, 1994; Covington, 1997; Glasser, 2000; Bass, 2001; Courtwright, 2004; Goode, 2007; Provine, 2007; King, 2008; Weisheit, 2009; Alexander, 2012; Swartz, 2012; American Civil Liberties Union [ACLU], 2013). Often, legislation concerning issues of morality (Duster, 1970) follows "moral panics" (Young, 1971; Cohen, 2002/1972; Reinarman, 1994, 2011) and the "social construction of drug scares" (Reinarman & Levine, 1997; Goode & Ben-Yehuda, 1994), sometimes with the help of a "moral entrepreneur" or crusader (Becker, 1963: 135-63; Anslinger & Cooper, 2011/1937; cf. Dickson, 1967). Some forms of drug use and users are thus perceived to be more problematic (Becker, 1963; Erikson, 1966) and, through processes encompassed by "labeling" and "societal reaction" (e.g., Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1963; Kitsuse & Cicourel, 1963; see Durkheim, 1947; Goffman, 1959, 1963; Kitsuse, 1962; Erikson, 1963; Matza, 1969), sides are established using symbols—a "major identifying badge" (Erikson, 1966: 7) or "Scarlet Letter" (Hawthorne, 1999/1850)—that connote a "master status" (Hughes, 1945) and indicate how "others" should be treated. Hughes (1945) remarked how:

> Membership in the Negro race, as defined in American mores and/or law, may be called a master status-determining trait. It tends to overpower, in most crucial situations, any other characteristics which might run counter to it (Hughes, 1945: 357).

Skin color is particularly salient for middle-to-upper class blacks thrust into service as "race ambassadors" (Anderson, 2011: 214). Such identities may also be associated with behavioral patterns, such as those of a witch (Erickson, 1966: 137) or an "addict" (Erikson, 1966: 7), "user," "pothead," "crackhead," "methhead," "stoner," or "junkie." When this occurs, an identity can permeate numerous social spheres, influencing whether users are perceived to be moral, "respectable" (Thompson, 1967), or employable (e.g., Pager, 2003; Pager & Quillian, 2005; Pager, 2008), and becoming salient as part of the "construction of a false separation between 'them and us'" (Granfield & Cloud, 2011: 451, citing Waterson, 1993: 14).

Yet morals function differently in public than in private (Douglas, 1970), and those espoused or displayed do not always coincide with actual perceptions or behavior. Regarding drinking and drugs, some may publicly decry alcohol while drinking in private (Warriner, 1958), or opponents of one drug may be proponents of another:

> Denunciations of the weed come characteristically from persons of those classes which prefer whiskey, rum, gin, and other alcoholic beverages and who do not themselves use marihuana. Such persons, overlooking the well-known effects of alcohol, commonly deplore the effects of hemp upon the lower classes and often believe that it produces murder, rape, violence, and insanity (Lindesmith, 1965: online, chapter 8).

Meanwhile, affiliation with elite or prestigious professions, people, and institutions can provide a master status resistant to negative labels associated with drug use. Some are likelier to be able to selectively incorporate or segment the implications of their substance use from adjacent areas of their lives, such as places of work, other public forums (e.g., classrooms, courtrooms), or the home. Status (e.g., employment, military), age (e.g., curfew, truancy), time (e.g., of day), location (e.g., urban versus suburban, in public), demeanor, race and social class play a role in determining whether behavior will be deemed objectionable, and in turn what and who will be considered deviant and criminalized (e.g., Chambliss, 1973; 1995; Black, 1976; Williams & Murphy, 1990; Tonry, 1995; Kennedy, 1997; Barlow & Barlow, 2000; Hagan & Foster, 2006;

Tonry & Melewski, 2008; Geller & Fagan, 2010; Lum, 2010a, 2010b; Alexander, 2012; Fagan et al., 2012; Brave New Films, 2014; Law Enforcement Against Prohibition, 2015).

2.1.1 Sociological theories of drug use

Sociological theories that account for interactions posit that drug use reflects a lack of self-control or social controls, is iteratively learned through subcultural practices, and is the product of selective interactions and socializations (cf. Goode, 2007; Mosher & Atkins, 2014). Self-controls derive from the internalization of beliefs through socialization, and are therefore influenced by exposure to external factors, particularly early experiences such as interactions with parents and then peers (Goode, 2007). Social or external control is exerted through bonds between individuals and mainstream conventions (e.g., the Protestant work ethic [Gusfield, 1986/1963]), involvement, attachment, and commitment to people, activities, and institutions—including, theoretically, those associated with higher learning—that make one want to be a part of society and where rule-breaking activities are not modeled or condoned (Hirschi, 1969). Conversely, when behaviors learned through interactions provide more lessons in how to engage in deviance than reasons to avoid doing so, the likelihood of participation will increase as techniques, motives, attitudes, and definitions conducive to continuing with a form of conduct are acquired (Sutherland, 1939; cf. Sykes & Matza, 1957). For a range of offense types, from white collar crime associated with “respectable” (Thompson, 1967) or “leisure class” (Veblen, 1994/1899) professions to drug use, immersion can become more likely absent external forces that discourage use, as perceived benefits outweigh the potential for penalties.

Given the opportunity, routine drug-using activities may emerge (Cohen & Felson, 1979) supported by positive associations with substances and like-minded peers—and “superiors”—that are experienced as rewarding (Becker, 1953). The same has been said of crime more generally (Akers, 1998), which, like drug use, “provide[s] immediate, easy, and certain short-term pleasure” (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990: 41) through overt and “sneaky thrills” (Katz, 1988;

cf. Jackson-Jacobs, 2004). There are many ways to experience such altered states of consciousness—like a child spinning in circles (Weil, 2011/1972)—of which drugs and crime are just a few (Lyng, 1990). Yet, according to the general theory of crime (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), drug users and criminal populations involve considerable overlap, with similar characteristics including impulsivity, carelessness, lack of empathy for others or themselves, malevolence, and minimal self-control that prevents them from making or achieving long-term plans. Not all who possess such traits use drugs or commit crimes, just as some users may have long-term plans and be empathetic.

The Chicago School of sociology created a tradition of going into the field to observe situations unfolding in their local and hence "natural" environments, incorporating public activities into social theory. Lindesmith (1940) and Becker (1953) famously demonstrated the utility of sociological methods for understanding how one becomes a heroin addict or "marihuana" user, respectively. Perhaps because the pleasures and withdrawal cravings associated with opiates can be so intense for the individual user, Lindesmith's "microinteractionist" (Goode, 2006: 417) work focused on the user and the drug (Lindesmith, 1947, 1968). Rather than using drugs for pleasure, in addiction the user is "trapped 'against his [or her] will' by the hook of withdrawal" (Lindesmith 1968: online). Therefore, the role of audience is less pronounced in drug-using practices or experiences, both during drug use itself and in the retelling for research. Meanwhile, before he became a sociologist, Becker (1953) played jazz for a crowd perched on a piano stool. This allowed him, initially, to interact with and observe musicians in his ensemble, and later, to interview them. Based on these interviews, he noted the importance of learning how to use marijuana and perceive its effects before pursuing it as enjoyable recreation—perhaps not so different from a musical instrument. The relationship between the individual user and the drug(s) depends on the nature of the former and addictive or enjoyable qualities of the latter, but the process of others teaching novice users how to perceive drug effects can also play a role.

The settings in which use occurs can influence pathways to involvement and related decisions, perceptions, and patterns of use (Zinberg, 1984), such as whether it will continue at all (Becker, 1953). Zinberg combined these aspects in his conception of *Drug, Set, and Setting* (1984), noting how different drugs are used in disparate ways, and even the same drug can have various levels of potency (e.g., after a period of abstinence) or be mixed with other substances (i.e., purposefully or unbeknownst to the user). “Set” refers to the individual characteristics of the drug user: physiology, mental and physical health, how they view their social relationships, and their expectations for what drug use will entail. The setting refers to the physical place in which the drugs are consumed, but also the features of a person’s life that may enter that space, or prevent the user from exiting, e.g., by removing themselves from a drug-laden environment. All three factors are essential “to understand in every case how the specific characteristics of the drug and the personality of the user interact and are modified by the social setting and its controls” (Zinberg, 1984: online, chapter 1). The function of language is of less interest.

Considering interactions between users and society, the ramifications of substance use may be differentially experienced based on how users are responded to socially by those they come into contact with (Becker, 1963; Blumer, 1986/1969), further shaping future usage patterns, practices, and associated beliefs. Lemert was the first in a series of scholars to consider deviance as a process that might “call attention to the importance of the societal reaction in the etiology of deviance, the forms it takes, and its stabilization in the deviant social roles or behavior system” (Lemert, 1972/1967: 62). The interactionist conception of deviance, encompassed by “labeling” and “societal reaction,” places priority on the role of interpretation, definition, and social control in the identification and “processing” of “deviants,” who face stigma and marginalization while attempting to maintain a self-image during interactions with researchers and others (e.g., Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1953; Kitsuse & Cicourel, 1963). Interactionist thrusts address how subjective and objective realities of deviance are actively

produced through symbolizations that are constantly in flux (e.g., Pollner, 1978; Berard, 2003; Ibarra, 2008; Holstein & Gubrium, 2000; Holstein, 2009). Other efforts combined components of scholarship by Lemert (1951, 1972/1967) and Becker (1953, 1963) to help further understandings of crime dynamics, including prostitution, drug use, and other so-called "*Crimes Without Victims*" (Schur, 1965).

Unsanctioned drug use that does not receive a criminal justice response might be considered for its criminogenic and theoretical implications (cf. Polsky, 1969). How does drug use proceed when external controls and secondary deviation are less pronounced? Educated or thoughtful users, even if their behavior has yet to be an overt issue personally or for those around them, may nonetheless realize their involvement could eventually create negative consequences (e.g., legally, medically, socially, productively). Situations and examples of how users exert the sorts of control exercised in pursuing their education to guide rule-breaking not labeled as deviant, such that it does not become problematic or discovered, can be documented among "successful" users who have not been caught or maintained an upward social trajectory in spite of use and detection. Complementing *in situ* observations of using and interactional practices, interviews communicate the decision-making that drug use entails: how to obtain and do drug while revealing or concealing interest across time and place.

2.1.2 Patterns in drug use: People do it

Prevalence rates for substance and associated behaviors use vary by age, drug, race/ethnicity, level of education, and employment. Before turning eighteen, nearly one in four (23.3 percent) Americans report having used an illicit drug. By age 26, after eight years during which young adults are likely to have joined the workforce, attended or completed college, or pursued postgraduate training, this ratio increases to three in five (57.0 percent) (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 1.19B). In 2013, marijuana, the most widely used illicit substance, had been consumed by nearly one in five Americans aged 18 to 25 in the last month, one in eight aged 26

to 34 (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 7.44B). While illicit substance use can often involve alcohol, legal substances are more readily ingested, including "binge drinking"[12] by nearly one in four (22.9 percent) above the age of eighteen (SAMHSA, 2014a).[13] One in five respondents aged 21 to 29 reported driving under the influence of alcohol in the last year (NSDUH, 2013: Figure 3.6).[14] Emergency department visits for the nonmedical use of prescription opioids, analgesics, and benzodiazepines doubled from 2004 to 2008, and were as common as those for illicit drugs (Cai, Crane, Poneleit, & Paulozzi, 2010),[15] while deaths involving nonmedical use of prescription drugs have increased (Cai et al., 2010).

Academic settings can provide opportunities for pursuing both licit and illicit drugs, and have long been associated with substance use (e.g., Goode, 1970; Schaps & Sanders, 1970). Until age 21, it is illegal to purchase alcohol in the U.S., though enforcement is inconsistent, particularly in private residences or establishments (Wagenaar & Wolfson, 1996). However, more than one in five (22.7 percent) below the age of 21 were current drinkers (NSHUD, 2013a: 3). Drinking increases precipitously among college-aged students and is maintained through the 20s for those with college degrees, deceasing only slightly in the early-to-mid 30s.[16] Among adults aged 26 years or older, college graduates had the highest rates of alcohol dependence or abuse (6.6 percent), with similar rates of illicit drug or alcohol dependence or abuse as less educated groups (7.2 percent), and lower rates of illicit drug dependence or abuse (0.9 percent)

---

[12] Defined as "five or more drinks on the same occasion" (SAMHSA, 2014a: 3).
[13] I.e., in the past month (SAMHSA, 2014a). Among Americans 12 or older, nearly half had taken a prescription drug in the past month, more than one in two (52.2 percent) consumed alcohol, and over a quarter used tobacco (NSDUH, 2014a: 4).
[14] For persons aged 21 to 25, 19.7 percent reported driving under the influence in the last year, while 20.7 percent of persons aged 26 to 29 engaged in same (NSDUH, 2013: Figure 3.6)
[15] Roughly 2.5 percent of those aged 18 or older reported the nonmedical use of prescription drugs in the past month (SAMHSA, 2014a: 2; cf. McCabe, Teter, & Boyd, 2006a: 269).
[16] Full-time college students aged 18 to 22 engaged in current (59.4 percent), binge (39.0 percent), and "heavy" (12.7 percent) drinking more than their part-time and non-enrolled peers (NSDUH, 2013a: 40), and rates of alcohol use remained relatively constant in the 26 to 29 age group, declining only slightly among 30 to 34 year-olds with college degrees (p. 36). Heavy drinking is defined as "five or more drinks on the same occasion on each of 5 or more days in the past 30 days" (NSDUH, 2013: 35).

(NSDUH, 2013: 88). Enrollment in college full-time was associated with increased rates of drinking, including at levels linked with dependence or abuse, and the years immediately after college graduation involved more current drinking relative to non-graduates—rate which held as college-educated users aged into their 30s.[17]

Rates of illicit drug use vary by drug and level of education. Incorporating the nexus between education and race/ethnicity, one quarter of white full-time college students had used an illicit drug in the past month, compared to slightly more than one in five Hispanics, one in five blacks, and one in ten Asians (NSDUH, 2013a: 27)—i.e., roughly the same proportion that engage in underage drinking. Among college graduates, illicit drugs are used less widely than alcohol, as data indicate that roughly a third reported such use in the past year (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 1.21B).[18] However, college graduates were likelier to have used cocaine or hallucinogens in the past year, and nearly as likely to have ingested marijuana (NSDUH, 2013b).[19] Among those aged 26 and older, college graduates (51.1 to 53.6 percent) are likelier than high school graduates (47.1 to 47.4 percent) or those with less than a high school degree (36.8 to 38.4 percent) to have used illicit drugs in their lifetime.[20] Lifetime use of marijuana, cocaine, and hallucinogens among those aged 26 or above were highest among those who attended some college, and college graduates were likelier to have used marijuana and hallucinogens than those with high school diplomas or less, with comparable rates of cocaine use (NSDUH, 2013b:

---

[17] Rates of current alcohol use were greatest among college graduates aged 18 to 25 (82.1 percent) (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 2.39B), compared to two in three 18- to 25-year-olds with "some college" education; among those 18 and older, more than two in three (69.2 percent) college graduates consumed alcohol in the past month, while a third (36.5 percent) of those with less than a high school education drank during the same time period (NSDUH, 2013a: 39).
[18] In 2012 and 2013, respectively, 32.1 to 33.6 percent of college graduates aged 18 to 25 reported any illicit drug use in the past year. Those not completing high school were the most likely to have used in the past year (37.9 to 38.9 percent) (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 1.21B).
[19] Among those aged 18 to 25, compared to those without college degrees (NSDUH, 2013b).
[20] Those those with some college education had the highest lifetime prevalence rates (55.3 to 56.3 percent) (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 1.22B).

Table 1.22B).[21] The illicit drug used in the past month by the largest proportion of college graduates aged 18 to 25 was marijuana (14.5 percent), which, aside from alcohol, was also the "drug of choice" among college graduates 26 years or older (4.6 percent); both age groups used marijuana less than their counterparts without bachelor's degrees (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 1.27B).

Substance use among adults is often considered in relation to employment (e.g., Winick, 1961; Crow & Hartman, 1992; Dreher, 1999; Shukla, 2005; Frone, 2006; Draus, Roddy, & Greenwald, 2010), including topics such as drug testing in the workplace (e.g., ACLU, 1999, Frone, 2006). Though four in five unemployed adults do not use illicit drugs, there are some indicators that the unemployed are likelier to be involved in current illicit substance use relative to those with full- or part-time employment (SAMHSA, 2014b), and overrepresented among arrestees (ADAM, 2013). An estimated 14.1 percent of employed adults use illicit substances,[22] and 3.1 percent use in the workplace (i.e., within two hours of beginning work, during breaks, or while working) (Frone, 2006). A study of marijuana smokers[23] found that "four in five reported that they never used at work, and two-thirds of the sample never used with their co-workers," and some purposefully did not smoke before work or professional encounters (Hathaway, Comeau, & Erickson, 2011: 461). Once at work, "Productivity … was less of a concern than the internal conflict that cannabis presented to their own professional identity and status" (Hathaway et al., 2011: 461). Still, several knew about colleagues and superiors who smoked pot. Whereas a 27-year-old female insurance broker kept work and pot separate—"I don't smoke around my

[21] By contrast, those with college degrees were less likely to report any forms of substance use in the past month. Overall, among those over the age of 18, academic achievement in the form of a college degree was associated with less current illicit drug use (6.7 percent) relative to those with some college coursework (10.8 percent), though the latter figure is inflated by users currently attending college (NSDUH, 2013a: 26).

[22] Compared to Frone (2006), the NSDUH reports lower rates of past month illicit drug use among full-time (8.9 percent in 2012, 9.1 percent in 2013) and part-time employees (12.5 percent in 2012, 13.7 percent in 2013) (SAMHSA, 2014a).

boss, although my boss smokes pot"—a 23-year-old female account manager smoked with some, but not others: “I don’t smoke with certain co-workers—even the ones who openly smoke and invite me along. It’s unprofessional. Why bother?’” Many people may deal with such questions, as in the U.S. in 2013, the majority of illicit drug users were employed: nearly seven in ten (68.9 percent) who reported illicit drug use in the past month had full- or part-time employment (NSDUH, 2013: 2), and full-time employees aged 18 to 64 represented the majority (55.1 percent) of people with substance use disorders[24] associated with illicit drugs or alcohol (SAMHSA, 2014b).

Taken together, these findings indicate that attending college or being employed does not preclude individuals from engaging in substance use, but relatively little is known about how time spent in graduate or professional school influences involvement with drugs. Some college was associated with higher lifetime rates of drug use, yet those who graduated from college were generally less likely to have used most drugs in the past month or year. That most have used drugs in their lifetime without reporting ongoing and recent use, abuse, or dependence suggests the importance of pursuing lines of questioning that can address “*how*” it is possible to engage in substance use without associated psychological, physiological, or social problems, especially as, for some, external sanctions for involvement with drugs can be as enduring or deleterious as internal processes associated with their use.

---

[23] A respondent-driven sampling framework led to interviews (N=92) with Canadian adults who had used cannabis on 25 or more occasions (Hathaway, Hyshka, Erickson, Asbridge, Brochu, Cousineau, Duff, & March, 2010).

[24] The NSDUH survey:

> asks persons to assess symptoms of substance use disorders involving alcohol or illicit drugs during the past year using criteria in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM, 2013). It includes such symptoms as withdrawal, tolerance, use in dangerous situations, trouble with the law, and interference in major obligations at work, school, or home during the past year (SAMHSA, 2014b: 1).

2.2 ”Deviant” drug use and arrest

Policing is influenced by how society shapes the law over time through the political-legal process, and police arrest data provide an indicator of the nexus between drugs, law, and society. Yet many use illicit drugs without coming into contact with the criminal justice system, which can be attributed to a combination of their status (e.g., middle-class, student, white), drug using behavior, and police practices. Certain characteristics, such as employment status, can influence officer decisions, making them more or less likely to proceed with formal arrest (e.g., Berk, Campbell, Klap, & Western, 1992). Employed people are underrepresented among arrestees: between 15.8 and 37.8 percent of arrestees were working full time or on active military status during the time of booking across ten U.S. sites (ADAM, 2010), indicating that people who are employed tend to be arrested less frequently in spite of being likelier to be involved with illicit drugs and problematic substance use.

Differential enforcement among privileged and underprivileged drug users has created a distinction between those discussed in this section on “‘Deviant’ Drug Use and Arrest,” and those in the next section engaged in “Privileged Drug Use Without Arrest.” It has been argued that discrepancies emerge in part because, rather than focusing on deviance that members of all racial groups are equally involved in, such as drinking and minor drug use, the

> emphasis of American law enforcement and research currently is placed on criminalized forms of deviance among African-American youth—notably involving vandalism, theft and violence—that are not prevalent either in this group or in the general population (Hagan & Foster, 2006: 66).

The result is a very low “hit rate” when attempting to detect such crimes, yet the targeting of certain places and groups combined with the prevalence of substance use in the general population leads African Americans to be overrepresented among criminalized substance users,

---

In the DSM-5, a “Substance use disorder [is] measured on a continuum from mild to severe,” with 2 to 3 symptoms from a list of 11 required for a diagnosis of mild substance use disorder (DSM, 2013: 1).

and hence in delinquent and drug subcultures (Hagan & Foster, 2006; cf. Covington, 1997). It is widely recognized that

> Urban black Americans have borne the brunt of the War on Drugs. They have been arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and imprisoned at increasing rates since the early 1980s, and grossly out of proportion to their numbers in the general population or among drug users. By every standard, the war has been harder on blacks than on whites (Tonry, 1995: 105).

Meanwhile, “non-normative behavior” among “privileged white youth in the party subculture” is less likely to be sanctioned or deterred (Hagan & Foster, 2006: 72; cf. Hagan, 1991), even though “information about these offenses is widely available” due to the transactional nature of substance use (Stuntz, 1998: 1803), as associated criminal conduct and related locations are infrequently targeted (Brave New Films, 2014). “The system must decide how to enforce the same offenses in very different communities” (Stuntz, 1998: 1803), eschewing “rich,” “upper-class,” or “upscale” areas for those that are “poor,” “lower-class,” and “downscale,” where residents have high rates of unemployment, low rates of income and legally-acquired wealth, and limited educational and social resources (Stuntz, 1998: 1801). The War on Drugs—like Jim Crow (Glasser, 2000; Alexander, 2012)—is discriminatory not only because of who it affects, but also because of who it does not, as it is not just about those who suffer, but also those privileged enough to avoid subjugation (cf. Lindesmith, 1948: 23);

> How fascinating, they will likely say, that a drug war was waged almost exclusively against poor people of color—people already trapped in ghettos that lacked jobs and decent schools (Alexander, 2012: 175).

2.2.1 Drug laws as social control

Like deviance, most drugs have a role and a place in society, and the function of laws pertaining to substance use has often been to criminalize the behavior or members of specific groups in an attempt to bring order to complex and changing environments. Historically, responses to drug use involved targeting locations where certain types of people congregated (e.g., opium dens, the South, the ghetto), but Duster (1970) also noted how:

> There was once a time when anyone could go to his corner druggist and buy grams of morphine or heroin for just a few pennies. There was no need to have a prescription from a physician. The middle and upper classes purchased more than the lower and working classes, and there was no moral stigma attached to such narcotics use. The year was 1900, and the country was the United States (Duster, 1970: 3).[25]

In the 18th century, Benjamin Franklin took a mixture of opium and alcohol to relieve the pain of kidney stones (Musto, 1991: 41), and in the 19th century William Stewart Halsted—former captain of the Yale football team and "one of the greatest American surgeons"—experimented with cocaine as a local anesthetic (Brecher, 1972; cf. Baldisseri, 2007). Before 1900, relatively few laws against particular substances existed, with one exception: the targeting of opium dens and their mostly Chinese operators and clientele through a local ordinance in 1875.

Well-known to the Chinese 500 years before Christ (Duster, 1970), and rooted as far back as the Neolithic age that ended over 4,000 years ago (Lindesmith, 1947; 1965), opium was brought to North America by European settlers. However,

> Americans had quickly associated smoking opium with Chinese immigrants who arrived after the Civil War to work on railroad construction. This association was one of the earliest examples of a powerful theme in the American perception of drugs: linkage between a drug and a feared or rejected group within society (Musto, 1991: 42).[26]

After the completion of the railroad, Chinese who settled in San Francisco drew ire by agreeing to work for low wages and providing opium to others (i.e., non-Chinese) (Brecher, 1972, online). Authorities learned that "many women and young girls, as well as young men of respectable family, were being induced to visit the [Chinese] opium-smoking dens, where they were ruined morally and otherwise" (Brecher, 1972). A 1875 Ordinance issued in San Francisco threatened fines and imprisonment for opium use and shut down some of the larger dens; as a result,

---

[25] For a brief description of drug use in the 1800s in America, see Musto (1991). For a detailed review, see *The American Disease* (Musto, 1973).

[26] Drugs are also associated with a particular group or set of values in other cultures. For example, the Chinese in the 19th century viewed "opium as a tool and symbol of Western domination," helping to "fuel a vigorous antiopium campaign in China early in the 20th century" (Musto, 1991: 41). Opium dens in San Francisco were therefore policed in part due to local

opium was used less openly and dens became smaller and more private to limit the potential for detection. Concurrently, the illegality "seemed to add zest to their enjoyment" (Brecher, 1972, citing Lindesmith, 1947: 186), and the local effort failed to produce appreciable reductions in use. Congress responded by raising tariffs in 1883, 1887, and 1890, before reducing them in 1897 because the high tariffs were encouraging smuggling to avoid the high tariffs (Brecher, 1972). Not satisfied with progress in reducing opium consumption, the 1909 Smoking Opium Exclusion Act was the first Federal law to ban the non-medical use of a particular substance.[27]

Moral indignation also surrounded a series of laws that brought marijuana use under government scrutiny, including the 1937 Marihuana Tax Act. At the time, marijuana was portrayed as being used mostly by "Negroes and Latin-Americans" (LaGuardia Report, 1945; Bonnie & Whitebread, 1970), which was effective in evoking fear given widely held opinions regarding these ethnicities (e.g., Merton, 1940). Though marijuana use was also associated with jazz musicians (Becker, 1953) and the "beat" community in Greenwich village (Polsky, 1969), the response to its use demonstrated how "the most severe punishment is reserved for those instances where a substance is publicly associated with a threatening minority group" (DiChiara & Galliher, 1994: 44). The passage of the Act is often attributed largely to the efforts of Harry Anslinger, a "moral entrepreneur" and the first commissioner of the Treasury Department's Federal Bureau of Narcotics (FBN) (Becker, 1963: 135-63), which oversaw enforcement of the resultant tax on the sale of cannabis. The FBN,

> faced with a non-supportive environment and a decreasing budgetary appropriation that threatened its survival, generated a crusade against marihuana use which resulted in the passage of the [1937] act and the alteration of a societal value (Dickson, 1967: 143).

Anslinger and his agents (e.g., Anslinger & Cooper, 2011/1937) were responsible for "furnishing facts and figures" (Becker, 1963: 141; cf. Galliher & Walker, 1977: 368) pertaining to marijuana

---

concerns, but also issues stemming from international relations between the U.S. and China, demonstrating the combined influence of moral panics and *The Power Elite* (Mills, 1940).

that appeared in the majority of newspaper articles that mentioned the drug, and repressing the publication of articles and media that suggested a more therapeutic and less punitive approach to drug users might be possible or preferable (Galliher, Keys, & Elsner, 1998; cf. Lindesmith, 1948). However, the FBN played off of American values supporting attempts to restrict drug use, which included "self-control, industriousness, and impulse renunciation" (Gusfield, 1986/1963: 4) represented by the Protestant Ethic, "disapproval of action taken solely to achieve states of ecstasy," and "humanitarianism" to protect people from their weaknesses (Becker, 1963: 136). These issues were addressed in one article dispersed by agents of the FBN pertaining to a Florida youth named Victor Licata who was reported to have smoked marijuana and, "in a daze," used an ax to murder his family: "father, mother, two brothers, and a sister" (Becker, 1963: 142). An earlier article stoked fears regarding marijuana use by Mexicans:

> On April 7, 1929, a girl was murdered by her Mexican step-father. The story was lead news in the Denver Post every day until April1 16, probably because the girl's mother was white. On the 16th it was first mentioned that this man might have been a marijuana user (Bonnie & Whitebread, 1970: 1015).

It was reported that, in light of his addiction to marijuana, his "nerves were unstrung" at the time of the murder because he had been without the drug for two days (Bonnie & Whitebread, 1970: 1015). Shocking the public conscience in this way helped spurn the passage of laws prohibiting the use of marijuana, which had been illegal in only sixteen states in 1930, but was illegal in all fifty by 1937 (Galliher & Walker, 1977: 367).

Passed after Mayor LaGuardia's Committee on Marihuana had released its results in 1945 stressing "the relatively triviality of the effects of marihuana use," the 1951 Boggs Act and 1956 Narcotics Control Act made it so that rules previously applied to opiate users and sellers now attached to those involved with marijuana (Lindesmith, 1965). Medical professionals stood to lose status from the re-classification or marijuana (see Beniger, 1984), and helped Anslinger

---

[27] The Pure Food and Drugs Act of 1906 did not ban drugs but required them to be labeled, and focused on opiates and cocaine (Brecher et al., 1972; Bonnie & Whitebread, 1970; Musto, 1973; Weisheit, 2009; Zinberg, 1984).

discredit the results of the LaGuardia Committee. The commoditization of drug use continued with the 1965 Drug Abuse Control Amendment, which for the first time regulated the sale and possession of stimulants, depressants, and hallucinogens, and the 1970 Controlled Substances Act that provided the scheduling system still employed today (Peterson, 1985). On June 17, 1971, President Richard Nixon remarked that "America's public enemy number one in the United States is drug abuse," stemming largely from "the passing of the war in Vietnam which has brought to our attention the fact that a number of young Americans have become addicts as they serve abroad, whether in Vietnam, or Europe, or other places" (Nixon, 1971; cf. Alexander, 2012: 43-4). Like the heroin that many service members used while in Vietnam,[28] marijuana was and still is included as a Schedule I substance, meaning it has no medical use, while cocaine—of which crack cocaine is a derivative—is Schedule II.[29]

As originally constituted, the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 was innovative and flexible, as it "did away with mandatory minimum sentences and provided more support for treatment and research" (Courtwright, 2004: 9). Early efforts by the Nixon administration stemmed the tide of the heroin epidemic and amphetamine diversion. However, "marijuana's growing popularity among middle-class youth alarmed parents" (Courtwright, 2004: 13). On the one hand, there were the "young middle and upper class white drug users who became identified as victims of drug traffickers," and on the other, "large-scale and professional drug dealers who became identified as enemy deviants—the true source and symbol of the drug problem" (Peterson, 1985: 243). In New York State, Governor Nelson Rockefeller and "Largely suburban, conservative, and Republican" parents supported the enactment in 1973 of

---

[28] Regarding whether substance use was a problem for veterans returning from Vietnam, "About 88% of the men addicted in Vietnam did not become readdicted after their return to the United States"; "once the users were taken out of the noxious atmosphere (the bad social setting), the infection (heroin use) virtually ceased" (Zinberg, 1984: online).

[29] Schedule I drugs are those for which (a) "The drug or other substance has a high potential for abuse[,]" (b) "The drug or other substance has no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States[,]" and (c) "There is a lack of accepted safety for use of the drug or other substance under medical supervision" (21 U.S. Code § 812, 2011: 522-3).

Rockefeller laws (Courtwright, 2004: 13), which provided minimum indeterminate sentences of 15-years-to-life for nonviolent offenses (see Gonnerman, 2004). Any successes of the 1970s then gave way to the challenges of the 1980s with the burgeoning use of crack and powder cocaine.

The crack epidemic of the 1980s compelled President Ronald Reagan to redouble the efforts of President Nixon before him, exemplifying a recent “drug scare” in full force (Reinarman & Levine, 1997; Goode & Ben-Yehuda, 1994; Inciardi, Surratt, & Kurtz, 2011). Crack appeared in the early-to-mid 1980s in “impoverished” urban minority communities in cities including New York, Los Angeles, and Miami (Reinarman & Levine, 1997: 1). Easy to make and very cheap, it was not a new drug, just a new form that allowed for an intense experience at the relatively low cost of $5 to $20 dollars per high, which could last for several hours. In 1986, “the first year of the crack scare” (Reinarman & Levine, 1997: 2), mandatory-minimum sentencing returned with the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, including for marijuana. As a “moral panic” “speeds up, and may overwhelm, democratic deliberation” (Provine, 2007: 8), the 250-page bill passed only two months after being introduced. Analyzing material provided by the “most ardent crusaders … for the edification of their colleagues” (Provine, 2007: 113), three racial themes emerged: (1) “Crack is moving from the Black ghetto to the white suburbs” (p. 113), (2) “Crack dealers are black men,” and (3) “Promising (white) young people are at risk” (p. 114). Based on such information, a 100:1 ratio was imposed whereby, for example, someone in possession of 500 grams of powder cocaine would receive the same *mandatory* sentence as someone with only 5 grams of crack cocaine (Inciardi et al., 2011). Reinforcing the 1986 Act, the Anti-Drug Act of 1988 created the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) and imposed a Federal death penalty for drug-related killings (i.e., to supersede states with no death penalty in place). Though the 2010 Fair Sentencing Act reduced the sentencing disparity for crack versus powder cocaine to 18:1, crack users tend to be of lower socioeconomic status, and are likelier to be arrested, whereas “Higher education and higher family income were negatively associated with crack use[,]

although these factors were sometimes risk factors for powder cocaine use" (Palmar, Davies, Ompad, Cleland, & Weitzman, 2015: 108). In sum, the 1980s crack scare exacerbated other issues associated with the inner city, such as race, crime, poverty, family structure (e.g., female single-headed households, "crack babies"), and violence (see Goldstein, 1985; Covington, 1997)—arrests and incarceration soon followed.

2.2.2 Policing practices and marijuana possession

Since the advent of the callbox, two-way radio, and patrol car, territorial aspects of policing have often involved the use of technologies (e.g., Herbert, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1997). The information technology era (Rosenbaum, 2007) has increasingly allowed departments to identify "hot spots" for certain offenses using sophisticated crime mapping, directing officers to specific areas where they might spend more time and be likelier to routinely find people involved in illegal activities (Cohen & Felson, 1984; cf. Kennedy, Caplan, & Piza, 2011), including would-be offenders and those involved with drugs. Police searches that occur in "hot spots" must meet Fourth Amendment constitutional standards. However, direct field observations have noted that misconduct in the form of unjustified searches stemmed from efforts to push the limits in waging the War on Drugs,[30] leading otherwise model officers to be disproportionately involved in unconstitutional searches—and suspects whose rights were violated to be released (Gould & Mastrofski, 2004: 332; cf. Mastrofski, 2004).

Problematic contacts may become even more likely in "hot spots" when considering the implications of predictive policing and crime mapping for reasonable suspicion. In the case of *Illinois v. Wardlow*, being present in a "high-crime area" was one of two factors[31] officers could

---

[30] Historically, narcotics enforcement was not the focus of critical reviews of police behavior (e.g., Galliher, 1971), though some aspects did begin to emerge as problematic in the late 1970s (e.g., Manning, 1980).

[31] Officers in New York City used a form ("UF-250s") to report why they conducted each stop; of 4.4 million stops between January 2004 and June 2012, roughly two in five (42 percent)

use to establish reasonable suspicion to stop an individual (Ferguson, 2011: 101).[32] Lacking a standard definition as to what constitutes "high crime," the rights of people who live in areas labeled as such are effectively diminished, with heightened attention to any movements considered to be "furtive" that would provide grounds for a search.[33] As a hot spot of crime is by definition a high-crime area, it follows that those subjected to hot spot policing have an increased likelihood of interacting with police, while being afforded fewer legal protections, i.e., to be secure from unreasonable search and seizure.[34]

Policing hot spots and high crime areas can also have an effect on police: similar to how officers en route to a call for service use information provided by the dispatcher to envision what may unfold when they arrive on scene (Fyfe, 1989: 595), those in crime hot spots prepare to engage with certain types of behaviors and people. Therefore, in addition to considering the demeanor of the suspect (Reiss & Black, 1967; Black, 1978; 1980), officer decision pathways may be influenced by the perceived "race of place" (Lum, 2010a, 2010b), or the demographic and socioeconomic conditions of a community, causing initial calls for service to be upgraded or downgraded after arriving at the scene, or before writing a report or making an arrest.[35]

---

involved "furtive movements," and more than half (55 percent) being in a "High Crime Area" (Floyd et al. v. City of New York, et al., 2013: 11).

[32] A reasonable suspicion that someone "has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a particular crime" is enough to justify a *stop*, but not to make a legal search. A reasonable suspicion that someone is armed and dangerous allows for a *frisk* (*Terry v. Ohio*, 1968).

[33] See Kennedy (1997) for a discussion of the use of "furtive" and "robust" crimes historically.

[34] Such an approach may seem counterintuitive to the logic of policing places with problems:

> Increased numbers of arrests are not going to solve the problem. Taking back the hot spot, demonstrating that someone cares, and rejuvenating the physical appearance of a problem place offer an alternative to arresting persistent offenders (Greene, 1996: 4).

[35] Controlling for a number of factors, including socioeconomic variables representing disorganization, needs, and wealth, level of violence, and interaction effects, findings show that—in Seattle, WA—responding to "places with a greater proportion of Black residents *or* wealthy residents significantly influences officers' decisions to downgrade crime classification and actions taken on incidents reported to the police" (Lum, 2010b: iii). In both types of communities, offenses were likelier to be downgraded, more so in the wealthiest areas than those with higher proportions of black residents. Such efforts may indicate that officers were

Unlike the use of pretext stops and consent searches (Alexander, 2012: 70), aggressive stop-and-frisk tactics employed in some New York City neighborhoods (Golub et al., 2006: 1; Geller & Fagan, 2010: 2) have come under judicial scrutiny for violating Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights (*Floyd v. City of New York*, 2013).[36] The stop is intended to facilitate crime detection, while the frisk is used to protect officer safety[37]; fewer than four percent of stops resulted in arrest, and less than half of one percent uncovered a weapon (Geller & Fagan, 2010: 41). Such low "hit rates" may be indicative of an unsuccessful practice, especially given that an analysis of 2.2 million stops and arrests reported "significant racial disparities in the implementation of marijuana enforcement, including both stops and arrests" (Geller & Fagan, 2010: 2).[38] Though blacks represent less than one quarter of the resident population of New York City, they represented more than half of all people stopped, whereas Hispanics were stopped relatively equal to their proportion in the population, and whites—who account for one

---

familiar with the neighborhoods to which they were dispatched and adjusted their responses accordingly in those with predominantly black or wealthy residents, though perhaps for different reasons, as the features of the police-civilian interactions that produced these findings were not reported. Variables in the wealth factor included median housing values for owner-occupied homes, median household income, and percentage of residents over the age of 25 with a 4-year college degree (Lum, 2010: 31).

[36] New York City is "the epicenter of marijuana law enforcement in the U.S." (Geller & Fagan, 2010: 41), and provides a contemporary example of how disparities in marijuana arrests could be a product of proactive policing in "public" places, rather than calls for service (Johnson, Golub, Dunlap, Sifaneck, & McCabe, 2006). The number of marijuana arrests in New York City increased from 16,000 in 1985 to 51,000 in 2000 after quality-of-life policing was implemented in part to reduce marijuana smoking in public (Golub et al., 2006: 10). One narcotics enforcement team referred to itself as "Operation Condor" and required members to make five narcotics arrests per shift (Bass, 2001: 169). Whereas most marijuana arrests in the early 1990s were recorded in the lower half of Manhattan, by the late 1990s and early 2000s, most arrests occurred in high poverty minority communities and low-income housing projects (Golub et al., 2006: 1; cf. Elliot, Golub, & Dunlap, 2012).

[37] Police in New York City reportedly used the pretense of officer safety to require individuals to turn their pockets inside-out, arrest those who in the process "openly display" even small amounts of marijuana, and charge them with a low level misdemeanor (Dwyer, 2013). A September 2011 memo from police commissioner Raymond W. Kelly to commanders was reportedly meant to reiterate "that officers are not to arrest people who have small amounts of marijuana in their possession unless it is in public view" (Harris, 2011).

[38] These findings "are robust to controls for social structure, local crime conditions, and general stop levels" (Geller & Fagan, 2010: 2).

third of the population—accounted for one in ten stops (*Floyd v. City of New York,* 2013).[39] Black and Hispanics were not only likelier to be arrested for using marijuana while in public view,[40] but also to be sentenced to additional jail time when compared to white smokers with the same number of prior arrests (Geller & Fagan, 2010), demonstrating how, for some, arrest for possession begets incarceration (Pettit & Western, 2004).

Disparate enforcement practices are especially prevalent when considering arrests stemming from marijuana possession, as they have a disproportionate impact on misconceptions regarding who is involved in illicit substance use. Four in five current users ingest marijuana, the most commonly used illicit drug in 2013, with increasing rates of daily or almost daily use compared to a decade ago (NSDUH, 2013a, 2013b).[41] While whites comprise roughly 72.4 percent of the U.S. population, and blacks or African Americans 12.6 percent (U.S.

---

[39] Similar rates were recently reported in an analysis of 250 randomly selected stops that took place in Chicago, Illinois, in 2012 and 2013: "Black Chicagoans were subjected to 72% of all stops, yet constitute just 32% of the city's population" (ACLU, 2015: 9).

[40] A modern example of place-based policing, "vertical patrols" in public housing emerged after the law in New York City was changed in 1992 to "criminalize entering or remaining in public housing without permission" (Fagan et al., 2012: 701). Known in police radio vernacular as a "10-75 V" (Scanner Frequencies in New York City, 2014), the process entails "systematically and methodically" checking the "roof, landings, stairwells, and lobbies" (p. 702) of each building in succession (Fagan et al., 2012: 702). Roughly 600,000 residents—in 2008, people of color comprised 91 percent of public housing residents—of 179,000 units in 344 public housing developments in New York City were subjected to 300,000 vertical searches per year (Fagan et al., 2012: 722), and more than twice as likely to be stopped for trespass, searched, or arrested as their neighbors in the surrounding communities. Compared with other strategies for uncovering drug users, such as time-consuming buy-and-busts, vertical patrols allow officers to approach anyone in the vicinity of a public housing building for questioning, meaning they are "able to question more people with less evidence" (p. 701). Though issues stemming from interactions between residents of public housing and police have been reported in other cities (e.g., Skogan & Annan, 1993), vertical patrols in public housing in New York City would seem to exacerbate issues with police legitimacy stemming from an enduring history of profiling and selective enforcement of some laws in some communities; conversely, they could be viewed as part of a concerted effort supported by the local community to remove negative influences (Rosenbaum, 1993).

[41] Daily or almost daily use is defined as "used on 20 or more days in the past month" (NSDUH, 2013a: xv). Among those who had used in the past year (12.6 percent), roughly one quarter (24.0 percent) reported having smoked marijuana on between 100-299 days, and 17.4 percent reported using on 300 or more days, while among past month users (7.5 percent of sample), more than two in five had smoked on 20 or more days in the past month (NSDUH, 2013b; Table 6.1B); *these rates are higher among those in the 18-25 and 26+ age groups*.

Census Bureau, 2010), blacks account for 30 percent of drug arrests, 40 percent of those incarcerated for drug offenses (Drug Policy Alliance, 2015b), and nearly nine in ten nonviolent drug offenders in federal prisons (Palmar et al., 2015: 109). Of an estimated 11,302,102 arrests in the U.S. in 2013, the most serious charge for 13.3 percent involved drug abuse violations, and of those 1,501,043 drug arrests, over 82.3 percent were for possession; in two of every five cases (40.6 percent), the most serious charge involved possession of marijuana (Uniform Crime Reports, 2013). Similar patterns emerged in cumulative totals from 2001 through 2010: 88 percent of 8.2 million arrests during this time period were for possession of marijuana (ACLU, 2013). Since 1980, the arrest rates of blacks for drug possession increased from over 450 per 100,000 persons, to a high of over 1,650 per 100,000 in 2006, before falling to roughly 1,140 per 100,000 in 2011 and 2012 (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BSJ], 2014). Arrest rates among whites for drug possession over the same time period increased from roughly 190 per 100,000 in 1980, peaking at nearly 500 per 100,000 in 2005 and 2006, before falling back to 400 per 100,000 in 2011 and 2012.[42] Despite relatively small differences in reported lifetime and recent use[43], in 2010 "a Black person was 3.73 times more likely to be arrested for marijuana possession than a white person" (ACLU, 2013: 9).

After years of disproportionate enforcement of the prohibition against marijuana in some communities and not others (Beatty et al., 2007; King, 2008; Brave New Films, 2014), marijuana accounts for more arrests than any other drug, but users appear undeterred: in 2013 rates of use in the past month among Americans aged 18 to 25 and 26 to 34 were at their highest levels

---

[42] There are reports that similar disparities persist in this decade in other major cities, including Philadelphia (Denvir, 2014; Goldstein, 2014; Bailey, et al. v. City of Philadelphia, et al., 2015) and Chicago (ACLU, 2015).

[43] Arrest rates can be contrasted with self-report data indicating that a greater proportion of whites (i.e., aged 12 and above) have ever used any illicit drug in their lifetime (52.9 percent), and marijuana specifically (48.5 percent), compared to blacks or African Americans (47.3 percent any, 42.4 percent marijuana), while greater proportions of blacks or African Americans report illicit drug use in the past year (16.8 percent, 16.1 percent for whites) and month (10.5 percent, 9.5 percent for whites) (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 2.1), and more marijuana use in the

since 1985 (NSDUH, 2013: Table 7.44B). Public opinion appears to be turning as well: for the first time since polling began in 1969, in 2013 a majority of adults (52 percent) indicated marijuana use should be legal (Pew Research Center, 2013).[44] In contrast to 2006, when half the respondents thought smoking marijuana was morally wrong and roughly a third (35 percent) indicated it was not a moral issue, the 2013 results show that half stated smoking marijuana was *not* a moral issue, while now fewer than a third said it was (32 percent). Furthermore, there was bipartisan agreement that Federal efforts aimed at enforcement of the marijuana laws were not worth it,[45] and a majority of respondents favored legalization regardless of the laws in their state of residence. Opinions regarding marijuana may be reaching a tipping point where a majority of states will have some decriminalized forms of marijuana use (Pew Research Center, 2013).[46] There is a growing realization that marijuana arrest rates do not correspond to self-reported rates of use, and people in certain places seem more likely to come into contact with police when breaking drug laws, particularly those whose most serious current offense involved marijuana possession or use.

---

past year (14.2 percent, 12.9 percent for whites) and month (8.7 percent, 7.7 percent for whites) (NSDUH, 2013b: Table 1.19B).

[44] Marijuana was the drug most-widely used by survey participants, with 48 percent having ever tried it, and 12 percent in the past year—similar to self-reported use rates in other surveys. There was a correlation between age and belief that marijuana has legitimate medical uses, with a greater proportion in the youngest age group responding that it does (84 percent of those aged 18 to 29) (Pew Research Center, 2013).

[45] More than two in three Republicans, Democrats, and Independents agreed that the War on Drugs was not worth it, with Conservative Republicans the only group to have a minority favoring legalization (Pew Research Center, 2013).

[46] Marijuana has been legalized or decriminalized in states along the East (New York, North Carolina) and West Coasts (e.g., California, Washington), in Central states (e.g., Ohio, Colorado), and in the North (e.g., Minnesota) and South, where it is grown on a farm in Mississippi by NIDA (e.g., Halper, 2015). The National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (NORML, 2015) has an interactive map showing the types of laws regulating the use of marijuana by state, including those with conditional release, mandatory minimum sentencing, tax stamps, and medical, decriminalized, and legalized marijuana, and medical cannabidiol.

2.3 Privileged drug use without arrest

The growing complexity of organizations and society more generally make it easier to diffuse responsibility (Galliher, 1980, citing Rainwater & Pittman, 1967). Those with elite status, power, and wealth are usually able to avoid interacting with agents of social control and criminologists, exercising their discretion without interruption, and so others are generally blamed for society's ills (i.e., those who *are* policed and researched). As "people often become powerful through their groups" (Galliher, 1980: 30), membership in *The Power Elite* (Mills, 1940) or *The Credential Society* (Collins, 1979) and affiliations with organizations and roles can help individuals avoid having to account for their actions.[47] With Anslinger still overseeing the FBN, Lindesmith (1948) wrote about "a small privileged class of [opiate] addicts" able to avoid arrest in spite of their use being known to some authorities "solely by reason of wealth, prestige, or political connections" (p. 23)—eliciting Anslinger's wrath (Galliher et al., 1998). Those privileged with access to money, authority, social, or informational resources (Marx, 1984) may have deviant characteristics overlooked, or, if they are noticed, be better positioned to divert attention or mitigate the implications of their behavior for their public standing. In this way, it becomes more difficult to investigate the physical, financial, and moral harms of elites and the organizations that they lead (Simon, 2006/1982: 35-6). Galliher (1980) therefore exhorts researchers who "look upward meekly" to instead engage in critical studies of superordinate elites and public officials accountable to all citizens (clandestinely if necessary). He notes that most efforts to do so are not critiqued for their merit, but rather their methods,[48] which tend to be qualitative or journalistic—such as disclosures of past drug use by Presidents Bill Clinton (see

---

[47] See Lyman and Scott (1968: 57) for a discussion of strategies for avoiding accounts.

[48] Galliher (1980) suggests that discrediting the methods used to study the elites as "simply not scientific" serves to "ostensibly disallow the researchers on professional and intellectual grounds, rather than admitting to political reasons" (p. 301), and is therefore a political ploy. Though he is referring to elites and politicians more specifically, the logic can be extended to critiques of methods for studying hard-to-reach populations and topics more generally, including those concerning conduct that is criminal or potentially objectionable.

Klein, 2003) and Barack Obama, including what may have amounted to felony possession of cocaine and marijuana (Obama, 1995).

Fieldwork conducted in Washington, D.C., provides an example of how privilege protects and generates disparities in arrest. Chambliss (1995) described how the rapid deployment unit—"originally designed for riot control" (p. 250)—differentially responded to people in "the ghetto," and those near George Washington University (GWU) in the Foggy Bottom neighborhood. In the former, police considered suspects to be

> all young black males between the ages of twelve and thirty who are visible: driving in cars, standing on the street corners, or in a group observed through a window in an apartment … actually confronting them consists mainly of finding an excuse rather than a legal reason (p. 250-1).

The police did not operate in the same way on the campus of GWU, where:

> underage students drink, use false ID's to go to bars and nightclubs, and in the presence of a "cool" professor they roll their marijuana cigarettes or stuff white powder up their noses. Not infrequently at fraternity parties or while out on a date these students commit rape and various other sexual assaults … if procedures that were followed in the ghetto were followed here, students would be violently shoved against a wall, called names, threatened with death, hand cuffed, banged around, shoved into a police car, and taken off to jail for booking (p. 253).

Reminiscent of the different locations in which the "Saints" and "Roughnecks" conducted themselves and the disparate response (Chambliss, 1973), it follows that drug use by students in dorms and residences associated with GWU will not be reflected in official crime statistics, as police do not look for it, let alone invoke the criminal justice process (cf. Wilson, 1968). As Senator Cory Booker recently commented in an interview,

> [T]here's no difference between black and white marijuana usage or sales, in fact. You go to college campuses and you'll get white drug dealers. I know this from my own experience of growing up and going to college [at Stanford University] myself. Fraternity houses are not being raided by police at the level you see with communities in inner cities (Lopez & Posner, 2015).

Indeed, arrest statistics indicate that between 2.0 and 5.4 percent of arrestees were in school only at the time of booking (ADAM, 2010),[49] though roughly 8.0 percent of the civilian

[49] Among adult males who completed surveys in ten sites across the U.S. (ADAM, 2010).

noninsitutionalized population aged 18 and over are current undergraduate or graduate students, including 7.3 percent of males (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). Similarly, while more than three in ten noninsitutionalized Americans have a college degree or more (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014), only between 2.5 to 8.5 percent of booked arrestees had a four-year degree or more, with the highest proportions of educated arrestees in Washington, D.C. (ADAM, 2010)—a known hub for credentials and the "power elite" of the military, government, and business sectors (Mills, 1940). Adult male arrestees were likelier to be employed than students or college graduates; it can be inferred that an even smaller proportion of arrestees with four-year degrees or additional schooling were also current students, i.e., a small percentage of arrestees were current GAPSS.

The following sections consider privileged drug use among high school, college, graduate, and professional school students, and members of the workforce. Surveys tend to exclude high-risk and hidden populations, as such users are not included in the target population (e.g., home-schooled students), due to respondent loss (e.g., because they are skipping class to use drugs rather than taking the survey), or because they do not report their use (Adlaf, 2005: 105). Those that may remain hidden to surveys include "the homeless, street youth, prison detainees, HIV positive individuals and even mainstream drug-using populations (e.g., white-collar executives)" (p. 105), though some of these are captured through targeted methods. Adlaf (2005) cautions: "the major weakness of non-probability based convenience samples is their inability to generalize to the population" (p. 105). Though school and campus self-report surveys are frequently conducted and considered practical and useful, there are fewer surveys of GAPSS, and they are often not distinguished from college students analytically.[50] It may therefore be stated that a weakness of survey methods are that they fail to

[50] Regarding the limitations of survey methods for understanding substance use among graduate students, consider that the Monitoring the Future (MTF) survey does not differentiate between college and graduate students, or explore why they take Adderall (e.g., they could be taking it to party, not to work), and assumes Adderall use stops at age thirty:

capture the population of drug users and drug-using practices from which to generalize.[51] Citing Faugier and Sargeant (1997), Adlaf (2005) notes the complementary nature of the strengths and weaknesses of probability survey methods and non-probability research focusing on "local social processes related to drug use" (p. 106).

2.3.1 High school

A section on use by privileged high school students foreshadows the first data chapter. Paralleling efforts to investigate the etiology of substance use among younger cohorts (ABCD, 2015), before reviewing pathways to student substance use in college or after, it is beneficial to consider how it may begin earlier for a portion of those who will eventually continue on to Bachelor's and advanced degrees. While it is "widely accepted in America that youth in poverty are a population at risk for being troubled" (Luthar, 2013: online), and acknowledged that "experimentation" with mind-altering substances has already occurred by age eighteen (Johnson et al., 2011; NSDUH, 2013a, 2013b), a body of developmental research demonstrates a greater prevalence of substance use and other issues (e.g., depression, anxiety, physical and emotional isolation) among high school students who are privileged "children of the affluent" (Luthar & Latendresse, 2005; cf. Luthar & Becker, 2002; Humensky, 2010; Hokemeyer, 2013; Patrick, Wightman, Schoeni, & Schulenberg, 2013; Luthar, 2013; Luthar, Barkin, & Crossman,

---

> The higher rates of use among those in their early 20s are consistent with the interpretation that initially Ritalin and perhaps now Adderall are used by college students and *perhaps* graduate students trying to stay awake and alert for studying and completing assignments (Table 4-3). Respondents over age 30 are not asked about Ritalin and Adderall use (Johnson et al., 2011: 84, emphasis added).

[51] There are benefits and drawbacks to the survey approach. Benefits include replicability in longitudinal designs, consistent presentation of stimuli (i.e., questions and answer choices), and statistical power that allow prevalence rates to be extrapolated from population-based samples. Drawbacks stem from their limited capacity to utilize clarifying follow-up questions, generate original responses or reasons for involvement with drugs, or depict how people go about doing so in relation to others in their social networks. For example, a survey of students attending the same school might be used to inform national trends while dynamics among students at that school remain unknown.

2013). Though the criminal justice system tends to focus on urban communities, there are indications that youth who a) grew up in communities where the average family income was twice the national average (Luthar et al., 2013: 1529), with high proportions of "white-collar, well-educated parents" (Luthar, 2013: online), b) were raised in "White, high-income, two-parent families" (Luthar et al., 2013: 1530; Luthar, 2013; cf. Humensky, 2010; Patrick et al., 2013), and c) attended schools with "rich academic curricula, high standardized test scores, and diverse extracurricular activities" (Luthar, 2013: online) were significantly likelier to engage in substance use, including experiencing stressors and achievement pressure (Luthar & Becker, 2002) that may precipitate psychological issues that lead some to "self-medicate" or act out (Hokemeyer, 2013).

Classroom-based surveys of substance use among high school students have a long tradition (e.g., Monitoring the Future since 1975 [Johnson et al., 2011]), and one particular "serendipitous" (Luthar, Barkin, & Crossman, 2013: 1530) study that sought to compare suburban and inner-city students (Luthar & D'Avanzo, 1999) has led to further explorations of the relationship between affluence, adolescent substance use, and associated issues (Luthar & Becker, 2002; Luthar & Latendresse, 2005; Luthar, 2013; Luthar, Barkin, & Crossman, 2013). Results indicating that children with affluent parents were likelier to smoke cigarettes, drink alcohol, and use marijuana and other drugs—particularly high-socioeconomic status (SES) girls (Luthar & Latendresse, 2005: 1530)—have since been replicated in suburban public and exclusive private schools on the East Coast, in the Northwest (Luthar et al., 2013), and in population-based surveys (e.g., Humensky, 2010; Patrick et al., 2013).[52] Other issues present among middle and upper school students included delinquency and rule breaking, such as stealing, cheating (Luthar et al., 2013; 1535), and misusing and diverting (e.g., using, selling, or

[52] Affluent boys and girls in the Northeast had elevated rates of self-reported depression, including among one in five girls, with "serious depressive, anxiety, and somatic symptoms" for both genders (Luthar et al., 2013: 1530). While substance use was not as widespread in the

trading) prescription stimulants (McCabe, Teter, & Boyd, 2004), behaviors which may continue in college (e.g., McCabe et al., 2006b; Serras, Saules, Cranford, & Eisenberg, 2010), graduate school (e.g., Dabney & Hollinger, 2002; McCabe, Butterfield, Treviño, 2006a), and beyond (e.g., Dabney & Hollinger, 1999; Merlo, Cummings & Cottler, 2014).

As the meaning of wealth and status are products of social interactions, attempts to delineate why privileged adolescents appear likelier to engage in substance use have focused on relationships with parents, siblings, peers, coaches, and teachers (Luthar & Becker, 2002; Luthar, 2013), and the lack and quality of interactions with successful parents (Luthar & Latendresse, 2005: 50; Hokemeyer, 2013). Achievement pressures (Luthar & Latendresse, 2005: 50) can come from all parties, and include wanting to live up to parent's expectations and levels of success while maintaining the same comfortable standard of living (Luthar, 2013). Siblings, including older high-achievers, may provide other sources of competition in the quest to attain "straight A's" in academic attainment and parental attention, admiration, and affection. Relationships with friends can also be tested, as peers and would-be confidants compete for leadership positions, playing time, starring roles, and ultimately admission to the same colleges that are becoming increasingly competitive (Luthar et al., 2013: 1535-6)—problems that may persist after arriving at colleges comprised of the top students from numerous high schools.

It is commonly assumed that affluent parents are more available to their children than parents of low-income youth (Luthar & Latendress, 2005: 50). However, when not being pressured to succeed or participate in extra-curricular activities, the children of affluent and successful parents experience isolation that can be both physical and emotional. "Business travel" and professional pursuits—including being recognized for various achievements—may demand that parents be absent for periods of time, or miss events that are special for their children (Luthar et al., 2013: 1534). Working mothers striving to overcome wage gaps may feel

---

Northwest, other "clinically significant internalizing and externalizing symptoms" emerged, including low closeness with parents and self-injurious behavior (Luthar et al., 2013: 1530).

pressured to make sure they are not perceived as working fewer hours or being less productive because of having a family, including in relation to single colleagues and those without children. Brief interactions at the dinner table before going into separate rooms to complete homework and professional work might overemphasize accomplishments likely to appear on a college application, rather than focusing on stories reflective of "personal character and resiliency" (Hokemeyer, 2013: online). Such a focus on extrinsic status-oriented goals associated with the "American Dream" (Luthar et al., 2013: 1536-7; cf. Messner & Rosenfeld, 2007), rather than "intrinsic goals such as relationships and personal growth," can compromise mental health (Luthar et al., 2013: 1537). Parents who do become aware of substance use or other issues with their children may feel shame and deny the problem, try to keep it hidden or have privacy concerns about the ramifications for their own public identity (Hokemeyer, 2013), consider use to be reflective of a moral failure or a "problem of the poor," feel affluence is a "vaccine against depression" (Luthar et al., 2013: 1537), or have their own problems (e.g., work, relationship, substance use [Hokemeyer, 2013]). Finally, when combined with the increasing tendency for parents to problem-solve and literally and figuratively bail their children out (Luthar et al., 2013: 1535), isolation may be exacerbated by the nature of suburban living, such that there are fewer peers and activities easily accessible by foot, making children reliant on parents and technology to facilitate social interactions (e.g., cars, the internet).

These findings from high school have been corroborated by research on early adulthood that also considers aspects of parental affluence and education. Young adults (aged 18 to 27) with college-educated parents[53] were likelier to engage in binge drinking, and to have used marijuana and cocaine in the last 30 days, while higher parental income was associated with

[53] The parents of nearly every student in the present sample had graduated college, and many held advanced degrees.

binge drinking and marijuana use (Humensky, 2010).[54] Results held when she controlled for whether the young adults had attended or were attending college (Humensky, 2010).[55] Meanwhile, using income, wealth, and parental education as indicators of family SES, others report that those from the highest family backgrounds were prone to alcohol and marijuana use (Patrick et al., 2013).[56] The top quartile in terms of average household income, average household wealth, and parental education,[57] were likelier to be white (86.9 percent, 83.9 percent, and 83.2 percent, respectively) and current students (73.7 percent, 67.8 percent, and 85.0 percent, respectively). Those in the top quartiles were likelier than those in the lowest respective quartiles to be involved in "heavy episodic drinking" and marijuana use (Patrick et al., 2013: 774-8).[58] Regarding advanced parental education, relative to those whose parents had not completed college, young adults whose parents had some postgraduate education were significantly likelier to be in the top quartile for average income and wealth (p. 776), but also to be involved in current smoking, current drinking, heavy episodic drinking, and marijuana use (p. 778). For many use began in high school, and for top-quartile high-SES users aged 18 to 23, these activities continued while pursuing their education.

---

[54] Humensky (2010) analyzed a large dataset (N=9,872) from the National Longitudinal Survey on Adolescent Health (AddHealth). These finding held in general and for white non-Hispanic young adults.

[55] Humensky (2010) tested the hypothesis that "wealthier young adults are more likely to attend college, and thus to be living near peers who are engaging in substance use, particularly alcohol and marijuana use" (p. 4/10).

[56] Patrick and colleagues (2013) analyzed data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, which began in 1968 and is "the longest-running, nationally representative, longitudinal household survey in the United States" (p. 773).

[57] Among a cohort of individuals (N=1,203) aged 18 to 23 years, with the top quartile of education defined as those who attended or completed postgraduate or professional school after college (Patrick et al., 2013)

[58] Defined as five drinks for a male or four drinks for a female on twelve occasions in the past year (Patrick et al., 2013: 774-5), and marijuana at all in the past 12 months (p. 778). Those in the top income and parental education quartiles were also likelier to have smoked marijuana twelve or more times in the past year (p. 778).

2.3.2 College

College campuses, like cities, do not all face the same crime problems. Rural colleges may not have as many commercial destinations within walking distance, increasing the likelihood students will have to drive, including after drinking. Urban universities can face the same types of problems as the communities in which they are located. Some common issues facing campus police regardless of school location include sexual assault or "acquaintance rape," underage and binge drinking, and other crimes stemming from youths transitioning to a new physical setting, and to early adulthood (e.g., bike theft, leaving valuables unattended).

Drug and alcohol arrests account for a large percentage of all campus offenses, as high as 95 percent in the 1990s (Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008, citing Sloan, 1994). Arrest patterns may differ depending on the school, type of institution, and the location on campus where use occurs. "For example, campus police can more likely curb drug use in a dormitory if nearby off-campus drug areas are addressed" (Peak, Barthe, & Garcia, 2008: 248). During the 3-year period from 2011-2013, many more arrests occurred on public campuses than private (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2014).[59] Regarding the location of the arrest, 76.0 percent of drug arrests at public 4-year institutions occurred on campus, including 54.0 percent in a residence hall, with 20.7 percent on public property; at private for profit 4-year institutions, 69.5 percent of arrests occurred on public property, and a small fraction on campus. Patterns for liquor law violations were similar. There was also variation across campuses, with students attending some schools much more likely to be arrested or disciplined per 1,000 students (Project Know, 2014).

Current drug use patterns on college campuses can be situated within a historical perspective: university students used drugs in the 1960s and 1970s, then shifted back to alcohol

[59] There were 101,092 arrests for liquor law violations and 64,473 for drugs at public 4-year institutions, compared to only 17,260 and 12,590 at private non-profit 4-year institutions, and 528 and 928 at private for profit 4-year schools, respectively (Office of Postsecondary Education, 2014).

as the “drug of choice” in 1980s because of an uptick in drug enforcement and easy access to alcohol (Powell, Pander, & Nielsen, 1994). Regarding the mid-to-late 1960s, Duster (1970) commented:

> Collegians on practically every major college campus in the country have used marijuana or other drugs—often with the approval of educators—the nation's narcotics chief has warned Congressmen. Commissioner of Narcotics Henry L. Giordano noted with alarm: "We have had a problem in just about every one of the major universities in the country with marijuana. Fortunately, you will not run into heroin. It is amphetamines, hallucinogenic drugs, tranquilizers and drugs of that sort” (Duster, 1970: online).

Students attending colleges and universities in the early-to-mid-1990s were “brought up in a pill society that is increasingly buying the well-advertised proposition that there is a chemical solution for any problem, whether it be physical, psychological, or social” (Powell et al., 1994: 15). There is less use of heroin, crack cocaine, and other “hard” drugs on campus (cf. Jackson-Jacobs, 2001, 2004), as students

> seem to have the knowledge that once they become involved with the drug, they are guaranteed an addiction that they do not desire. A student addicted to crack probably won't remain a student for very long; crack is not common on campus because those who use it do not remain on campus. Similarly, though recreational use is observed, the use of cocaine is not widespread on most campuses (Powell et al., 1994: 17).

Field research on crack use on a college campus provides mixed support to the notion that it is not compatible with college requirements (Jackson-Jacobs, 2001; 2004). Some students from “middle-class families” whose “parents included a doctor, an engineer, a librarian, and a federal law-enforcement officer” (Jackson-Jacobs, 2001: 609) used crack and other drugs while working towards and completing their degrees. Though one individual “lost control” of their use and dropped out of college, another went on to attend graduate school (p. 610). Drug use on college campuses continues to evolve, and more recent efforts have called attention to binge drinking (e.g., Vander Ven, 2011), the re-emergence of marijuana, and a number of other drugs (e.g., Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2006, 2010).

Drug use and dealing are pursued and responded to differently by social control agents on college campuses. Relative to other users, those on campus have been portrayed as

operating in a more secure context, such that students involved with crack and powder cocaine, marijuana, LSD, mushrooms, Ecstasy, alcohol, and occasionally heroin could a) mostly remain sheltered from interactions with external law enforcement and b) keep different people and spheres of their lives separate from their use, including employers and parents (Jackson-Jacobs, 2004). The same was true for "*Dorm Room Dealers*" in California involved mostly with marijuana, but also mushrooms, Ecstasy, prescription pills, and cocaine. These affluent youth operated with relative impunity on a college campus patrolled by armed campus police able to conduct searches of cars and dorm rooms (Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2006: 117). University officials were apparently aware that a particular student was dealing drugs, yet were

> reluctant to formally confront him for fear that he would bring his parents' wrath down upon the university or that a major drug bust would bring unwanted attention to the campus (Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2006: 54).

In this case the university took the stance that "we have no problem here," trying to downplay the issue (Powell et al., 1994: 15), and college students may generally be aware of this mentality (Schaps & Sanders, 1970: 145). The "vast majority of the users and dealers … were never confronted for their illegal use or transportation of pharmaceuticals," either by campus police or other enforcement agencies (i.e., off-campus), and did not know anyone who had faced legal sanctions for their behavior (Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2010: 90).

The process of obtaining and dealing drugs on college campuses further illustrates how students are protected physically and psychologically from negative repercussions stemming from their decisions. One dealer described how he procured drugs to sell:

> I [had it mailed] from Ohio, where I grew up, for really cheap. It was about $25 [for] an eighth [of an ounce] and I sold it for $50 an eighth out here . . . I didn't have any weighing equipment so [my friends back home] weighed it all and put it in bags and everything… I'd send them a check for how much I wanted and then shipping. And they'd weigh it in eighths and send it to me in little packets of eighths (Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2006: 106).

Receiving packaged marijuana shipped through the mail and across state lines in such a way (i.e., weighed out) provided evidence of the intent to distribute, and the check a paper trail, a

seemingly brazen approach based on convenience more than guile. Yet these students successfully navigated potentially perilous routes to obtain drugs, including one informant who on multiple occasions interacted with police or Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) officers while transporting pounds of marijuana and under the influence of same. When questioned regarding whether he was transporting any marijuana, his response of “I’m not that type of person” was accepted, “consistent with the notion that this affluent, primarily white drug network is relative[ly] immune from law enforcement scrutiny,” or at least a “low priority” (Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2006: 109). Similarly, a female dealer made a statement that “captured some of the ways these biases [e.g., societal conceptions of drug dealers] likely contributed to the largely nondeviant self-perception that characterized most of the dealers" (Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2010: 108):

> I mean, if you’re a clean-cut suburban kid. . . It’s all college kids . . . I mean if someone really wanted to bust us they could, all they would have to do was get someone to sit on our house to get some evidence against us to be able to go in there. No one cares that much. I think a lot of it has to do with the people we are. We don't live in the ghetto. We don't make noise. We don't have parties. We don't bring attention to ourselves. We are quiet. We pay everything on time (Mohamed & Fritsvold, 2006: 110).

Their physical location in a “non-ghetto” setting and status as students meant that dealing garnered little attention from community residents or the authorities. College polysubstance users described by Jackson-Jacobs (2004) also managed to avoid trouble on campus, though one student and his friends had been involved in a number of violent or dangerous altercations while using off-campus in “urban slums” (p. 851).

As students graduate college and transition to occupations and perhaps graduate or professional schools, some habits developed during undergraduate years are likely to continue. A study on the use of prescription stimulants by undergraduate and graduate students at one University found that students aged 24 years and older, 74 percent of whom were graduate students, had patterns of use similar to younger, mostly undergraduate students (White, Becker-Blease, & Grace-Bishop, 2006: 264). Roughly one in every six reported misusing prescription

stimulants, of which nine in ten had never been diagnosed with an attention disorder (e.g., attention deficit hyperactivity disorder [ADHD]) (White et al., 2006).[60] Rates of misuse and abuse were found to be significantly higher among students who had attended private high schools, who were also likelier to be diagnosed with an attention disorder (White et al., 2006). A multi-campus probability sample (Serras et al., 2010) found that undergraduates were significantly more likely to report self-injury over the past year, behavior that was more than twice as prevalent among first-year undergraduates compared to advanced (beyond fourth year) graduate students. Drug use and frequent binge drinking were associated with higher rates of self-injury, and depression, cigarette smoking, gambling, and drug use were predictive of self-injury (Serras et al., 2010). Though it appears undergraduates are at greater risk for substance use and other issues, that all GAPSS were at one point in time undergraduates reinforces the relationship between associated behaviors and problems during one phase of life, and the likelihood that they will persist for some in the next chapter.

2.3.3 After college

Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital (1979) suggests that, as attainment of a college degree becomes more common, middle and upper classes will "increase their investments" in higher forms of education (i.e., graduate and professional schools) (Moss, 2005: online). In the U.S., the majority of those who earn a high school diploma go on to earn a college degree. The U.S. Census Bureau (2014) reports that, in 2014, 26.7 percent of adults[61] had earned a high school diploma, and nearly a third (31.9 percent) a bachelor's degree: 14.9 percent had received a bachelor's degree only, 13.9 percent held bachelor's degrees and were pursuing a graduate or master's degree, and 1.5 and 1.8 percent held a professional or doctorate degree,

[60] Rates of misuse/abuse among graduate students in contrast to the undergraduate sample were not reported (White et al., 2006). Another study of undergraduates found 14 percent had used prescription drugs illicitly in the past year, while 21 percent had in their lifetime (McCabe et al., 2006b: 273).

respectively. As higher proportions continue to seek additional credentials and specialized training, “Graduate degrees [will] increasingly function to exclude those whose highest degree was the Baccalaureate from high paying or prestigious occupations” (Moss, 2005: 3), and law enforcement and drug researchers from prying into their lives—except in extreme cases (e.g., Bowden, 2001/1987), surveys, or anonymously.

Stories involving substance use have been provided by men and women who completed graduate and professional schools, yet the accounts of students experiencing ongoing professional socialization (Bucher, 1965) tend not to focus on ramifications for substance use (Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 2008/1961; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001; Weidman & Stein, 2003; McCabe et al., 2006a; Gardner, 2007; Sweitzer, 2009; Holley, 2011; Platt, 2012; Rashe, 2012). The significance of their status as a hard-to-reach population of knowledgeable and high-status drug-using informants has so far been understated. Substance users in such subgroups are not frequently asked to provide reasons for their behavior, so it can only be assumed that their reasons are similar to those of other users. Thus, the drug use takes priority in determining and providing reasons (e.g., Weinstein, 1978), not the user. Substance use among GAPSS may function distinctively for users and be responded to differently by those around them, with consequences for theories concerning drugs and discourse.

Prevalence estimates of substance use for particular professions (e.g., doctors, lawyers, dentists) or sub-specialties (e.g., surgeons, pharmacists, anesthesiologists) indicate the extent to which it does occur among advanced degree students and in related fields, and the response. Though there are some differences based on specialty, location, the era during which the study was conducted, and the drug (McAuliffe, Rohman, Fishman, Friedman, Wechsler, Soboroff, & Toth, 1984: 36-7; Gold & Teitelbaum, 2006), most surveys report that health care professionals have comparable rates of use and problem use as the general population (Baldisseri, 2007; Kenna, Baldwin, Trinkoff, & Lewis, 2011). Specifically, between 10 and 15 percent of healthcare

---

[61] Noninstitutionalized civilians 26 years and over (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014).

professionals misused substances during their careers (Hicks, Cox, Epsey, Goepfert, Bienstock, Erickson, Hammoud, Katz, Krueger, Neutens, Peskin, & Puscheck, 2005; Baldisseri, 2007; Berge, Seppala, & Schipper, 2009), with 3 to 20 percent experiencing substance dependence in their lifetime (Dabney & Hollinger, 1999; Dabney & Hollinger, 2002; Kenna & Lewis, 2008; Berge et al., 2009; Oreskovich, Kaups, Balch, Hanks, Satele, Sloan, Meredith, Buhl, Dyrbye, & Shanafelt, 2012). Similar percentages of students in health care fields reported substance abuse during their training (e.g., Winter & Birnberg, 2002; Hicks et al., 2005; Baldisseri, 2007; McBeth, Ankel, Ling, Asplin, Mason, Flottemesch, & McNamara, 2008), with some indications of higher rates of use among students (McCauliffe et al., 1984). Generally, those pursuing careers in health care appear more likely to use illicit “street” drugs in school than after becoming credentialized, at which point alcohol and prescription drugs are more commonly used and abused (e.g., Kenna & Wood, 2005), with exceptions for professions that have greater access to prescription drugs during training, e.g., pharmacists (Dabney & Hollinger, 1999, 2002).

Discussions of substance use among lawyers suggest that the profession experiences elevated rates of addiction relative to the general population. Between 15 and 18 percent of lawyers experience addiction (e.g., Beck, Sales, & Benjamin, 1995; Rothstein, 2008), roughly twice the rate of the general population (9.4 percent) (Rothstein, 2008), with between 9 and 20 percent “exceed[ing] expected norms for current alcohol-related problems” (Beck et al., 1995: 3), 50 to 70 percent of disciplinary cases involving alcohol or addiction (Rothstein, 2008), and “nearly 70% of lawyers … likely candidates for alcohol-related problems at some time within the duration of their legal careers” (Beck et al., 1995: 3). The problems are so intractable that it has been suggested they stem from the onset of legal training during law school:

> A significant percentage of practicing lawyers are experiencing a variety of significant psychological distress symptoms well beyond that expected of the general population. These symptoms are directly traceable to law study and practice. They are not exhibited when the lawyers enter law school, but emerge shortly thereafter and remain, without significant abatement, well after graduation from law school (Beck et a., 1995: 2).

Perhaps due in part to the high prevalence rate of substance use among lawyers and its perceived inevitability, efforts have attempted to delineate “mitigating and aggravating” factors (Beck et al., 1995), finding, for example, that both male and female lawyers expressed more stress and anger than the normal population, and experienced less satisfaction in their relationships (p. 30). Considering the social environment at law school would further inform how these problems emerge during professional socializations in this particular field.

Research conducted across schools, disciplines, and a mixture of students and practicing professionals in the Northeast U.S. demonstrates that, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, from 61 to 79 percent of students in all sampled disciplines—nursing, business, medicine, communications, law, social work, and counseling—had ever used marijuana; 14 to 29 percent cocaine; 13 to 33 percent tranquilizers; 14 to 26 percent amphetamines; 9 to 30 percent hallucinogens; 5 to 17 percent sedatives; and 2 to 7 percent heroin or other opiates (McAuliffe et al., 1984: 41; cf. McAuliffe, Santangelo, Gingras, Rohman, Sobol, & Magnuson, 1987a; McAuliffe, Santangelo, Magnuson, Sobol, Rohman, & Weissman, 1987b). Young American physicians were least likely to have used marijuana in the past year (28 percent), but had rates of past year cocaine use (8 percent) comparable to medical (10 percent), nursing (7 percent), and business students (7 percent); by contrast, nearly one in five counseling students had used cocaine, and they were also most likely to have used marijuana in the past year (58 percent), followed by medical (44 percent), nursing (38 percent), and business students (34 percent). Roughly half of students who reported use in the past year also reported current marijuana use, i.e., once per month or more in the past year. Noting that most of the use reported was of an “experimental” nature, the authors commented that “for the moment, the levels of drug use … reported by our nonclinical sample … should not be viewed with great alarm” (McAuliffe, et al., 1984: 49); the drug use is not discussed in relation to its illegality, but rather its implications for “self-treatment” and “impaired-physician committees” who only occasionally have to deal with “nontherapeutic addicts” (p. 50).

With more status to lose if drug use is detected and they get caught up in the criminal justice system (see Shukla, 2005), indiscretions among professionals (e.g., doctors, lawyers, police) are addressed by colleagues and conceptualized as problematic in relation to the profession. These responses can still involve stigma and a strict approach to treatment that does not cater to individual needs. There appears to be a greater emphasis on treatment and strict abstinence among doctors, as use may affect their ability to treat patients while putting themselves and the hospital in legal jeopardy (O'Conner & Spickard, 1997, Berge et al., 2009: 629), whereas lawyers might place themselves, their clients, and colleagues who know about their use and fail to report them at similar peril. Meanwhile, investors "on Wall Street" who use drugs are risking financial returns, but, in contrast to doctors and lawyers, are perhaps less likely to have face-to-face interactions with clients than colleagues, further removing behavior from public settings. Responses to use in medical and legal professions therefore diverge, as research on substance use by those "practicing" medicine does not consistently indicate that health care professionals are at higher risk of using drugs, but rather have unique pathways to use and risk factors for relapse that are important to consider in relation to treatment (e.g., Domino, Hornbein, Polissar, Renner, Johnson, Albert, & Hankes, 2005; Kenna & Lewis, 2008). By contrast, alcohol-related problems among lawyers are portrayed as inevitable for most (Beck et al., 1995: 3).

The logic that substance use can be addressed within a profession because colleagues know stressors and risks—doctors can treat doctors, lawyers know what drives a lawyer to drink—buffers affiliated members from criminal justice sanction, but also sometimes from help, reducing the likelihood of intervention by external systems. This might suggest that health care professionals would be in a better position to receive treatment. A longitudinal study of 904 physicians treated in physician health programs across 16 states reported more than half abused alcohol, and more than a third opioids, with stimulants (7.9 percent) and other substance use (5.9 percent) less frequent, though half abused multiple drugs, and some (13.9

percent) had a history of using intravenously (Berge et al, 2009: 625). Nearly one in five (17 percent) had previously been treated for addiction. Regarding the potential for doctors to be treated in state programs for use or diversion (e.g., Merlo et al., 2014), a study of a program aimed at helping impaired physicians and physician's assistants in North Carolina found that 91 percent had an overall successful outcome; for more than a quarter this involved at least one relapse while being monitored (Ganley, Pendergast, Wilkerson, Mattingly, 2005; cf. Valliant, Sobowale, & McArthur, 1970; Domino et al., 2005). Compared to the general population, physicians in treatment were likelier to remain abstinent in part due to their frequent in-person contact with other physicians (Winter & Birnberg, 2002), though also perhaps because healthcare professionals have been found to be less likely to have family histories of alcohol or drug use (Kenna & Wood, 2005), and therefore less likely to encounter users in non-treatment settings. While some risk factors may not be as prevalent as in the general population, others outcomes, such as suicide, occur more frequently among physicians (Hampton, 2005; Berge et al., 2009; Legha, 2012), reaffirming that some professional allures, experiences, and demands may uniquely impact those subjected to associated ideologies, procedures, and prescriptions.

Sociological studies of students who use drugs while enrolled in graduate and professional schools illustrate the processual and social nature of involvement, though most of the accounts provided are retrospective stories told by those who already completed their graduate and professional schooling (e.g., Zinberg, 1984; Dabney & Hollinger, 2006; Perrone, 2009; cf. Schleef, 1997). When current students *are* interviewed, their statements reflect the integration of new information and consideration of how to morally navigate professional careers after completing their schooling, including issues relevant to their own substance use and use in society. For example, a second-year law school student explained how he and some classmates took a stand by deciding not to interview with companies manufacturing guns, ammunition, cigarettes, or oil:

> I would have a lot of difficulty working for a tobacco company. I mean that's not something that I really would consider because in general you're profiting by selling a substance that kills people, a drug that's addictive. I would say, yes, I'm socially responsible, not maybe because I work for the Body Shop, [but] because I don't choose to work for companies where I think that I would have trouble—look, is Joe Camel oriented towards kids? Is that really what I should be doing even though it's going to sell me a lot of cigarettes and profit the shareholders? (Schleef, 1997: 646)

Distinct ideologies adopted in response to professional training and socialization with "peers, professors, 'ordinary' classes, ethics courses, and the ethical dilemmas they face" (Schleef, 1997: 647) influence what students believe is expected of them and how they talk about their behavior (Stelling & Bucher, 1973). Akin to medical residents being "*handed* vocabularies of realism" that help them address mistakes (Stelling & Bucher, 1973: 664)—"Doing one's best" (p. 667) or "Recognition of limitations" (p. 668)—terminologies common to professions are available to be summoned and leveraged in responding to questions regarding drugs.

Success in a graduate and professional program generally requires that students demonstrate the self-control necessary to complete their work, and also keep their use separate from work or family. The opening to *Drug, Set, and Setting* (Zinberg, 1984) presents the case of "Carl," a graduate student in Boston who was an occasional heroin user (p. 7/176). Zinberg (1984) begins his presentation of the basis for controlled substance use by noting that "Carl has a very active social life in which heroin and marihuana play only a small part," and "Until quite recently it was not recognized that Carl and others like him could use illicit drugs in a controlled manner" (p. 8/176; cf. Zinberg & Harding, 1982). Carl had a job offer contingent on finishing his thesis in time, and a good relationship with his parents, who lived abroad but visited. "[A]s a member of a doctor's family," he was "fully aware of the possibility of infection" from using heroin, and carefully sterilized his needles. In addition, he only used with a small group of friends that did not include his "best" friend—a fellow graduate student—or the person he shared an apartment with, neither of whom knew about his substance use (Zinberg, 1984: 1). Carl's experience suggests that the setting and other people in the user's life can influence

whether they feel social and monetary support or a sense of community and shared culture, though not all are counted on to generate such support.

Graduate and professional schools may provide settings where recreational drug use can be pursued in moderation and is socially tolerated (e.g., Dabney & Hollinger, 2002: 193), but also opportunities for less controlled use. Though Carl kept his use separate from his classmates, graduate school fraternities and use in small groups with colleagues can amplify individual usage patterns, with groups becoming increasingly guarded and reclusive as use increases (Dabney & Hollinger, 2002). In contrast to Carl's approach, use in non-communal settings can introduce risks, as in the case of a graduate student who traveled to Boston at the time Timothy Leary was there, reportedly took too much acid, and "went essentially psychotic" (Zinberg, 1984: 97/176): perhaps the student was unaccustomed to using acid in that particular environment, or got a stronger or larger dose than anticipated based on prior experiences. For those with the means, vacationing may provide additional opportunities for substance use with fellow tourists in unfamiliar places (Briggs & Turner, 2011). Characterizing the unique settings in which GAPSS use drugs is central for understanding their experiences.

The social contexts of drug use are similarly important for GAPSS users who may move to new locations to pursue their education or career, and meet a range of people who can influence their decisions to use drugs. Each new affiliation and community may provide a potential turning point in the life-course (Sampson & Laub, 1993; cf. Holstein & Gubrium, 2000), with some perhaps more conducive to controlled use or cessation than others (e.g., Zinberg, 1984; Waldorf, Reinarman, & Murphy, 1991). The development of drug-using habits can be attributed to time in graduate or professional school, as reflected in the statement of a recovering pharmacist who had only tried a few things before attending pharmacy school:

> The descent to hell started when I got to pharmacy school. There were just so many things [prescription drugs] available and so many things that I thought I just had to try. (Dabney & Hollinger, 2002: 194).

Conversely, moving from a setting where drugs were present to one where they are less accessible can lead to decreased consumption. “Dawn” used heroin on the West Coast before returning to the East Coast for graduate school (Zinberg, 1984). While in school, she “used hardly any drugs, and no opiates at all, even though she had ‘coincidentally’ met a dope dealer” (p. 19/176). After graduate school, her use resumed with three “associates”—the only ones who knew that she used—though she never used at home, i.e., some contexts were off-limits. Subjects denied that some drugs, such as marijuana, “had any definite influence on their work” (Zinberg, 1984: 60/176), and did not shy away from comparing it to other legal drugs. For example, as one law student explained:

> I just happen to know, through a string of people, a young lady who works for the FDA [Food and Drug Administration], and this chick has worked on marijuana until a few months ago … she was working on it for years and could discover no physical problems arising out of marijuana, that it was much less harmful than cigarette-smoking, coffee, alcohol, and a lot of other things to your body (Priest & McGrath, 1970: 191).

Still, analyses generally are not organized to explore the status of interviewees as knowledgeable students who make informed statements. In spite of his attention to the settings in which drug use occurred, Zinberg did not report on implications of the interview setting for statements about drug use; the notion that his framework (Zinberg, 1984) was influenced by the experiences and explanations of educated users is understated. The dialectic between studies of users, and the analytic attention to the circumstances of account giving, should be of constant concern.

Research on “club kids” (N=18) provides examples of drug use over the life-course of middle-and-upper class users (Perrone, 2009). Included in the sample are six participants with advanced degrees, including one pursuing a Master’s of Arts (MA) at the time of the interview, and a post-doctoral fellow with a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in neuroscience. Two high-status informants were married: “Jack,” 29-year-old chief resident of a hospital, and “Michelle,” an occupational therapist with a Master’s degree. A second Doctor of Medicine (MD), “Tyler,” was a surgical resident, and a participant who received their Master of Business Administration (MBA)

degree owned an investment company. These informants used LSD and other drugs extensively at different times in their lives, including during graduate school and after beginning to work. For example, Jack described using student loan money to party while in medical school, while the MA student referenced use in relation to her job as a special education teacher.

In a sample of users with access to medical reports regarding drugs, several quotes demonstrate how the educated informants thought and talked about substance use in a way that influenced their practices and those of other users. In one exchange, a PhD in Neuroscience and surgical resident "debate and describe the effects [of Ecstasy and LSD] both on the brain and behaviorally … [including] the loving, communal, feeling commonly associated with the effects" (p. 134-5):

> Tyler: Ecstasy was like, ya know, a dipole—a completely opposite experience [from LSD]. To this day I would say there's nothing at all cerebral. There's nothing at all cortical about ecstasy. At best it gets up to you're fuckin' amygdula [sic] and makes you fall in love with everyone around.
>
> David: That's true, well maybe it gets to your insular as far as the cortex. It's actually meaningful, believe it or not.
>
> Tyler: Yeah, but, that's like dinosaur, pre-historic cortex, right?
>
> David: Well it's probably who you really are.
>
> Tyler: But I thought pre-frontal's who you really are?
>
> David: If you think you're like the thinking person. But the sense of feeling good, insular.
>
> Tyler: Alright. Good. Insular: spirit.
>
> David: Yeah, the emotional self (Perrone, 2009: 134-5).

Verbiage indicating familiarity with brain anatomy and function was interspersed with slang and portrayals of the drug-using experience. Other comments demonstrated how decisions to use drugs were based on technical knowledge, e.g., "We were all really scientific about it" (Perrone, 2009: 138). It is worthwhile to quote Jack at length describing the influence of his medical knowledge derived during medical school on his decision to use drugs:

> I've never seen anything convincing … I mean, as far as I know, there's no science saying that, ya know, any of these drugs cause like prolonged effects, ya know? There's really not that much science to go through … You can do imaging studies from those who did acid in the 60s and show that there are cortical changes with this group compared to the control group. But then, ya know, if cognitively you can't find any real differences 30 years out, or there aren't any increased rates of Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, brain tumors, then what is that image you found on the MRI? Does it mean anything? I would argue that it doesn't mean anything … I've also been to Tox[icology] conferences, and New York City Poisons … and they don't really know, they're not aware of any short term or long term like harms of these drugs. Like people have called like 212-poisons and asked, ya know, "what are the risks of like doing ecstasy?" And they [poison control] just laugh. And these guys are the experts on drug abuse in the medical community (Perrone, 2009: 190).

Relative to the "average user," Jack portrayed himself as more informed regarding the history of research on drug use and its limitations, and the range of issues in the statement demonstrate a high level of analytical thinking. Yet there is the potential for over-confidence, as indicated by his willingness to "dismiss" evidence from neuroscience, or for the leveraging of knowledge in such a way that it consistently is used to facilitate continued involvement with illegal behavior.

The social nature of drug use and knowledge means that educated users can influence the drug-using behaviors of those around them. Michelle and Jack were married, and she drew comfort from using drugs with him because of his medical background:

> It definitely helped ease my worry in the beginning, um, because I was probably more comfortable doing drugs if I knew he—like, knowing so much information about it … I was concerned about long-term effects … like what would happen to me now. And ya know, once it was explained to me, and ya know, I knew he had done his research so, I was definitely willing to try some things. So I would say if anything, it just kind of eased some of my worries, 'cause I kind of knew, "hey, if I get sick, the doctor's right here," ya know? I knew they were watching out for me, and I kind of knew that he wouldn't do anything that was that bad, ya know … at the same time the knowledge has helped us not to go too far. Like none of us would really ever, we look down on, ya know, coke and heroin (Perrone, 2009: 155).

However, incidents where drug-induced problems arose in spite of using with a medical doctor and neuroscientist were also reported. For example, a friend drank too much water while on Ecstasy and had to go to the Emergency Room (Perrone, 2009: 151), and on another occasion David and Tyler were unable to help a friend who got a nosebleed due to being in their own ketamine-induced "K-holes" (p. 158-9). The potential for knowledge to influence the drug-using

behavior and discourse of individuals with academic training—and those in their social networks—begins to emerge.

As conveyed in their statements regarding drugs and immersion in “the scene,” current and former GAPSS users appear to have unique “sets” (Zinberg, 1984), yet the theoretical implications of their training and knowledge for how they talk about and use drugs have not been developed. The number of drug-using doctors or lawyers who are arrested is unclear, as is the degree to which these samples and criminal justice populations overlap, though such events have been documented, e.g., among opiate-using physicians (Winick, 1963: 177). Research interviews provide opportunities to probe how students navigate encounters with law enforcement and others in relation to their professional aspirations and participation in substance use.

2.4 Drugs and discourse

Sociological approaches to the study of illicit substance use are not consistently linked with literature on the discourse of offenders and deviants, creating a theoretical disconnect between efforts portraying *why* and *how* people use drugs and those considering *how* people talk more generally, and in relation to drug use. This is an oversight as, in the years since criminology emerged as a discipline distinct from sociology,[62] the tendency has been to study those affected by the criminal justice system, making legal terminology—“the language of blame” (Sarat & Felstiner, 1988: 747)—and processes (e.g., negotiation [Sarat & Felstiner, 1988: 742]) central to portrayals and interpretations of statements offered in related and research settings when explaining prior thoughts and actions (e.g., *mens rea* and excuse defenses). Accordingly, rather than creating a holistic portrayal of use as complex, serving a social function, or occurring in relation to particular events, criminological studies approach question situations seeking to

uncover *why* informants commit crimes and use (e.g., psychological dependence), and *how* use is related to offending: impairment at time of arrest (i.e., ADAM) or hospitalization (i.e., DAWN), or as an excuse for conduct (e.g., Scully & Marolla, 1984; Maruna & Copes, 2005).

When only substance use or other forms of deviance are discussed, proffered statements are likelier to relate to wrongdoing or associated orientations and experiences. Perhaps particularly in interviews conducted with populations disproportionately affected by the War on Drugs—and depicted in the literature during encounters where it is clear who is the deviant—there may be attempts to resist further labeling while constructing a negotiated moral identity (Douglas, 1970). Asking "Why?"—a focus of criminal justice system efforts when responding to norm-violating behavior (i.e., motive)—tends to result in the provision of a reason (cf. Mills, 1940; Scott & Lyman, 1968), while asking "How?" allows stories to emerge. Schaps and Sanders (1970) noted how, in their study of substance use among undergraduates, they "were careful never to ask why a drug was being use, because the question is often regarded as unanswerable and the questioner as ignorant, obtuse, or unsympathetic" (p. 141). Not asking why increased the likelihood that "all legitimations of drug use were spontaneously volunteered" (Schaps & Sanders, 1970: 141). Whereas both reasons and stories might change over time, and have different meanings attached to them depending on the place and audience (e.g., references to "4:20" sometimes have more specific connotations [Hanlon, 2011]), stories can be descriptive portrayals of cultural events. The gap can be bridged by first focusing on clearly non-deviant activities, and then asking questions that allow informants to describe "how" they go about engaging in "deviant" practices, and finally by appreciating the uniqueness of discursivity to identity construction from an analytical standpoint.

Furthermore, in addition to studying the words, actions, and legal outcomes of those sanctioned by law enforcement, it is important to explore deviance among those whose

---

[62] The number of criminal justice programs ballooned from 39 bachelors and 14 masters programs in the mid-1960s to 376 and 121, respectively, a decade later, with six new doctoral

involvement has continued without official rebuke (Polsky, 1969). Failure to do so makes it seem that the same behavior is only immoral or criminal for some, and the neglect of non-criminalized lawbreakers has skewed perceptions of who is involved, with implications for those who do get in trouble, justice agencies, theories, laws, and society.

2.4.1 Sociological theories of discourse

Theories of offender discourse play a prominent role in considering the function of talk, an important concern when speaking about deviance and other activities that could elicit a social response (e.g., disgust, anger, incarceration). Sociological approaches to analyzing how offenders talk usually rely on a combination of neutralization theory (Sykes & Matza, 1957), the "Accounts" framework (Scott & Lyman, 1968), and Mills' classic "Situated actions and vocabularies of motive" (1940); as of 2005, these three articles were among the fifteen most frequently cited manuscripts published in *American Sociological Review* (Jacobs, 2005). However, lessons and considerations developed in each article are not consistently integrated in conceptualizing or reporting interview-based research.

Developed based on interactions between adults and detained juveniles, the "Techniques of neutralization" (Skyes & Matza, 1957) focused on the etiology of criminal behavior and the process of learning. Due in part to the influence of "differential association" theory, or the process by which juveniles learn "definitions favorable to the violation of law" (Sutherland & Cressey, 1955: 77-80), Sykes and Matza (1957) noted that neutralizations—as products of learning—may be differentially distributed across age groups: "Aging, as the mere passing of time, has no significance as a cause" (Sutherland, as quoted in Laub & Sampson, 1991: 1413). "Accounts" (Scott & Lyman, 1968, 1970; Lyman & Scott, 1970) and "Vocabularies of motive" (Mills, 1940; cf. Gerth & Mills, 1953) were not developed specifically to address what people involved in criminal or objectionable behavior might say, and are conceptually more

---

programs (Galliher, 1999).

relevant to interpreting how adults of relatively equal social status communicate, i.e., when conversations entail more than non-conformity. “Accounts” (Scott & Lyman, 1968) offers a more interactionist conception of deviance, potentially reflecting the influence of Erving Goffman, Scott and Lyman’s teacher, on their work.[63] Relevant aspects for the study of uncaught educated drug users emerge through a consideration of all three manuscripts, which, along with more recent literature, help in considering the social function of “intelligence” (i.e., information) when talking about substance using practices.

By offering an explanation for how delinquent values could be learned and behavior practiced while maintaining conventional underlying values, neutralization theory (Sykes & Matza, 1957) challenged conceptions of “Lower-class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency” (Miller, 1958). Accordingly, deviance could emerge regardless of class, as, by linking internal thoughts to future behavior through verbalizations, a successful neutralization rendered social controls “inoperative” (Sykes & Matza, 1957: 667), relieving an actor from a) constraints on engaging in deviant behavior and b) a sense of guilt or remorse for having so proceeded. A momentary suspension of rules and standards ordinarily accepted by the actor provides a “green light” for a deviant act, leaving internalized norms to idle at the intersection (see Matza, 1967/1964).

The nexus of drug use and neutralizations seems promising. First, context is important to both drug use (Zinberg, 1984) and the study of neutralizations, though this is less consistently recognized in the latter despite being based on interactions between adults and detained youth. Second, the effects of some drugs are likely to alter conceptions of time, so those who have experienced such shifting temporalities may have insight into the relationship between thoughts,

---

[63] Like Mills (and Garfinkel, 1964), Goffman (e.g., 1959; 1961; 1963; 1967) was influenced by the notion that language is akin to performing an act (Burke, 1966). That “the individual is likely to present himself in a light that is favorable to him” is clear to Goffman (1959), who extends the dramaturgical perspective to the social self and interpersonal rituals. The implications for the witness are to focus not on verbal assertions, which are “relatively easy for the individual to

verbalizations, and behavior. Third, and also related to temporality, is the nature of drug laws, which are in flux.[64] Fourth, both areas might be said to involve the loss of control, which is deviant (Becker, 1963: 13), as with neutralizations the values of dominant society fail to control delinquent behavior, and disinhibition is often associated with substance use, perhaps most commonly with alcohol (e.g., Weinstein, 1978, 1980; Dabney & Hollinger, 2002; Vander Ven, 2011). Fifth, drugs are often used socially, and verbalized neutralizations are inherently social. This provides an opportunity to ask interviewees about their interactions with other drug users, non-drug users who see them using drugs, and others.

However, based on their documentation and presentation of the "Techniques of Neutralization," it is not clear whether Sykes and Matza (1957) fully appreciated that their main claim rests upon an assumption, as a thought pattern—the act of neutralizing a norm or value—can only be documented socially. For Gerth and Mills, as

> motives are acceptable justifications for present, future, or past programs of conduct[,]... By examining the *social* function of motives, we are able to grasp just what role motives may perform in the social conduct of individuals (Gerth & Mills, 1953: 116).

Temporally, a "verbalization of motives for an act is itself a new act" (Gerth & Mills, 1953: 117) necessitated by a "situation in which one's conduct or intentions are questioned by other men or by one's self" (Gerth & Mills, 1953: 115). When something unexpected or untoward happens, or something anticipated or expected does not, people suddenly pay attention, calling for an accounting for the disharmony, and responses may vary depending on the seriousness of the infraction, audience, and response. The social function of verbalized reasons can be studied using in-depth interviews, which can ask about interactions that occurred beyond the interview space; such exchanges are of interest, as

---

manipulate and control," but rather on "the expressions he gives off," "a part in regard to which he seems to have little concern or control" (p. 7).

[64] Scott and Lyman (1970) note "users of LSD were once a law-abiding group, but since the passage of recent legislation, they must excuse or justify their drug use with respect to the law" (p. 110).

> To explain some line of conduct by referring it to an inferred and abstracted motive or to some psychic element is one thing; to observe the function of motive imputation and avowal in certain types of social situations is quite another (Gerth & Mills, 1953: 115).

Thus, someone asked “why?” offers “socially available answers” in an attempt to “persuade others to accept our act, to urge them to respond to it as we expect them to, and to make them believe that our act sprang from ‘good intentions’” (Gerth & Mills, 1953: 116). If the claim is understood as a new act in itself, then so are responses to statements, which may be more or less accepting, as “What is reason for one man is rationalization for another” (Mills, 1940: 910):

> Proper consideration of the claims-making process entails attention to both how claims are licensed and acted upon as well as how they are displaced or discredited; interpretations of claimants' motives can have something to do with both processes (Ibarra & Kitsuse, 2003: 21).

Though past motivations can change over time before eventual behavior, or plans for potential deviance to be committed in the future may never materialize, the role of the response might also help explain mismatches between proffered statements and future behavior, yet Mills “tended to ignore the processes of interaction through which vocabularies of motive emerge” (Sarat & Felstiner, 1988: 738). Past behavior can be examined more closely than future plans, as proclamations about previous activities are readily available prisms through which to judge present and future actions, assertions, and—occasionally, with unrecognized speculation—thoughts, whereas motives regarding behaviors that have not yet occurred are more difficult to study in relation to eventual outcomes (cf., Minor, 1981; Fritche, 2005).

In one-on-one conversations, the relationship between the interviewee and the interviewer imbues the social space (Black, 1976, 1995; Jacques & Wright, 2008a, 2010a), greatly impacting how identities are performed when called to account (cf. Scott & Lyman, 1968, 1970; Lyman & Scott, 1970). Social interactions involve people who are relationally more or less intimate, who may or may not share membership in organizations or cultural backgrounds and

related experiences (Black, 1995; Jacques & Wright, 2010a; cf. Collins, 2000: 18).[65] As a result, depending on the style of the interaction, accounts might be given, or avoided altogether (Scott & Lyman, 1968: 57).

Scott and Lyman's (1968, 1970; Lyman & Scott, 1970) synthesis of socially situated interactions advanced neutralization theory (Sykes & Matza, 1957). They focused not only on what causes people to provide verbalized accounts—"linguistic device[s] employed whenever an action is subjected to valuative inquiry" (Scott & Lyman, 1968: 46)—but also shifted the focus from discourses of guilt, shame, and conscience espoused by Sykes and Matza (1957), and likely more relevant to juveniles, to a discourse of responsibility. Namely, when responsibility is accepted, *justifications* deny "the pejorative quality associated with it," whereas denying full responsibility is associated with *excuses*, "accounts in which one admits that the act in question is bad, wrong, or inappropriate" (Scott & Lyman, 1968: 47).[66] Rather than generating guilty feelings associated with adolescents, departures from internal values and normative behavior may lead to considerations usually associated with adults, such as respectability (Thompson, 1967; Douglas, 1970), ethics and responsibility (Schleef, 1997), risk or harm (Lyng, 1990; Sheard & Tompkins, 2008), boredom (Ferrell, 2004), thrills (Katz, 1988; cf. Weil, 2011/1972), ambiguity (Lex, 1990), and plans for the future. Implicit to Scott and Lyman's synthesis of

---

[65] Collins (2000) presents some issues with the assumed relationship between organizational affiliation, profession, culture, and status:

> Although surveys show "professor" ranks high as a bare category, any specification ("economist," "sociologist," "chemist") brings down the prestige rating (Treiman 1977); further specification ("assistant professor," "junior college professor") brings it down yet further. "Scientist" and especially "physicist" rank very high in recent surveys, but does this mean that most people would like to sit next to a physicist at a dinner party? "Plumber" may rank low in the survey, but in practice their income outranks many educationally credentialed white-collar employees, and this may translate into material resources to dominate most life situations; plumbers may sit in the box seats at the stadium while white-collar workers are in the remote grandstand (p. 18).

[66] For example, violent offenses are likelier to evoke justifications (Felson & Ribner 1981), whereas excuses are more likely to stem from property crimes; this may have to do with the fact that violent offenses are more likely to involve two people, allowing participants to position

accounts is a relationship between a speaker and a listener, an actor and an audience, or two opponents in an escalating conflict,[67] creating a model generalizable to numerous contexts.

Acknowledging that not all interactions are one-on-one, Scott and Lyman (1968) offer five “linguistic styles” that “frame the manner in which an account will be given and often indicate the social circle in which it will be most appropriately employed” (p. 55). Delineating the impact of context and social distance, the intimate, casual, consultative, formal, and frozen styles exist on a continuum of “decreasing social intimacy” (p. 55). For example, casual accounts

> [are found] among peers, in-groups members and insiders ... Typically it employs ellipses, i.e., omissions, and slang ... [as] certain background information is taken for granted among interactants and may be merely alluded to in order to give an account (Scott & Lyman, 1968: 56).

Scott and Lyman (1968) provide an example where two regular users of hallucinogenic mushrooms interact. The first asks, “Why were you running about naked in the park?,” to which the second replies “I was ‘on’” (p. 56), vernacular understood by both parties. There is greater social distance between casual interactants than intimates, and this difference is what distinguishes the two styles. By contrast, a formal interaction in a classroom is regularly understood to involve a teacher calling on students to respond, while concertgoers know not to sing along in an opera house, but might at an outdoor venue. Such interactions also play out in courtrooms when judges provide defendants an opportunity to speak, but there is no change in relative status between the parties (p. 56). Shared status between interviewer and interviewee (e.g., as GAPSS) decreases the social space between the parties. Commonalities increase the likelihood that responses will be framed in a casual style, as would normally be done with colleagues or friends the participant may regularly talk with about intellectual topics or substance use (Platt, 1981; Jacques & Wright, 2008a, 2010a).

---

themselves as the victim, or as having behaved in self defense (Maruna & Copes, 2005: 239).

The culture conflict approach to understanding the discriminatory impact of drug laws in U.S. history is relevant for understanding interview dynamics, as interview encounters between researchers and populations involved in deviance can also be experienced as sites of conflict,. In most criminological work, it is clear who is being positioned as the deviant (see Topalli, 2005, 2006; cf. Christensen, 2010). Recent interview-based research with substance users (Sandberg, 2009a, 2009b) underscores the importance of the interview environment and the auspices of the interview for the types of discourse that arise. Such an orientation positions social realties of crime as active interpretations (Quinney, 1970), and interviews as attempts to construct meaning (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003; 2004) “in concrete situations” where “members of our society do not, in fact, find it easy to agree on what is right and wrong, moral and immoral” (Douglas, 1970: 15)—"It is thus *against something* that the self can emerge" (Goffman, 1961: 320).

Researchers can set parameters that allow for the emergence of fuller, richer, and more elliptical life stories. This notion is “constructivist” (Charmaz, 2012/2006; Holstein & Gubrium, 2000) and non-positivist, as added layers of humanity make prioritizing a single binomial identity (or sociological label) difficult. Such lines of research suggest that the interviewee should not be essentialized during face-to-face interaction or analysis: informants convey and help the listener understand the intricacies of their lives, particularly if the behaviors of interest are mostly deviant. Sometimes this is performed more eloquently than others, both by the interviewer and interviewee. Regardless, different features of the life story (Holstein & Gubrium 2000; Presser, 2009) are central to understanding a particular event or identity (e.g., guilty/deviant act vs. guilty/deviant identity), requiring an environment in which interviewees feel empowered to reveal relevant aspects of their lives that the research might not regularly ask about. In part by redefining the social distance between the interviewee and interviewer (see Sandberg, 2009a,

---

[67] An escalating conflict is described in the taxonomy of “account episodes” reported by Schönbach (1990). Some research interviews do involve some form of escalating conflict

2009b, 2010a), the former is able to engage with questions of identity while maneuvering through different aspects of their lives.

Similar to constructionist interviewing, postmodernist ethnographers "argue against one *Truth*" (Clair, 2003: 17; cf. Foucault, 1972, 1973, 1990). In observing and writing about culture, language assumes a privileged position where "Discourse is not only a means to understand culture but is culture itself" (Clair, 2003: 15). When subcultures of interest are involved with illicit, immoral, or dangerous behavior, field research "at the edge" (Ferrell & Hamm, 1998) may add layers of presentational and interpretive complexity to portrayals of the self and behavior. If all research questions pertain to rule-breaking, especially among people who mostly engage in socially acceptable behavior, the stories that naturally emerge will be attempts by the informant to provide alternative narratives that will allow speaker and listener (and reader) to construct more intricate identities, both immediately and going forward (see Sandberg, 2009a, 2009b). Yet, particularly for crimes with victims, any attempt to talk about or portray one's own hardships is frowned upon if it is done in a way that relates to the victim of the act in question and minimizes the victim's plight or the storyteller's responsibility (Scully & Marolla, 1984; Benson, 1985; cf. Maruna & Copes, 2005; Christensen, 2010). Rather than view such efforts as attempts to avoid guilt, escape blame, justify behavior, or be less than truthful with the interviewer or oneself (e.g., Sandberg, 2010b), their presentation represents what is meaningful to the interviewees and is a reflection of the social patterning of behavior and discourse, e.g., related to substance use. Such an approach is consistent with the view of interviews as "speech events" where meaning is jointly constructed (Mishler, 1999/1986).

2.4.2 Conducting and analyzing "active" interviews

A social constructionist epistemological approach to talking with (e.g., interviewing) hard-to-reach populations offers a sensitizing conceptualization of the interactional dynamic.

(Topalli, 2005, 2006; cf. Poller, 1978; Berard, 2003; Holstein & Gubrium, 2011).

Particularly when speaking with elites who might be knowledgeable and accustomed to controlling or guiding a conversation (cf. Kezar, 2003; Costa & Kiss, 2011; Walford, 2011), or at the very least having an equal role, *The Active Interview* (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995) may be a useful method that recognizes the inherent "meaning-making practices on the part of both interviewers and respondents" that take place during an interview (p. 5). As "The social milieu in which communication takes place [during interviews] modifies not only what a person dares to say but even what he thinks he chooses to say" (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995: 14, citing Pool, 1957), there is no such thing as an "underlying 'true' opinion" (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995: 5). In this way, the interviewing method should focus on how "the relationships we construct with interviewees affect the quality of their responses to our questions" (Chase, 1995: 275), considering the apparent reluctance of respondents to share (Adler & Adler, 2003) and the need to probe responses for information (Gordon, 1992). For example, among those seldomly researched, some may be more reluctant to talk, or some topics seemingly unspeakable.

Considering the nexus between classical theories of discourse and "active" interviews, most criminological work done in the neutralization (Sykes & Matza, 1957) and accounts (Scott & Lyman, 1968, 1970; Lyman & Scott, 1970) tradition has neglected to view offenders' talk reflexively, or as the product of a dynamic interview. Instead, it has tended to examine the extent to which offenders' statements represents a distortion of "true" reasons for offending, or plays a role in moral reasoning. Incorporating aspects of the active interview (e.g., Holstein & Gubrium, 1995; 1997; 2000) into research on "active" (Polsky, 1969) drug dealers, Sandberg makes a distinct break from this non-reflexive and non-constructivist approach, showcasing the potential of "interdiscursive" narratives. Sandberg's approach (2008a, 2008b, 2009a, 2009b, 2010a, 2010b, 2012) to the interview encounter is fundamentally different from other efforts incorporating the neutralization framework, consistently detailing the run-up to (e.g., recruitment)

and come-down from (e.g., analysis) the interaction that produces discourse.[68]

Describing interviews featuring accounts of violence and drug dealing, Sandberg (2009b) highlights times when interviewees used opportunities to shift the discourse to unquestioned or divergent topics, allowing them to talk about other aspects of their lives and identities. To illustrate how these moments arose, Sandberg (2009b) includes what they had been talking about before presenting the quote, and then the interviewer's question followed by the respondent's utterance. The answer is not suspended amidst analysis, but presented as it occurred in the interaction space. Several excerpts detail the flow of talk back-and-forth, stressing when and how informants actively shift the dynamic of the interview. Farouk, an interviewee, did not understand a question pertaining to his drug dealing, and instead brought up religiosity: attending Mosque, the month of restriction (Ramadan), and being Muslim (Sandberg, 2009b: 496; cf. Sandberg, 2010a). The lack of mutual understanding as to what the question asked allowed Farouk to "define the question he *wants* to be asked" (Sandberg, 2009b: 496, emphasis in original), and Sandberg noted how the new direction the interviewee steered the conversation towards was understandable given that the two had "been talking for more than one and a half hours about fights, problems with the police, and illegal drugs" (2009b: 496). Such an opportunity was only possible because the interview setting allowed informants to feel like they were part of the active process of understanding the phenomena, allowing them to demonstrate roles, relationships, and identities not normally associated with the topic of interest.

---

[68] Stemming from his thoughtful approach to how the meaning-making occasion unfolds, Sandberg conveys details in his work that are generally absent from other efforts, including the "interview constellations" (2009b) in which talk is recorded and how they might influence what is said. For example, Sandberg differentiates between interviews conducted between himself and a male interviewee, which tend to produce "a kind of man-to-man talk," and those involving two researchers, one a female, which were more likely to result in participants associating "the interview with a meeting with the welfare state apparatus" (2009b: 493). Thus, Sandberg does not limit his analysis to the actual words that are spoken in the interview by the interviewee, but also considers how the interviewer and the flow of the interview interact with the interviewee to allow certain forms of talk to emerge at different points in time within the interview.

An approach to constructivist and active (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995; 1997; 2000) interviewing allows for a more malleable and tenuous relationship between interviewer and interviewee, the emergence of which is demonstrated during an exchange where the interviewee assumed the role of the questioner (Sandberg, 2009b). The reader is informed of the point in the interview where this occurs: “For the last five minutes Ali had been talking about drug dealers above him in the hierarchy” to Sandberg and another male researcher, and then Ali was asked: “So is it particular people who are doing hashish?” In an attempt to support his claim that “Everybody does it,” Ali asked the academics: “Have you never smoked hashish?,” to which either Sandberg or his colleague replied, “Ehh... [pause] Yeahh” (Sandberg, 2009b: 498), and then the interaction continues. Analyzing this exchange, Sandberg noted that

> By taking the role as the interviewer, he [Ali] changes the definition of the situation … to downplay differences between the interviewer and the interviewee. By getting the author reluctantly to admit that he has smoked cannabis, Ali challenges the implicit difference between the ‘illegal drug user’ and the ‘non-drug user’ implicit in the definition of the situation (Sandberg, 2009b: 498).

Whether this opportunity for role-reversal is unique to active interviews is an important consideration. Though Sandberg initially worried that he would be associated with the group of social workers through which he gained access to the open-air drug market where he recruited participants (2009a: 528), something about the interview space allowed the participants to feel that they could engage the process, and the interviewer, in unique ways rarely depicted in the literature. Sandberg and colleagues created an interview environment in which the interviewees were empowered to both engage questions of identity as well as hold different identity positions in part by redefining the social distance between the interviewee and interviewer (Black, 1976; Jacques & Wright, 2008a, 2010a). Relating Sandberg’s work to neutralizations and accounts, his style of interviewing, analyzing, and reporting qualitative data highlight interpretive resources employed and deployed by interviewees in the course of negotiating a tenable identity that shifts based on the arc of the interview discourse. Thus, he suggests how an interview is a space for the display and interplay of identity where the interviewee can portray themselves as a

gangster, a victim, or both (Sandberg, 2009a), while normalizing, celebrating, or neutralizing their activities (Sandberg, 2012a) through talk that emerges as a function of a specific context, line of questioning, or way of listening and interacting within the interview.

Stemming from research conducted with men who perpetrated violent crimes, Presser (2004, 2009) approaches interviewing in a way that is similarly sensitive to temporal and constructive features of the interactive nature of talk, while focusing on aspects other than crime. The interview provides a context for narrative stories to be voiced, some of which will come to define the interviewee's identity, and "the research interview sets story parameters and asks informants to respond within those parameters" (Presser, 2004: 83). Especially in criminological research, "interviewers convey particular views of problematic conditions in the world, including their causes and consequences, reasons for the conditions, and so forth," at which point the interviewer "does social problem work" (Presser, 2004: 83).[69]

Presser's (2004) continued emphasis on the constructionist nature of interviewing is crucial to her strategy of obtaining life stories from her informants (cf. Holstein & Gubrium, 2000). She views the interview "as a key instigator of action" (Presser, 2009: 177) that might allow researchers to "focus on narrative as a guide to behavior" (p. 181). By thinking about the interview as "an event *in* these men's lives, insofar as it was a setting for construction and reconstruction of the self," one where efforts can be made "to resist their problematic classification" (Presser, 2004: 83), there is awareness that what is said in the interview, and the identity work performed by the informant in the particular context, extends beyond the setting. The interview does not merely provide data for the researcher to analyze; it influences the story that is told, how the erstwhile violent criminal views the acts that have come to define them in

[69] Citing Loseke (2003: 19-20), Presser describes this as "the human activity of categorizing some—and only some—conditions and people as social problems" (2004: 83). Presser is concerned that researchers remain reflexive not only about how they conduct and present themselves in the interview setting, but also in how they engage the "collaborative social problems project" and "joint effort to interpret social problems and, in so doing, to *identify* the

this particular time and place and more generally in the context of their entire lives, and the role of offending in their future. Nesting a deviant act within the life story of a moral self, Presser (2004) finds that informants apply themes from neutralization, such as appealing to higher loyalties, to their entire lives, rather than a particular event that has come to define them (i.e., for which they have been recruited to participate in a particular research study) (p. 88). Furthermore, the crafting of individual stories from collective narratives makes the function of talk for the teller more important than the accuracy of how the depicted experience is portrayed—statements serve a role regardless of truthfulness (Presser, 2009; Sandberg, 2010b). Accordingly, context is important in terms of creating an environment in which the interviewee feels comfortable that the interview is not something where they are being pinned in a corner: they will be able to talk about their life story, not the actions that might have come to define how some people "construct" their identity.

2.5 Conclusion

Taken together, the reviewed literature conveys how drugs have been differentially problematic for some people to use across time and place. Specifically, marijuana is the most widely used drug, and therefore the one for which people are most likely to be selected for arrest, yet many use and are less at risk. The implication is that there are distinctions between forms of drinking and drug use that lead some groups to come to the attention of police and the criminal justice system more than others. That criminological research focuses on those who come into contact with legal systems and related processes has stunted the development of theories of discourse surrounding involvement with illegal behavior that has not been punished. Some GAPSS drink heavily and use drugs, and their way of talking about their academic and substance use experiences and histories addresses multiple gaps in the literature by providing a

---

informant" (Presser, 2004: 83). While some attempts to construct offender narratives may occur during the interview itself, the categorization process extends beyond the interview into analysis.

sample of “career criminals” who have deflected contacts with law enforcement while internalizing concepts, terminologies, and social behaviors associated with a profession. What they say is less likely to be influenced by contact with systems designed to rehabilitate or punish, and more with those that have nurtured their sense of self and critical thinking skills, which can be applied to both analyzing and neutralizing one’s own involvement with drinking and drugs.

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

Studies of substance use tend to rely on three sources of information to complement self-report surveys: 1) secondary indicator data sources (e.g., law enforcement arrest data, toxicology reports, treatment admissions), 2) institutional and professional information sources (e.g., a researcher granted access to a population through an organization), and 3) indigenous informants, a "most valuable source of information to the researcher attempting to identify hard-to-reach populations" (Wiebel, 1990: 3-4). Efforts targeting the third source, while likelier to uncover emergent issues, require methodologies that are more time-consuming (Wiebel, 1990: 8), flexible, and opportunistic, such as interviews, participant observation, and fieldwork. Drug research requires "a more theoretically informed account of the constitutive organization of social contexts in order to open contexts up to a richer and more diverse set of analytical and descriptive inquiries" (Duff, 2007: 504; citing Agar, 2003: 979-981). Unlike self-report surveys, interviews and ethnographic data are ideal for recording stories that richly convey how educated members of professional classes portray and make sense of their drug using experiences, allowing for the development of a grounded theoretical framework (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1978; Strauss, 1987; Charmaz, 2012/2006). Targeting "indigenous informants," this study examines the using practices among, and leveraging of professional discourse by, graduate and professional school students (GAPSS) who consume psychoactive substances, including marijuana, cocaine, ecstasy, "acid," mushrooms, DMT, prescription pills, "whippets," and alcohol. *By asking them to talk about their professional choices and substance use histories in relation to the situations and people in their lives, in-depth research interviews provide insights into how these members of "respectable" classes (Thompson, 1967) incorporate emergent knowledge into stories about drug-using experiences, and interpret the meaning of drug use by educated people*. Qualitative efforts that integrate aspects of participant observation (Whyte, 1943; Becker & Geer, 1957; cf. Holstein & Gubrium, 2011) can record inter-group

dynamics and interactional processes, and are well-suited for studies of hard-to-reach population networks that are closed and clustered, yet where the researcher has shared status and relational groundwork (Adler & Adler, 2003) with the population of interest (Platt, 1981; Jacques & Wright, 2010a).

"Pilot" data initially collected for a class assignment and the extant literature on substance use among GAPSS guided the development of the research design, resulting in an approach that addresses the descriptive knowledge gap—substance use by GAPSS—while remaining flexible enough to pursue emergent themes. In the spirit of two readings assigned for a qualitative methods course—a chapter from Adler's (1993) opportunistic research with high-level drug-dealing neighbors, and Riessman's (1987) article on "women interviewing women" and the interpretation of discursive accounts—interviews were conducted with two students who shared their substance use with me. Both agreed to talk about "the doing" of drugs in the context of their status as students, one in a graduate psychology program, the other attending medical school. Interviews focused specifically on what, as graduate and professional student drug users, they associated with the doing of drugs: procurement, consumption, and all related considerations, people, and activities that surround it. Independently, they referred to themselves as "high-functioning users" able to maintain status as contributing members of society and help others, including "actual" abusers and addicts. The analysis of these interviews with knowledgeable informants presaged the current study, raising a series of theoretical and methodological questions meriting further examination.

The literature review introduced relevant theoretical considerations guiding the present exploratory study; in this section, their methodological implications are discussed. The main issues identified were how to 1) recruit suitable informants, and 2) create an "active" (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995; 2003; 2004) interview space conducive to storytelling and "the joint construction of meaning" (Mishler, 1999/1986: 52), requiring an appropriate line of questioning. The decision to use purposive (Patton, 1990; Schwandt, 1997) and targeted (Watters & Biernacki, 1989)

convenience and snowball sampling methods (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981; Wright, Decker, Redfern, & Smith, 1992; Faugier & Sargeant, 1997) with key informants (Deaux & Callaghan, 1985) in turn influenced the research settings—a series of public and private venues in cities and college towns across the Midwest and along the East Coast—and resulted in a sample of GAPSS (N=27) with a range of professional and research interests that met the selection criteria. Data collection procedures, including the interview strategy and guide, are detailed below, as well as data management and the protection of human subjects. The chapter concludes by describing the approach to analyzing qualitative data, and by acknowledging methodological limitations.

3.1 Research design

Sampling frameworks involving recruitment through social networks can locate the "dark figure" (Biderman & Reiss, 1967) of criminal behavior not generally depicted in a dataset. Referred to as research-averse, reluctant, hidden, hard-to-reach, hard-to-research, or difficult-to-study events (Chambliss, 1975; cited in Wright et al., 1992: 12; Marx, 1984; Adler & Adler, 2003), Wiebel (1990) describes a "hidden population" as "a subset of the general population whose membership is not readily distinguished or enumerated based on existing knowledge and/or sampling capabilities" (p. 6). Remaining hidden includes aspects of social invisibility in relation to agencies of social control (Watters & Biernacki, 1989),[70] and privacy concerns stemming from the threat of public acknowledgement (Heckathorn, 1997),[71] such that the "elite" (Simon, 2006/1982; Mills, 2000/1956) are even more difficult to sample (Galliher, 1980), and tend not to be subjects of criminal justice research (Jacques & Wright, 2010a).

To recruit participants, respondent-driven and purposive (Patton, 1990; Schwandt, 1997)

---

[70] Watters and Biernacki (1989) consider "populations [that] are socially invisible or 'hidden' in the sense that their activities are clandestine and therefore concealed from the view of mainstream society and agencies of social control" (p. 417).

[71] "A population is 'hidden' when no sampling frame exists and public acknowledgement of

convenience and snowball sampling frameworks (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981; Wright et al., 1992; Faugier & Sargeant, 1997) were adapted to opportunistically access hidden populations involved with drugs (Adler, 1990, 1993; Adler & Adler, 2003; Draus, Siegal, Carlson, Falck, & Wang, 2005; Dunlap & Johnson, 1999). Criminologists interested in "active" offenders (Polsky, 1969; cf. Wright & Decker, 1994; Wright & Decker, 1997) engaged in ongoing illegal behavior have successfully applied purposive and convenience snowball sampling (Wright et al., 1992; Wright & Stein, 2005), including in studies of drug and alcohol users (Goldstein, 1979; Adler, 1990; Mohammed & Fritzvold, 2010; 2006; Sandberg, 2008; 2009a, 2009b, 2010, cf. Sandberg & Copes, 2013). As Polsky (1969) noted,

> This means—there is no getting away from it—the study of career criminals *au natural*, in the field, the study of such criminals as they normally go about their work and play, the study of "uncaught" criminals and the study of others who in the past have been caught but are *not* caught at the time you study them (Polsky, 1969: 122-3).

It is nonetheless rare to find accounts of the practices of drug users able to maintain an upward trajectory while pursuing an education or succeeding professionally in spite—and occasionally perhaps with the help—of drugs, with seemingly minimal legal or social repercussions stemming from their substance use (cf. Winick, 1963; Zinberg, 1984; Jackson-Jacobs, 2001, 2004; Hagan & Foster, 2006; Shukla, 2005; Jacques & Wright, 2008a; 2008b; 2010; Perrone, 2009).

Snowball sampling strategies employed with hard-to-reach populations sometimes direct enrolled subjects to act as liaisons or intermediaries in referring investigators to other suitable research candidates. There are benefits, drawbacks, and other considerations associated with such an approach, including the matter of compensation. One benefit is the potential to gain sponsorship (Adler & Adler, 2003) and overcome reluctance by having "insiders" vouch for the researcher to allow them to enter an otherwise restricted area or population.[72] The use of an

---

membership in the population is potentially threatening" (Heckathorn, 1997: 174).

[72] Examples of this strategy in participation-observation include "Doc" from *Street Corner Society* (Whyte, 1967/1943), "Tally" of *Tally's Corner* (Liebow, 1967), and high-level neighbors who are drug dealers in *Wheeling and Dealing* (Adler, 1993). In conducting research for his dissertation on *Prostitution and Drugs,* Goldstein (1979) relied on an intermediary who could

intermediary can be unnecessary or counterproductive, particularly if they are associated with an agent of social control.[73] Therefore, it is also possible to recruit drug-using participants directly and independently with no network-based methods utilized.[74]

Snowball recruitment efforts can sometimes result in those who may not want to participate being identified to the research team (e.g., Schaps & Sanders, 1970; Wright et al., 1992; Wright & Stein, 2005; Perrone, 2009). For example, to study marijuana use on a college campus, rather than have potential participants contact the researchers if interested, Schaps and Sanders (1970) had sixteen friends provide them with names and telephone numbers used to create a list of 310 individuals, of which forty were selected.[75] However, more recent research on drug use has also involved "asking participants to provide names and contact information of others who may participate" (Perrone, 2009: 10; cf. Scott, 2008a; 2008b).

As generating a sufficient sample size can be challenging when researching reclusive populations, such as active drug dealers and users, it can require enticements for participants and recruiters: "It is a cardinal rule of streets [sic] life that one should never do anything for

---

indicate to potential subjects that he was "a serious researcher and an 'okay guy'" who could not pay a lot for interviews (p. 12). Sixty women were interviewed, receiving anywhere from no compensation up to $10 (not including freely supplied nonmenthol cigarettes) (p. 12-7). Contact with high-level prostitutes in the sample was similarly arranged through an intermediary who had a therapeutic relationship with a call girl, while a chance encounter at a friend's party provided another contact (p. 17-18). Through these means, Goldstein was able to gain access to a hard-to-reach population of high- and low-level prostitutes who use drugs, of which less than one quarter had been incarcerated.

[73] For example, Sandberg (2009a) initially approached street drug dealers by "The River" with field social workers, and was able to recruit a few participants. However, "it seemed as if contact with the social workers was more problematic than helpful for data collection" (p. 528), so Sandberg decided to go at it alone. With this method, he found himself approached by dealers asking him if he wanted to buy drugs, which was much more apt for his purposes.

[74] In his study of "bridge and tunnel" youth in New York City, Kelly (2010) struggled at times to keep up with the club scene—clubs he intended to study closed by the time he was prepared to begin—the ability to change on the fly "and plain old dumb luck" (p. 674) allowed for a successful exploration of the hard-to-reach population.

[75] Schaps and Sanders (1970) compiled a list of 270 local marijuana-using students who had not provided their names or consent to participate. Though they wrote informally about their experience—"The approach was as friendly and non-threatening as possible, and all those contacted agreed to be interviewed" (p. 136); "interviewee[s were] instructed to 'rap' with the

nothing" (Sandberg & Copes, 2013: 182, citing Wright & Decker, 1997: 19).[76] Previous research has demonstrated it is also possible to recruit drug users without providing compensation (e.g., Dabney & Hollinger, 2002; Osborne & Fogel, 2008; cf. Sandberg & Copes, 2013), especially as rapport and more extensive interactions between the researcher and "a criminal and his or her associates" will make it likelier that the "criminal" will participate in the research, reduce the cost of the interview (i.e., need for compensation), and increase the validity of the data (Jacques & Wright, 2008a: 33).

3.1.1 Recruitment

The sample developed using "seeds" and purposive sampling to help inform potential participants about the research effort. Seeds included the two students interviewed for the class assignment, additional students and non-students with whom I discussed my dissertation research, and, eventually, interviewees who participated in the study. Such purposive sampling targeted individuals who may know eligible subjects, and I often carried recruitment material with me in case I met any GAPSS at conferences or social events (see Appendix A). For example, I distributed sealed envelopes with recruitment material to GAPSS presenting posters on drug-related issues at conferences, and to law school students I met at a bar who, between taking shots of hard alcohol, discussed what it was like to be black conservative Republicans. I met several eventual participants this way, including one at a wedding, and a few who helped spread the word about the research.

Snowball sampling involved word-of-mouth and sealed-envelope referrals (see Appendix

---

researcher" (p. 137)—such an approach might concern a contemporary Institutional Review Board (IRB) (cf. Jacques & Wright, 2010b; Librett & Perrone, 2010).

[76] Sometimes, recruiters are as valuable as participants, and are compensated as such, e.g., $50 for each successfully recruited participant (Topalli, 2006: 484-5). Those using recruiters consistently compensate them (Sandberg & Copes, 2013: 183). Meanwhile, interviewees are generally paid $50 per hour of interview, but sometimes more, up to $100, if—according to one researcher interviewed by Sandberg and Copes (2013)—"it's for somebody who's going to give me really good data" (p. 183).

B), usually by those who were interviewed, to individuals they thought may be eligible for and willing to participate, a strategy that allowed people to vouch for the research. Details of this process were provided in a debriefing script at the conclusion of each interview (see Appendix C) and section on “Data collection: Procedures”). One individual who did not qualify to participate in the study because he was not a GAPSS nonetheless told appropriate students in his social network about the effort. These three primary “seeds”—the two “pilot” interviewees and the third individual with a large social network—each produced a chain of referrals. There was no compensation provided to those who assisted with recruitment, just as there was none for participating in the research. In the present study, one MBA student noted she decided to participate in part because she thought nobody else would do so for free.

Though researchers generally use snowball sampling to help increase their potential sample size, here the main concern during recruitment was to avoid having potential high-status participants feel like they had been “outed” as drug users. Therefore, the research protocol that generated the sample analyzed herein asked interested potential subjects to contact the researcher directly from a non-school email account, or by phone, offering them anonymity until they willingly identified themselves. When contacted, potential participants were screened before scheduling an interview. Overall, more than forty (40) students expressed interest in participating in the research between January 2011 and January 2015, though not all were interviewed: some completed their programs before I was able to reach them, others initially expressed interest but did not schedule an interview while others scheduled, had to cancel, and were unable to reschedule (e.g., due to travel). For example, a few potential informants in Boston did not respond to messages I sent following the marathon bombings there, and then graduated.

3.1.2 The research interview

Language and verbalized reasons are central to how the criminal justice system

conducts business (i.e., laws, invocations, confessions, testimony). Patterns of language and substance use are learned through social interactions across the life course, making the research interview an optimal tool for exploring experiences and processes that influence how different groups utilize words and drugs. The overarching aim of each interview was to provide a context in which the informant was able to convey stories that would make it possible to characterize the substance use experiences and practices of GAPSS, what drug use means to students transitioning into careers, and, therefore, how academic knowledge can be leveraged discursively to maintain status or achieve distance from stigmatized use or users. Formative experiences with drugs, those that occurred during postbaccalaureate schooling, and interactions involving social control agents (e.g., police) were of particular interest.

The present study employed semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions, allowing discussions to be driven by close listening to the interviewee's stories about involvement with substance use. Such an approach mitigated problems stemming from "a sharp disjunction or gap between asking and answering in naturally occurring conversations and the same process transformed into a systematic research procedure" (Mishler, 1999/1986: 2), and was consonant with strategies developed based on interviews with people in positions of power:

> rather than developing questions based on background research, the questions should partially emerge within the interview setting, providing a more mutual exchange that includes the elite's interests and perspectives and emerging interest of the interviewer (Kezar, 2003: 407).

Many GAPSS already have "real-world" experience or are attending school to learn how to make informed inferences and decisions in their field of study after graduating, and foresee rising to prominent roles in part due to their pursuit of an advanced education. A less rigid interview structure allows informants to have more power over how they tell their story, rather than treating them like a "passive vessel of answers" (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995: 50). Therefore, though the same topics were of interest across interviews, and the interview guide provided structure and areas to probe (see Appendix D), it was not consistently followed: the same

questions were not asked of each interviewee, the ordering of questions varied, and, as greater understanding of the phenomenon developed over time, questions asked in the first interview differed from those in the last. As is often the case when “researching up” (Kezar, 2003),

> the interviewee is encouraged to structure the account of the situation and is able to introduce his or her notions of what is more relevant instead of relying on the investigator’s notions of relevance (Kezar, 2003: 397).

Due to the process of incorporating emergent knowledge in deciding which line of questioning to pursue and how the query should be phrased given the nature of a particular interview encounter, participants were sometimes asked slight variations of the “same” questions, and this may have generated different answers from those they would have offered if all had been asked identical questions sequentially. Even if asked identical questions, it is to be expected that responses would be as variegated as the backgrounds of the sample. Furthermore, the individual characteristics and experiences of the participants made certain sections of the guide more relevant for some than others, and some interviewees broached a range of issues in a single response that did not emerge for others, or did eventually, but piecemeal, i.e., across answers to several questions. Aside from the reluctance of several JD students to be interviewed or tape recorded, and a few occasions where JDs who were tape recorded denied the veracity of a line of questioning (see “Professional discourse and leveraged expertise”), informants generally did not seem to exercise their power or status to avoid answering questions (cf. Costa & Kiss, 2011; Adler & Adler, 2003), and discussions were consistently related to the overarching areas of interest: graduate or professional school, and experiences using substances.

Given the anticipated discussion of illegal behavior, the ability to build rapport and establish trust was aided by sharing relatively equal status as fellow GAPSS (see Black, 1976). The more comfortable students felt candidly sharing unflattering, difficult, or embarrassing stories about their experiences with substance use, the less likely they were to practice account avoidance strategies (Lyman & Scott, 1968: 57). Therefore, procedures entailed *first* asking

questions to explore interviewees' academic programs and careers, *before* asking them to situate how their drug use began and had been integrated into or shaped by professional ambitions and social interactions in their degree programs. This process was likely to raise issues that respondents were unlikely to have experience being asked to account for (Scott & Lyman, 1968; Lyman & Scott, 1970). Interest in studying social situations, rather than features of personality (Goldstein, 1979: 11, citing Matza, 1964), meant not necessarily asking how particular drugs made them feel. Instead, interviewees were consistently asked to provide stories descriptive of interactions associated with their substance use. Participants did sometimes comment on feelings they associated with drugs, but usually in the context of telling stories about a particular occasion when they were intoxicated; anticipated future use and societal responses to involvement with various drugs were also of interest.

During interviews, I balanced a formal non-pejorative or judgmental approach with opportunistic levity at the expense of my own misunderstandings, and attempted to mirror the informant's discomfort, sadness, or matter-of-fact storytelling style. It was sometimes difficult to conceal my interest in a particular utterance or evocative description; when this occurred, I reassured informants with smiles, comments (e.g., "that's interesting"), and made noises (e.g., "Mmm-hmm"), to let them know that what they had said was thoughtful and relevant, rather than frowns that might reflect negative judgments akin to "I can't believe you did that!" Responses were probed to clarify meaning and gain further insight into events or topics that seemed ordinary to the interviewee but were potentially unique within the context of the research, and to assess the breadth, depth, and reliability of the interviewee's knowledge.

The credibility of informants was further assessed based on their demeanor and the extent of their knowledge regarding drugs. As the excerpts in the data chapters illustrate, many of the experiences were vividly retold in a manner that conveyed the unfolding nature of the event, suggesting that memories were being recalled (rather than generated anew). At times, informants indicated that they had not told many people about a particular detail that they

disclosed during the interview, or had not revealed so much of their substance use history to most people, especially in a single sitting. On one occasion, the fiancé of an interviewee indicated from the next room that he had not heard about her use of a particular drug, suggesting some information disclosed in the interview might not have previously been shared even with close relations. Collectively, that there are consistent elements across stories told by people attending different programs and schools who had not used drugs together reinforces the plausibility of these types of narratives. Overall, informants had little to gain by participating or by misrepresenting their experiences, especially as those they described were sometimes illegal or embarrassing, and they potentially had a lot to lose by disclosing such activities.

As is sometimes the case with qualitative and survey research, most of the personal information presented in the following data chapters was not independently verified; some might question the veracity of the interviewee's statements.[77] While this was particularly true for stories of past experiences, short of obtaining letters of reference and hair samples, their academic *bona fides* and ongoing substance use were, respectively, often and sometimes confirmed. A few participants handed me law review or peer-reviewed journal articles they had authored, others had framed Ivy League degrees hanging on the walls of their apartments, and some were interviewed on their school's campus. Regarding substance use, on a few occasions, after providing informed consent, interviews were conducted over drinks at a bar, while informants sipped on a beer in their apartment, or within view of a wine cabinet or cadre of liquors. Towards the end of the interview, several students displayed their familiarity with drugs by, for example, rolling a joint, one rolled several spliffs, and others smoked out of glass pipes. As another example, after mentioning having used a particular drug (DMT) and being asked to

[77] Based on interviews with ethnographers (N=15) who study drug dealers, Sandberg and Copes (2013) presented a series of "Challenges in ethnographic research on offenders" (p. 180). Those enumerated include "Approaching participants," "Enticing consent," "Drug use of participants and researchers," "Recording interviews," "Physical and legal security," "Potential ethical dilemmas," and the "IRB." The veracity of the statements of drug dealers did not emerge

describe it, one participated proceeded to get up off the sofa, walk to the refrigerator, and return with edifying evidence. Though it was not used at the time, the presentation supported statements that conveyed close familiarity with the drug. Generally, substance use during the course of the interview extended the discussion, as students described what they were doing and experiencing, or offered additional comments.

In line with the principle that researchers should not "argue with the members" (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011; cf. Pollner, 1978; Berard, 2003), and acknowledging that, when speaking with elites, "the result of the interview is the interviewee's definition of the situation" (Kezar, 2003: 397), interviewee's stories were generally not challenged by expressing incredulity regarding whether the events did in fact unfold as retold. Rather, responses that seemed noteworthy or unique in the context of the research effort were confirmed to ensure that they had been properly heard and understood by the interviewer—who was engaged in close listening but also, due to the open-ended nature of the interview, thinking which emergent issue to pursue with each subsequent question. Interviewees were challenged more strenuously when they made statements that were inconsistent with what they had mentioned previously, which was sometimes the result of a misunderstanding, or if they ascribed a particular thought pattern or rationale to explain behavior they had engaged in years before the interview that seemed to reflect more mature reasoning. For example, a medical student stated that:

> … even prior to using the drugs I think I had a good knowledge of what I was taking, uh, ya know, understood the, I guess, the benefits and the costs [he chuckles] of taking such a drug. Of taking marijuana and cocaine.

I then asked: "When did you first smoke? ... Pot?" After he indicated his first experience was at the end of 7th grade, the following conversation ensued:

> Oren: At that point you'd already considered the costs and benefits of it?
>
> Interviewee: Um…

---

as a pressing concern for these researchers, suggesting it might similarly not be an issue for the statements of recreational users.

> Oren: What was your thought process at the time?
>
> Interviewee: Oh I don't know what the analysis was at the time. Obviously, there is more literature about it now (smiling), but I think at the time I had, I had known some, even, even friends of mine whose parents had, ya know, smoked marijuana, and they held respectable jobs, and made good money, and were, ya know, good, good people. I, ya know, I guess, I guess you sort of, I guess it was, it was a less informative more rationalization based on the information that I had at my disposal. …

The repetition of phrases (e.g., "I had," "even," "ya know," "I guess," "it was") suggested he was working to re-position his earlier statement after being challenged as to his reconstruction of distant memories. Generally, these sorts of in-between or transitional utterances may have reflected embarrassment about admitting to something, a search for ways to report a hard-to-describe event, or the haze of memory of experiences had while in a stupor; though preserved in transcription (e.g., "um," "uh," "like"), they are removed from the data chapters when possible. Furthermore, such back-and-forth exchanges are not always incorporated or analyzed where doing so would impede the flow of the narration or not expressly relate to the substantive point (e.g., when the following question was transitional rather than probing), though they are occasionally noted in commenting on specific stories.

Perhaps because they were aware that what they said could not be independently verified, it is possible that participants in the present study were not completely forthcoming in regards to their substance use and related altercations with law enforcement. In this sense, they would be similar to people who do not publicize the extent to which they privately push their own boundaries by engaging in behavior or activities they understand some might find objectionable or think of as reflecting poorly on their decision-making or intellect. Specifically, while many did describe negative aspects of drug use and close calls with police (see "Segmented identities"), including the effects themselves, even less savory experiences might have been understated or not mentioned at all. While conducting the research and subsequent analysis, it was not evident that the interview structure encouraged such "sugar coated" renderings, and for many seemed to provide a context in which they felt comfortable disclosing a mixture of high points and low

points in their lives involving substance use (e.g., acquaintance rape, psychiatric diagnoses, familial hardships). Aside from a few informants who remained relatively even-keeled throughout, both in how they told stories and the nature of the stories they told, the overwhelming majority described both positive and negative experiences with substance use. For those who portrayed themselves as relatively less involved in substance use or with few stories associated with impaired judgment, they might nonetheless have had more debaucherous experiences that they consciously decided to avoid talking about or merely forgot to mention.

To help mitigate self-censorship issues, one of the penultimate questions usually involved asking participants if there were some aspects of their substance use that they had not disclosed; most indicated they had tried to be completely forthcoming (particularly those whose interviews were longer in duration), others that any omissions were not purposeful, and a few mentioned drugs they had used that we had not yet discussed. For some it was not plausible to address all noteworthy experiences given that the interview was only supposed to last one to two hours. As participation was voluntary, it is possible that those who did were willing to talk openly about their history; conversely, perhaps some planned ahead of time to self-censor certain stories for any number of reasons (e.g., to maximize privacy and minimize risk of legal and social harm, either in the interview itself or more broadly). Just as the stories that were shared cannot be independently verified, those that were not told are difficult to assess.

3.2 Setting

The population of interest informed the strategy for selecting interview locations. In line with approaches to ethnographic qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), rather than conduct interviews in places unrelated to the participants' identity as a student or substance user, research involved traveling "into the field" (DeVault, 2007) to the natural settings where informants attended school, lived, and used drugs. Interviews were conducted at a mutually

agreed upon time and place of the interviewee's choosing in a number of cities and college towns across the Midwest and along the East Coast with students attending schools in twelve (12) states. The sampling framework generated several networks, including students who socialized and used drugs together, and some who knew each other as classmates but not fellow users.

Traveling to conduct interviews meant that research took place in a variety of settings. The location of each interview can be distinguished by whether they were conducted on-campus, in a social venue, or in the informant's living space. Encouraging interviewees to select the setting increased their familiarity and comfort when discussing the subject matter, and made participation convenient. The majority of interviews (n=15) were conducted in the informant's apartment, including one that took place in their childhood home. Four were conducted on the campus of the student's graduate institution, usually in their office, but on one occasion in a school cafeteria. Restaurants, coffee shops, or bars were the venues for five interviews, including one over lunch between classes in a restaurant near the informant's campus, and another that took place over the course of two meetings in the same coffee shop. The remainder (n=3) began in one setting, such as a restaurant, and then transitioned to the interviewee's living space.

Interviews conducted in the interviewee's home provided special insight into the informant's lives that would not have been obtained using other methods or in other places. In a few cases, fiancés, boyfriends, or roommates were in adjacent rooms playing video games or cooking during the interview, while in others husbands and girlfriends returned home in the middle or towards the end, in one case also agreeing to participate in the research. One participant answered several phone calls from family members during the course of the interview, including her father, husband, and a brother, indicative of their close bond. Elsewhere, an interview just underway required a brief pause when an informants' mother visited the kitchen; his wife followed soon after, then left, leading to a whispered discussion of

her unfavorable views regarding his drug use. Switching rooms to avoid such interruptions, the rest of the interview took place in his father's study, providing a number of contextual cues. Such features of the setting were documented in process notes and referenced during several interviews; for example, drugs and associated paraphernalia belonging to informants and their co-habitants, and a picture of a "frat house" on a wall that one informant looked at while describing a time he locked himself in his room there with half an ounce of cocaine. Therefore, in addition to helping participants feel more at ease, entering and conducting interviews in the private residences of informants allowed for the development of richer ethnographies. Public interview settings could be similarly informative—such as the interview in the business school cafeteria during which students attending a weekly school-sponsored social were playing what sounded like drinking games in an adjacent room—but were also sometimes problematic, with occasional distractions, such as waiters, coffee shop doors opening onto busy streets, and other ambient noises that made transcription more challenging. Inaudible or incomprehensible words or phrases were indicated as such when necessary.

3.3 Sample

At the time of their respective interviews, participants (N=27)[78] were attending seventeen different schools, mostly located in large cities. The resulting sample was comparative, representing multiple professions and academic settings (see Table 1). In addition to the JDs, MBAs, and MDs, I spoke with PhD students pursuing degrees in fields including Biology, Clinical Psychology, Neuroscience (x4), Criminology (x3), and Literature, and Master's students in Communication, Criminal Justice, Psychology, and Urban Planning. Over half of the cohort had attended private high schools, just over half an Ivy League undergraduate institution, and two in five were attending an Ivy League graduate or professional school at the time of the

[78] A few interviews are pending so the final total is subject to change.

interview. Some students not attending Ivy League graduate institutions were at large research institutions, or top- to mid-tier law and business schools. The sample includes:

- Eleven (11) students attending five (5) Ivy League institutions
- Seven (7) students attending five (5) private schools
- Nine (9) students attending seven (7) public or state schools

At the time of the interview, some had recently returned to school after years in the workforce, or just begun their programs, whereas others were close to finishing and looking for jobs. One part-time MBA student was also working full-time, while a postdoctoral student was affiliated with her third or fourth prestigious institution.

Table 1. Academic concentrations, descriptive monikers, and demographics (N=27)

Degree, Moniker/Concentration	Gender	Background	Duration (H:MM)
JD, “Civil”	M	White	1:41
JD, “Corporate”	M	White	Off the record
JD, “Criminal”	M	White	Off the record
JD, “Family”	F	White	Off the record
JD, “First semester”	M	White	2:00
JD, “Non-profit”	F	White	1:48
Master's, “Psychology”	F	White	1:41
Master's, “Urban Planning”	F	White	1:35
Master's, “Communication”	F	White	2:18
Master's, “Criminal Justice”	F	White	1:19
MBA, “European Corporate”	M	Hispanic	1:40
MBA, “Finance”	M	White	0:50
MBA, “Management Consultant”	M	White	2:03
MBA, “Social Entrepreneurship”	F	White	1:48
MD, “East Coast”	M	White	0:52
MD, “South”	F	Hispanic	1:52
MD, “West Coast”	F	Asian American	0:25
PhD, “Biology”	M	Unknown	4:09
PhD, “Clinical Psychology”	M	White	4:34
PhD, “Criminology Midwest”	F	White	5:40
PhD, “Criminology South”	F	African American	5:31
PhD, “Criminology West”	F	White	2:01
PhD, “Literature”	M	White	2:50
PhD, “Neuroscience West”	F	White	3:07
PhD, “Neuroscience East”	M	Indian	4:45
PhD, “Neuroscience”	F	Indian	3:06
PhD, “Neuroscience Midwest”	M	Indian	Off the record
TOTAL	14 F, 13 M		57:35

3.3.1 Selection criteria

Two eligibility requirements and a few exclusion criteria were employed to select candidates for interviews. To be eligible, students had to 1) be enrolled in a graduate or professional degree program, and 2) have experience using illicit substances, or licit substances illegally (e.g., taking medications prescribed to someone else). The first point was explicitly stated in recruitment material, and verified at the time of the interview. After potential participants established contact, the second criterion—willingness to self-identify as having used illicit substances—was verified using a brief Institutional Review Board (IRB)-approved phone screen with a series of "yes" or "no" questions (Protocol No. 2010-0193). For example, potential interviewees were asked, "keeping in mind that you only have to answer by stating 'yes' or 'no,' have you ever used any illicit substances, or abused licit substances, such as prescription medications or alcohol?"—interviews were scheduled with those replying "yes" to all such questions. Regarding exclusion criteria, in addition to excluding non-GAPSS and GAPSS with no history of illicit substance use, the IRB precluded students attending the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) and immediate friends and personal acquaintances of the author from participating in the study. With these caveats, all those who did participate would appear in the box marked "Included" in Table 2:

Table 2. Selection criteria: Graduate or professional school student drug users

		Graduate or Professional School Students	
		Yes	**No**
Drug	**Yes**	Included	Excluded
Users	**No**	Excluded	Excluded

3.3.2 Selection strategy

The purposive selection strategy was predicated on addressing the research questions and including students attending a mixture of professional and graduate programs and schools, those at different phases of the process (e.g., just beginning, in the middle, and close to

finishing), and similar proportions of male and female participants. While it was not always possible to know before meeting for the interview, efforts were made to include students from a range of backgrounds. Stemming from an interest in documenting how professional training and ways of thinking can emerge while discussing substance use, the initial aim was to include multiple informants from each of the professional schools (i.e., business, law, and medicine), as well as Master's and Doctoral students in the biological and social sciences knowledgeable about processes relevant to substance use and users.

Adaptive sampling (Thompson, 1997) occurs when "the selection of people or other units to include in the sample adapts to observations made during the survey" (p. 298). Over the course of the study, as interviews with several knowledgeable Master's and Doctoral students were analyzed, it became clear that portions of their accounts incorporated intimate knowledge of medical terminology. Therefore, rather than selecting students primarily based on whether they were workings towards JD (N=6), MBA (N=4), MD (N=3), PhD (N=10) or Master's degrees (N=4), attention shifted towards attaining descriptive adequacy in conceptual categories that reflected the different types of language and knowledge acquired through schooling: legal, business, medical/biological, and research, respectively, with some students able to apply more than one (e.g., medical and research, or legal and research).

Traveling, scheduling, and funding issues also influenced who was selected to participate. The lack of consistent funding restricted the ability to travel to meet all potential participants, so some interviewees were strategically selected based on factors including their proximity to one another, and need to target specific types of students in pursuit of the selection strategy. As some degree programs require more years of schooling than others, interviews with JD and MBA students were sometimes prioritized over those with aspiring MDs or PhDs. For example, while traveling I attempted to squeeze in an interview with a law student by postponing an interview with a medical school student scheduled for the following day in a different city; the plan was to conduct both interviews. However, after waiting for over an hour in the school lobby,

the law student cancelled, explaining that a work meeting was running late, and the medical student then cancelled the next day after I had arrived to meet her; neither materialized. Towards the end of the study, interviews sought to further explore emergent themes and issues (e.g., the relevance of privilege), while targeting unique informants (e.g., a “grower”).

3.3.3 Demographics

The sample can be described using standard and population-specific demographics pertaining to education. Most of the following information was not acquired by asking for each response directly or sequentially. Instead, the data was extracted from stories the interviewees told about themselves and their experiences, and at times supplemented by other sources, including other interviewees and inference. For example, one interviewee commented that a friend she planned to snowball had an affluent family, while year of high school or college graduation could be used to estimate their ages at the time of the interview.

Participants ranged in age from their mid-20s to early-to-mid-30s; fourteen were women, and thirteen men, with each degree type (MD, JD, MBA, PhD) and conceptual knowledge category (medical/biological, legal, business, research) represented by both genders. Nineteen participants (70%) were “White, not of Hispanic Origin,” including a number of second-generation U.S. citizens. The sample included a female African American, and more than six students whose parents grew up outside the U.S. Most participants grew up and attended colleges in cities and towns of various sizes across the U.S., from California to Colorado to Illinois to Florida to Pennsylvania and New York, though some were also raised and attended college in other countries. Many had traveled internationally, including to places with different drug laws and customs (e.g., Amsterdam, Australia, Japan, Peru, Spain). Interviews lasted for an average of two and a half hours; while nine lasted between one to two hours, discussions with PhD students averaged nearly four hours, including two “marathon” interviews each lasting

roughly five and a half hours. Three interviews lasted less than one hour, and four were conducted “off the record.”

In collecting participants from different graduate and professional programs, several schools, departments, and social networks were represented more than once in the sample. Among students attending the same schools, a trio were in different programs but used drugs together, while three business students in the same cohort of their program did not report having used drugs together. The first trio also socialized with and helped recruit other research participants attending different schools. Two sets of female participants attended the same programs at the same time, and used drugs together, and two participants attended the same law school program, but not at the same time; others were pursuing different graduate degrees at the same school without interacting. Overall, the cohort is comprised of accomplished students, including teaching and research assistants, orientation organizers, authors of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and a book, members of Law Review, and a business student who was financially induced to temporarily leave his job that paid six figures to return to school. Most participants had middle-to-upper class upbringings, though a few came from less affluent backgrounds. The relative privilege of some participants was noted in their private schooling, parental education and occupation, international travel, availability of disposable income to spend on drinking and drugs, and living spaces.

3.4 Data collection

Once IRB approval was received in December 2010, interviews were conducted over the next four years. This section reviews procedures on the day of the interview, including the progression of the interview guide, and details how the data was managed thereafter.

3.4.1 Procedures

Formal interviewing began immediately pursuant to meeting the interviewees, initial greetings (Platt, 1981), and informed consent. Prior to the start of the interview and audio-recording, potential participants were asked to read the IRB-approved consent document while I read it aloud, and, if the subject felt comfortable proceeding, they were asked to provide verbal consent (cf. Roberts & Indermaur, 2003), with the option to keep the two-page consent document (see Appendix E). No potential participants refused to consent, though a few asked that no audio-recording be created, and it was not possible to audio-record one interview because of the setting (a wedding); four were therefore "off the record," three of which were with law school students. At the expense of fewer quotes, such interviews tended to provide more opportunities for participant observation. GAPSS who willingly shared their experiences provide the basis for the present study.

Upon completion of each interview, a debriefing script was reviewed with participants that asked them to consider helping recruit student users (see Appendix C). The debriefing script read, in part:

> I will ask you to seal the envelopes before handing them to potential participants in order to protect both your and their confidentiality. I will also ask that you hand them the envelope privately, so as to reduce risk, and to only ask potential participants if they are interested one time.

If they expressed interest in doing so, the appropriate IRB-approved recruitment material was provided for them to review, and then folded and sealed in envelopes. Some participants declined this material, or stated they would instead describe the project and provide relevant contact information to anyone who was interested.

A digital voice recorder was used to audio-record interviews, with pauses or breaks taken whenever requested by the informant and when a private interview space was breached (e.g., someone enters room, phone call). One of the initial interviewees happened to have experience working on sound production and, upon seeing that I planned to begin conducting

the interview without checking the sound levels in a mostly empty bar at 11:00 AM, helped teach me how to do so using headphones. I repeated this procedure before each subsequent interview, which helped later on in producing accurate transcriptions. Efforts were also made to record paralanguage and body language in observational notes, and these were integrated during transcription.

Complementing the interview-based data, being in the field conducting interviews allowed for participant observation before, during, or after the interview. Upon arriving to conduct an interview I sometimes met GAPSS who were friends or roommates of soon-to-be research participants, but did not express any particular interest upon learning about my research; however, upon interviewing their colleagues, I would then hear stories involving, “you know, the guy you met earlier.” As it turns out, one such GAPSS I met in passing who did not readily identify himself as a substance user was a medical student affiliated with the armed services who regularly used synthetic pot, and on one occasion got very drunk at a bar with his friends and wife and proceeded to invite a stranger to share a cab home to have a threesome without informing his significant other. Therefore, participant-observation in the settings to which I was invited allowed the substance-using experiences of some GAPSS who did not participate in the research to be documented in field notes, suggesting that the informants are not the only advanced students in their social networks to engage in drinking and drugs.

Other opportunities for participant-observation emerged during and after interviews that were documented in field notes. On one occasion, the girlfriend of an interviewee returned home during the interview; she also qualified for the study, and, after reviewing the consent document, agreed to join our discussion until her friend arrived to go to a bar. Though her boyfriend was present and engaged, I focused on asking her questions during the time when she was available, before returning to the one-on-one interview when she left. Later on, she returned with her friend and friend’s boyfriend, who happened to also have participated in the research months earlier. I learned that he had successfully defended his dissertation, and was

pursuing a postdoctoral position rather than the job he had told me about aspiring to during his interview. Not wanting to infringe further after nearly five hours of interviewing, I excused myself; on my way to the door, the host opened a toolbox on the kitchen counter to reveal his collection of drug paraphernalia. On a few occasions, following an interview, I agreed to meet interviewee's GAPSS acquaintances at social gatherings they invited me to attend while in town: a house party, or at a bar for some drinks. These events facilitated chats with other GAPSS involved in drinking and drugs who were not interviewed.

3.4.2 Interview guide

By leveraging technical knowledge and wielding words in an "active" interview, interviewees navigated presenting themselves as both drug users and intellectually curious soon-to-be credentialed professionals. Open-ended questions *first* explored interviewees' academic programs and careers, before asking students to situate the onset of their use and how it has been influenced by professional ambitions and social interactions (see Appendix D). The idea was to have stories about substance use emerge after the interviewee's various accomplishments had already been outlined, requiring them to account not only for use in general but also in light of their successes. As they had already used technical terms from their profession in describing their interests, terminology acquired by way of academic and experiential knowledge was also likelier to be folded into drug-related stories. Furthermore, interviewing students attending school at the time of the interview may have increased the likelihood that newly acquired knowledge was incorporated into how they understood and portrayed drug use. The interview generally covered the following topics in this order:

1. Academic arc
2. Substance use history
3. Experiences taking or talking about use with fellow students and mentors
4. Interactions involving drugs and "the scene"
5. Harms stemming from use, or being "caught"
6. How they compare to other users

7. Views of societal responses to substance use based on personal observations and class/textbook learning

Interviews began by letting informants know that before discussing substance use, the research aimed to get a holistic view of their professional choices and life history. The first question situated the informant as a student—“How is school going?”—with subsequent background questions about their academic program and classes facilitating a discussion of topics and issues germane to their discipline. From the outset, participants were encouraged to demonstrate their expertise stemming from career or school experiences. Early questions also focused on their pathways to this career (as opposed to pathways to drug use), and establishing comparative and social reference-points: “How has your thinking about your career choice changed over your time in the program?” “What sorts of questions does your family ask you about the program?” Transitioning into the next section on social life, participants were asked: “What are the things you do that balance off your academic pursuits?”

Documenting how students became involved in substance use and mapping the different drugs they consumed allowed for hints of unique stories or influential experiences to emerge. Special attention was given to probe interactions between interviewees and their fellow graduate or professional school students, and with “social control agents” (e.g., parents, family, friends, mentors, police, psychiatrists, psychologists, medical doctors). Continued emphasis was placed on asking questions that would allow the informant to compare their own experiences and practices to those of others they had observed. While not all questions were asked of all participants, some included: “Talk to me about substance use you have seen occurring around you,” “How has your use been perceived by those around you?,” "Were you ever caught or made to feel like you were ‘caught’?” The process of obtaining and consuming substances was also reflected on: first time paying for drugs, interactions with dealers, “How much do you pay for how much?,” “How long does it last?,” “How do you feel about your current pattern of use?”

Following description of their professional careers, substance use, and any overlap between these areas, questions then turned to how their knowledge and understanding of substance use had changed over time, was incorporated into using practices, and affected school, work, career goals, and professional development. Participants were asked if they differed from other drug users and in what ways. The social contours of their drug using networks were probed: “Are there some drugs you use with some people, but not others?” This question led to stories about substance use with people from the informant’s past, including family members, and provided another opportunity to ask about the informant’s background, home environment, academic career (e.g., high school), and turning points in their lives (e.g., “Where were you living before moving to this city?”).

Interviews concluded with a section where participants were asked to come “full circle,” describing what they had learned academically and professionally that helped them explain their own use of substances, substance use observed going on around them, and substance use in society more generally. Students were asked if there was a discourse of their profession relating to substance use, about laws pertaining to various drugs and alcohol, and distinctions between “licit” and “illicit.” In some cases, based on their knowledge of the relevant details, informants took this opportunity to say what was right, wrong, and everything in between about societal responses to substance use, particularly in relation to other persistent social issues they felt to be more important (e.g., education). To investigate whether graduate and professional student users experienced some of the features of drug use endemic to other populations, participants were asked if they have ever witnessed or been subjected to violence in relation to drug procurement or use, or about times they felt (or feel) ashamed of their drug use (e.g., labeled due to their use). The situated nature of the accounts proffered was explored: “I appreciate how open you have been throughout the interview. Is there any substance use you may not have mentioned? You don’t have to tell me what it is, but if so, why not?” Here, participants usually noted that they had been forthright and upfront in retelling their experiences, or mentioned a

substance that had not yet come up and had not been asked about directly. The final question was usually: “Is there anything you think we haven’t covered that you expected to go over when you first head about this research?” For some students, this was an opportunity to comment on the extent to which particular aspects of their history emerged: it was more about what we did talk about than what we did not.

3.4.3 Data management and protection of human subjects

A number of data management precautions were taken to enhance the protection of human subjects. All interviews were conducted, transcribed, and analyzed by the author. Before beginning, informants were reminded not to provide the names of specific people or places. After the interview, data was de-identified during transcription, removing all personal information or biographical references. These included stripping any names or street addresses mentioned during the interviews, and inserting pseudonyms in their place. The recordings of the interview were destroyed immediately after confirming the accuracy of the transcription[79], which was achieved by printing out a copy of the transcript to annotate with potential corrections while listening to the interview, with some unclear phrases reviewed numerous times or determined to be indecipherable. The accuracy of transcriptions were further verified by selecting random sections of transcribed interviews and providing them to the faculty advisor/dissertation chair to review while listening to the audio.

There were no adverse events related to confidentiality during any of the interviews, and while there are few, if any, physical risks associated with talking about substance use, some of the discussed subject matter could be considered sensitive (e.g., drug use). The ability of participants to control the direction and pace of the conversation reduced the potential for any

[79] Any correspondence with participants were destroyed within seven (7) days of the interview. No data sheets were maintained with contact information (e.g., for a follow-up study) or that could link interview subjects with specific identities, as keeping such records would jeopardize confidentiality and efforts to minimize the risk that subjects could be identified.

adverse psychological risks. Sensitivity was used at the first sign of any adverse reaction, such as when one informant started crying while discussing her family history; the interview stopped, we took a break, and then resumed with a new line of questioning and continued for a few more hours. Subjects were informed that they could withdraw from the research at any time, and have the interview immediately deleted.

Additional precautions were taken to enhance protections for this “high status” sample, including adapting recruitment strategies employed by other researchers. As described earlier, steps were also taken to protect the identities of GAPSS who might qualify for the study, but not be interested in participating. This was achieved by asking those assisting with recruitment to have their acquaintances contact me, rather than having recruiters provide me with the names and contact information for people they knew to be eligible who might not want their drug use to become known. “Peer pressure” to participate was also avoided by not compensating recruiters. While such efforts may have precluded more expansive sampling, the recruitment parameters perhaps reassured potential participant that protecting their confidentiality was a priority, partially informing their decision to participate.

3.5 Data analysis

The social space (Black, 1976) and fluid power dynamics (Mischler, 1984 122-123) in the interviewer-respondent relationship when “interviewing one’s peers” (Platt, 1981) suggested that the interview should not be approached as the “instrumental use of another person” (p. 78), i.e., to acquire information. The interactionist conception of deviance (Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1963; Kitsuse & Cicourel, 1963) and how subjective and objective realities are actively produced through symbolizations that are constantly in flux (e.g., Pollner, 1978; Berard, 2003; Ibarra, 2008; Holstein, 2009) suggests an “active interview” approach (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995; 2003; 2004) that is mindful of the ways in which “every interview is an interpersonal drama with a developing plot” (Pool, 1957: 193, quoted in Holstein & Gubrium 1995: 14), i.e., a “meaning-

making occasion" (Holstein & Gubrium 1997: 114). Priority is given to understanding and portraying member's meanings (Holstein & Gubrium, 2012; cf. Garfinkel, 1964; Wieder, 1974; Sykes, 1958) and the role played by participants in guiding the discussion to situate how their drug use intersected with their professional career or other aspects of their social identity (e.g., religiosity, family, relationships). In short, the interview encounter became a venue in which the interviewee practiced visible strategies for the presentation of self (Goffman, 1959).

Ongoing transcription and coding of interviews by the author facilitated a grounded inductive approach to the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Charmaz, 1983; 2000): open, axial, and selective coding highlighted recurring themes and variations (Strauss, 1987), offering lines of inquiry to pursue in subsequent interviews and develop analytically (Glaser, 1978; Charmaz, 2012/2006). Interviewees made "thick" descriptive statements (Geertz, 1983) that were scrutinized and probed, thereafter categorized, and continuously re-examined. Conducting the interviews over an extended period of time allowed for further research into emergent issues, which in turn generated possible lines of inquiry to listen for in subsequent interviews. Memos utilizing the point-excerpt-commentary format reflected on particularly meaningful exchanges and developed conceptual categories (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). Negative cases that did not adhere to evolving understandings of the phenomena in question were identified and provided variations that in turn necessitated further conceptualization and contextualization of core processes; general claims were qualified and could thus be elaborated on in greater detail. For example, not all integrated academic acumen to portray themselves as high-functioning users; a diverse range of background factors had implications for the intersectionality of privilege, such that it emerged in various ways at different points in their lives (e.g., for those with less familial wealth, their academic careers were the driving force in creating prestige and status); some patterns of initiation and subsequent use did not fit into previously constructed categories. The data chapters present an analysis of the interviews and process notes. Information was sorted and dimensions of the social processes conveyed in the data were

examined to refine conceptions of central phenomena and causal, contextual, and intervening conditions noted by GAPSS users (Charmaz, 2012/2006).

3.5.1 Study variables

Variables culled from discussions were organized to further describe the backgrounds and drug use histories of informants, and depict the interview context and interaction. These biographical markers were identified while coding the interviews: information on parents, siblings, and significant others; locations of international travel and other indicators of social or economic wealth; age and context when various substances were first ingested; and high school, college, extra-curricular, and work experiences. In addition to recording how use occurred in different contexts and aspects of the informants' backgrounds, descriptions of the research setting were included: seating arrangements during the interview, whether drugs or other people were present, the time of day and year, and recent personal and societal-level events preceding the interview. For example, some interviews occurred shortly after the economic downtown, while others took place the day after interviewees had been involved in minor altercations; these included a verbal fight with a boyfriend after a female informant burned through their shared stash of marijuana more quickly than usual, and a separate incident in which a taco was thrown against a wall to relieve exam-induced stress. Interviews were further characterized by their duration, the number of questions asked and frequency with which specific questions were asked, and tendencies towards short or long responses; the willingness to disclose information was also considered (e.g., across disciplines). Finally, the content of the statements were coded to develop the experiential- and language-based themes presented in the data chapters.

3.5.2 Limitations

The study has some limitations associated with qualitative methodology that values processes and stories over statistical representations of recruitment or involvement with drugs. Theoretically-driven purposive snowball and convenience sampling are likely to result in a non-representative sample (Erickson, 1979), such that results from this cohort may not reflect substance use in the general population of GAPSS or GAPSS users. The sample size is limited, and students who grew up or attended schools in certain regions of the U.S. are not represented. Demographically, many ethnicities or minority groups are represented, and some minority groups are underrepresented. Participants' age range was also restricted, with no graduate students in their late 30s or older participating, and nobody under the age of 22 being interviewed. The method employed provides a snapshot into the lives of the informants; a longitudinal design with follow-up could explore substance use during time spent in graduate and professional school in relation to use thereafter. De-identifying the data and conducting interviews off-the-record reflected the tradeoff between participant comfort and safety, on the one hand, and methodological rigor and consistency, on the other.

Motives for participating in the study are unclear, as are reasons some chose not to get involved. The cohort may be more likely to include people who felt comfortable talking about drugs, or those who did not have anyone else to talk to about such issues. For example, after an interview wrapped up, the participant wanted to know—based on other interviews I had conducted—"am I normal?" Even though he did occasionally use with colleagues, this suggests that he may have been unaware of the pathways and usage patterns of other GAPSS in his program or more generally, or was curious if his late immersion into substance use was truly unique (see "Waiting until college or graduate college"). Similarly, graduate students who do not perceive their substance use to be problematic are more likely to be willing to participate, such that the experiences of those who use drugs to the extent that it interferes with their lives, or use riskier drugs, might be underrepresented. While students in the sample have engaged in illegal

behavior (e.g., illicit drug use, drinking and driving), they did not report involvement with “riskier” drugs (e.g., heroin)—one informant thought she may have smoked crack cocaine—or forms of use (e.g., intravenous).

A limitation of this study is the lack of a comparison or control group of GAPSS who did not use drugs. Though beyond the scope of the present effort, such an approach would have provided insight into the experiences of those who had either never used alcohol or drugs, or had not done so since beginning their program. For example, non-drug users might have avoided alcohol and drugs altogether, never had the opportunity or inclination to try, turned down opportunities to use earlier in life, and more recently—including offers made by their current peers—be in recovery and abstaining, or “always pregnant” (the last two examples were reported by an interviewee). The reasons associated with decisions not to pursue drug and alcohol use may be informed by specific knowledge regarding various substances, or be based on matters completely unrelated to substance use per se, such as personal beliefs, career goals, or medical conditions.

Fortunately, students in the present sample did have experiences that address aspects of the aforementioned issues. Some turned down opportunities to use drugs more frequently than others, avoided particular drugs because of their own experiences or those of loved ones, and spoke about people they knew who did not use drugs, but to whom they occasionally would disclose their own use. A few students did not consider themselves to be drug users, but had used illicit drugs a few months prior to the interview. While the present effort focused on people who had used drugs as GAPSS, many participants were often sober in the presence of colleagues who were not, and provided their observations of others who might have used more frequently or copiously than them. Such accounts might be considered a form of neutralization, and cannot be independently verified, but exemplify how those who did participate compared themselves to other GAPSS they regularly interacted with, both professionally and personally. As will be shown in the data chapters, for some who participated in the present effort, their

colleagues were ostensibly members of a sort of “comparison or control group”—at least until they learned if they too enjoyed drinking or drugs. Namely, for those who were not sure how or whether to reveal their interest in substance use to colleagues, they acted and treated their peers as if drugs were the furthest thing from their mind. These cautions or fronts often receded after school-sponsored or -organized social activities involving alcohol.

Still, a comparison group would have allowed for a more complex analysis of the dynamics between users and the non-users who share classrooms, offices, responsibilities and collaborations, but also compete (i.e., for funding, jobs, the attention of faculty). It would be informative to systematically examine what those in each group think of the other.

A final limitation is a paradox associated with participation in the research. On the one hand, most informants reported that they had avoided the risks that would stem from interacting with the criminal justice system as a result of their use. On the other hand, by participating in this research they exposed themselves to potential harms and professional blowback if their identities become known. This reflects a limitation because individuals who are ostensibly doing well in spite of substance use might not be so adversely affected by the drugs themselves, but rather by the perceptions of those who might happen to recognize them by virtue of reading this dissertation. Ironically, such an outcome would reflect the very stigma associated with substance use that this research is challenging by documenting how it occurs at all levels of the social strata.

CHAPER IV. EARLY SOCIALIZATION AND PRIVILEGE: FIRST EXPERIENCES WITH DRUGS

> [My mom] always smoked pot in the house even when we were kids and I didn't know what it was when I was a kid and I didn't think anything of it. But once I, uh, once, uh, ya know, as I got older I started, you know, putting the—you know, I caught a glimpse of a bong, I smelled bong water and pot smoke—you know, I put the pieces together. … I don't really remember how I felt about it.
>
> –Law school student

The decision to use a psychoactive substance for the first time can be made well in advance or moments before ingestion. On subsequent occasions, conscious choices to again use or avoid doing so can incorporate previous experiences. Some reach a point where a transition occurs after which they are considered to be less in control of their intake as drugs assume priority over other motivators, cause neurophysiological imbalances, restrict potential prospects, and alter social relationships. Similar to how the drug(s) taken, set(s) of the user(s), and physical setting(s) influence the extent to which this is likely to occur (Zinberg, 1984), understandings regarding the permissibility and suitability of use at different times and places play a role. Focusing on eventual graduate and professional degree students, this chapter considers initial pathways, an issue of relevance to all types of substance users.

Both licit and illicit drug use are discussed in this chapter as, at the time when alcohol is generally first consumed, legally, it is akin to using a "controlled" substance. All participants in the sample (N=27) had gotten drunk before the legal drinking age, and had also all tried marijuana which, aside from underage drinking, was almost universally (n=26) the first experience with illicit substance use—the notorious "gateway drug" (Anslinger & Cooper, 2011/1937; Peele & Brodsky, 2011/1997). Overall, roughly two thirds of the sample had snorted cocaine and eaten hallucinogens (mushrooms, acid), roughly half had taken pharmaceuticals not as prescribed, and less than half ecstasy/MDMA. While a few participants used marijuana socially with friends or family before alcohol, the rest first experimented with altered states of consciousness by drinking with family and friends. Therefore, this chapter outlines pathways into substance use that began in familial contexts and with peer groups in high school, and then among those whose first

experience came in college or graduate school. Rather than focusing on “representativeness,” the following analysis considers “patterns and variations in relationships and in the ways that members understand and respond to conditions and contingencies in the social setting[s]” (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995: 162) where they have used and procured psychoactive substances. Special attention is given to the transition from not using to using, and the various social and physical contexts in which it occurred for those in the sample: times when they were offered, accepted, sought out, or were denied alcohol, cigarettes and drugs, and related factors, such as availability, ability, and desire. The following incorporates individual background factors to the extent that doing so helps distinguish between similarities and differences in the sample of dynamic actors whose stories portray and are being documented at unique points in their lives. When relevant, students from different types of degree programs are compared and contrasted.

4.1 Family contexts

As children, many of the participants were introduced to “off-limits” or “adult” activities by relatives, during family gatherings, and in the home. As adolescents, they had seen adults drinking alcohol and smoking tobacco in the home during a social event or through media. Students in the sample also traveled to visit family members, or on family vacation, providing additional opportunities to use drugs with relatives. For several students, their first exposure to intoxicating substances came in the home setting, with or without adult supervision; others were introduced to substances while staying at “a home away from home.”

Introductions to alcohol use are culturally specific, and adults may employ a number of strategies. An MBA student who grew up in Europe (hereafter “European Corporate MBA”)—and who noted he wanted to represent the European experience regarding substance use—described how “you start drinking very young” there. He recounted his experience with his parents:

> I mean, wine is something you can give to your son and nothing happens, it's part of the culture, it's part of enjoying a good meal. Uh, it's true there is some alcohol inside, but it's not like, like a drug, ya know? It's not, like something we (indecipherable), I mean. You, you have to, put a threshold. Uh, because you know people of younger ages do not control themselves, but not because it is not safe for use or bad for health, if it is consumed in moderation.

Being introduced to alcohol by his parents—and having a father who was a medical doctor; they "have always self-prescribed"—meant that the amount of alcohol he first consumed was controlled. It also shaped his approach to alcohol, which he viewed as an appropriate accompaniment to food. In response to a question regarding whether he remembered the first time his parents had offered him alcohol, he responded:

> I can't remember, but probably 14, 15. Like like, I mean, I'm not saying [they would be like], "hey, here, you have a bottle of wine," but [rather], "try this wine, so you start tasting," or "you start understanding how it tastes, what is the difference between a good wine and a bad wine." And this is something that a lot of families do [in the country where I grew up]. Like, educating their children—not, not so young, they're teenagers—educating them to understand what is a good wine, what is a beer. And they always tell you—and this is not something specific to my family, I have noticed that some friends had the same experience—that your-your parents would always tell you, "I prefer you do this with me than without me," so, uh, "I want you to try with me and I would like to educate you."

The interviewee noted the cultural underpinnings of European drinking, distinguishing between the quantity that is offered, and the manner in which it is presented as an educational platform for the adolescent and a bonding opportunity for the family. He was also careful to indicate that his experience was not unique to his family, and was part of the culture among his friends; this may have been done as part of his self-appointed role representing the larger European experience, but also because he perceived my widening eyes as reflective of moral judgment, rather than a combination of excitement to be hearing "good data" and an attempt to understand through his accent. A Biology PhD student born and raised in the U.S. also commented that European children "know how to use it responsibly because they were taught to"; "ya know, drinking wine from age 9 during dinner, by the time they get to college, ya know, they're not behaving like American kids are."

However, similar experiences were also conveyed by participants raised in America. In contrast to the Biology PhD, who "abstained" from drinking until college, a JD student (hereafter "Non-profit JD"), while outlining her drinking career from its inception to present, briefly remarked, "I mean, I grew up being able to sip my parent's beers and wines blah blah blah," before going on to describe her first time getting drunk as a freshman in high school—implying she was drinking with her parents before 9th grade. I asked her to elaborate on her early exposure to small amounts of alcohol:

> Well I wasn't allowed to have my own glass until I was 21. I was always able to sip theirs, either at home or a restaurant. But… I was not allowed to, like I was never allowed to pour my own glass until I was 21, they were really strict about that.

Her statement delineates the rules created by her parents, the enforcement of which would curtail access to the physical tool that would facilitate drinking with less supervision. Being allowed to drink in public settings was also noteworthy for her, perhaps indicating her recognition that in doing so her parents were subverting one form of social control (i.e., the law) while exerting their own power, e.g., to know better than the law. They were very happy when she got into a prestigious Ivy League law school, an opportunity she could not pass up even though she was unsure about whether she wanted to become a lawyer going in, and at the time of the interview.

Complementing legal and parental doctrine, religious traditions and interactions with grandparents can also expose children to drinking in the home. A PhD student studying Literature recalled being allowed to drink wine for religious occasions, and his first encounter with his grandfather's hard liquor:

> Yeah, I mean, growing up in a Jewish family there was always wine every Friday night and Passover we would always get a little bit tipsy because we would, you know, drink the four cups. And, it was like, (changing his voice to sound mischievous) "let's get the kids a little drunk!" Ya know? And one time when I was quite young my grandfather had, um, ya know, my grandfather said, (using an authoritative tone) "Heyyyy (begins to say his own name)—hey buddy. Why don't you go get me that glass on that countertop over there?" And I got it for him, and I said "is this water?" He said, "it looks like it, doesn't it? Why don't you take a sip." I took a big sip and it was just like straight vodka and I was like "grahahahaw" (makes a face indicating displeasure). It was terrible for my young palate.

The knowing invitation from the grandfather can be contrasted with another PhD student's more innocent exposure from smelling empty beer cups she collected with her father at baseball games, though the reaction was similar: "gross." She "could not understand why I had to acquire a taste for it," as people sometimes say. For the Literature PhD, drinking alcohol with Friday dinner, therefore, was somewhat routine, with yearly opportunities to drink a little more for religious and social purposes. While the comment ascribed to his parents about getting the kids drunk seemed to be said in jest (i.e., may not have been his belief regarding his parent's intent, let alone what they actually said), the interaction with his grandfather and vodka likely represented his recollection of an actual exchange. This informant, perhaps akin to "the wise child" from the Passover story, was very inquisitive in general, and specifically regarding substance use, which was "not a taboo subject in my family."

> I grew up hearing about my family's drug use. Ya know, my father did marijuana and LSD in college in the 70's, my mother used to take Quaaludes, and my sister was, like, fucked up on all kinds of drugs for all four years of school—more than my parents, and more than me at the end as well.

His sister "majored in drugs and partying" in college, as his parents used to say, and eventually introduced him to marijuana when he visited her on campus while in 10th grade. Yet he first learned about marijuana in 5th grade, which is when he asked his parents about it. The following excerpt includes this exchange, and demonstrates how his parents wanted him to be open with them in regards to encountering drugs and other risks:

> I remember my father saying, "you can tell me anything you want but you can't lie to me." And, like, always asking me to be open with him, and that was in regards to—I was like very young, I was young—it was like in regards to "good touch, bad touch," but he was like, "also, if anybody ever asks you to take anything or smoke anything and you don't want to do it," like, "you can always tell me, I'm not gonna get mad at you," things like that. But that wasn't—that was only obliquely about drugs. And I guess I remember the first time I found out about marijuana—maybe I was in 5th or 6th grade—and I asked my parents, "have you ever done this drug?" It was 5th grade, that's right, I remember. Um, and I asked my parents "have you never done this drug," and they both said "Nooo (exaggerated), we have not done this drug." And then, like, later in life, maybe in 10th grade, I don't know if it was before or after I smoked for the first time, but I asked them—ya know it was probably after I smoked for the first time because I'm sure I told them that I did [smoke marijuana with my sister]. Um, and I was like, "you told me you never did it, is that really true?" And they were like, "No, we did, we both did" (said while lowering

> head and voice, conveying how his parents reacted). I think I told them about it because it [the first time I smoked marijuana] was with my sister, and, like, it felt like an okay thing to talk about.

In this context, it is perhaps not surprising that a grandfather who knew his grandson to be inquisitive might prompt him to attempt to answer the question regarding the liquid that looked like water on his own, particularly as the wise man likely anticipated how it might taste to immature taste buds. His father took a similar approach with tobacco, forcing him to smoke an entire cigarette after he returned from a Bar Mitzvah where he had seen some of the "cool" kids smoking—this was also a memorably negative experience. The PhD student went on to drink beer socially on only a few occasions during high school, avoid hard liquor again until college, rarely smoke cigarettes, and use marijuana with relative consistency since the summer following his senior year of high school through the time of the interview (twelve years).

Parents and grandparents can also be a source of early awareness about other drugs, such as marijuana. A JD student (hereafter "First semester JD") who described himself as a "gay male … from a lower-to-middle/middle-class background" realized as a sophomore or junior in high school that his mom had been smoking marijuana around the house during his childhood:

> … she always smoked pot in the house even when we were kids and I didn't know what it was when I was a kid and I didn't think anything of it. But once I, uh, as I got older I started, you know, putting the—I caught a glimpse of a bong, I smelled bong water and pot smoke—I put the pieces together. … I don't really remember how I felt about it.

He realized before ever having tried marijuana, which he did in his senior year of high school; "pretty late, relatively." This knowledge made it harder for them to reprimand him when, for example, his mother found marijuana he was "holding"—"like I know that's an excuse: 'it's not mine, it's my friend's,' but that's really how it was, that *was* the situation"—while "cleaning" his room (see "Segmented identities"). Thus, in addition to providing socialization, having family who use has potential implications for social control. A female medical doctor (hereafter "South MD") had not directly observed her family members smoking, but heard about their use through stories: "my dad tried marijuana once, he thinks," and "my mom definitely used marijuana, my

grandparents definitely use marijuana, my brother definitely uses marijuana." Though she had only used marijuana with her brother, she recalled how:

> … my grandma used to have this cigarette roller that she rolled marijuana cigarettes with. And she always tells me all these stories, like one time my grandfather was so high he was jumping along this huge line of parked cars, and cracking up, and... She and her friend are (mimicking her grandmother's voice) "currently getting ready and packing for a trip to Amsterdam," and ya know, "going to see the tulips" and all of that., [I] definitely [heard] stories.

While it is unclear how old she was when she observed the roller, and if she was shown at the time what it was used for or only realized in retrospect, the excerpt shows how the device and associated behaviors became the subject of memorable stories—first for grandmother, then her, and now in the interview. As conveyed, her grandmother did not seem angered by her grandfather's behavior, and the medical student's transition to her grandmother's impending trip to Amsterdam may have implied that the MD suspected tulips were not the only flower she was interested in seeing. These details reinforced assertions made elsewhere regarding the warm coastal environment in which she grew up, where an emphasis was placed on "kind of living that fast lifestyle. People have a crazy nice car but live in a shack kind of thing." Whereas marijuana, cocaine, and alcohol were very commonplace in her community, "in my experience, these are people who use it socially, not people that use it daily, or are in any way physically addicted to it." Made at different points in the interview, the comments regarding substance use by family and community members illustrate the nested nature of family within a social environment.

In addition to experiences at home, vacations with or trips to visit youthful family members, such as siblings and cousins, presented opportunities to drink, smoke cigarettes or use drugs. The European Corporate MBA first smoked cigarettes as a fifteen year old with his cousin while spending the summer in the north of the country:

> My parents had to go to work, and I was left with one of my cousins [and his parents]; for me it was like freedom. And I said, "ok, let's try to smoke" with some friends I had at the time. It was just, pretending you are older, more mature.

Some fifteen years ago, he noted, "You saw all the adults smoking… it was not something taboo, like it is now."[80] Thus, he was finally able to do something he regularly observed adults doing. A trip to a tropical island provided the first exposure to beer for a female MBA (hereafter "Social Entrepreneurship MBA") from a "Big Irish Catholic family" that knew how to drink:

> The first time I drank alcohol was, uh, the very first time was as like a… sophomore in high school, on a family trip with my older cousins—in Jamaica. So my first beer was Red Stripe, which means I had really high taste for a week and then realized it was not what most people were drinking. Yeah, and then [I] drank fairly regularly for the remainder of high school…

Her experience demonstrates that family members can help "demystify" alcohol, as trusted individuals with whom children may have developed a longer-term bond provide pathways to involvement. The MBA student went on to drink with her high school friends upon returning to the U.S. She did not initiate her younger siblings into drinking, but worried about her sisters because, like her, they were petite and therefore likelier to start feeling the effects of alcohol after fewer drinks—one sister had gotten in trouble for driving under the influence (DUI). She noticed that her siblings, "even, like, freshman in high school," alluded to underage drinking more openly in front of their parents than she had as a high schooler, and felt that, in light of the DUI and joking manner in which alcohol use was mentioned, "there needs to be a re-imposition of rules" by their parents.

Siblings were also particularly influential for initiation into use. A male JD student (hereafter "Corporate JD") who began sneaking alcohol into school social events with friends in 7th grade and in 8th grade was introduced to marijuana by his older sister while on a family vacation in the Caribbean, where their father was attending a professional conference. On this occasion, after being denied service at the all-inclusive conference hotel, he decided to venture to a local market to buy himself a case of beer. Upon returning to the resort from the beach, he happened upon his sister in a gazebo with some people her age who were impressed with his

---

[80] Currently, he felt that "99 percent" of Americans disapproved of smoking cigarettes, and think that if "'you are a smoker, either you are European or you are drunk' … you are low class."

purchase, and shared their marijuana with him. He returned home from this vacation to learn that his best friend had independently also tried marijuana during the same break, and went on to smoke throughout high school, a bit less in college, and rarely in graduate school. Other students also first experienced marijuana with their siblings, such as the aforementioned Literature PhD who, as a 10th grader, visited his sister at college, smoked with her and a friend, and listened to the "Grateful Dead," but did not smoke again until after senior year of high school. Therefore, after being exposed to a substance by a family member, some students continued to pursue involvement with friends, while others did not become regularly involved until later, if at all.

Aside from alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana, most participants tended not to have used other drugs with family members during high school, with one exception: a female medical student (hereafter "West Coast MD") who used ecstasy, cocaine, and marijuana with cousins she would visit once a year. They were more than ten years older, and one of them was in a band, so they would use and attend concerts. She initially tried mushrooms at age 14 with a boyfriend, ecstasy at age 16 with family, and cocaine shortly thereafter with an older friend she was visiting at college, and then also with family. Exposed to marijuana before birth—her mother smoked marijuana while pregnant—it was also around her as a child, as she recalled "walking into a grow room as a kid" and her parents being worried she would tell others: "Ya gotta worry about kids saying things to the general public you don't want them to know about substance use." That led her parent's friend to get rid of his plants for a while. Her father is a recovering alcoholic who now enjoys growing marijuana for her mother, a musician who also drinks a bottle of wine every night. When she reads magazines her boyfriend—a clinical psychology PhD student who was also interviewed and was present throughout the discussion with his girlfriend—leaves in the bathroom, "I wonder about the effect of using drugs at such a young age." However, it remained an annual occurrence, as cocaine, mushroom, and ecstasy use never entered her high school

group of friends, who instead "got way too stoned" on marijuana.[81] She reported using ecstasy four or five times in her life, the last time six or seven years ago, and did not use cocaine again until her senior year of college, as it was hard to get in that small town. Her cocaine use peaked with friends between college and graduate school, and was generally accompanied by playing "Guitar Hero."

Rather than waiting for family members to offer them a drink or smoke, sometimes children take the initiative to socialize themselves into alcohol or tobacco use by sneaking into a familial "stash." This point is illustrated by the experiences of a student pursuing her PhD in Criminology (hereafter "South Criminology PhD"). She described her first time sharing alcohol and a cigarette with three friends when she was between 8 and 10 years of age. They took one of her father's cigarettes and his gin while at her home, as she describes:

> Yes, it was me (thinks)—it me me, a friend, and another friend. Yeah… well you can bleep that out, it was me, [states first and last names of three female friends]. We were at my place, we had this big entertainment stand, like, for when the grown folks came over, it had liquor galore, and my dad always left his Newports up there. So, I think, as children, it was just like, you know how you play? Just, 'cause it was, ya know, your parents do it… I think, all of our parents—(looks up and to side while trying to think) I know [one girl's] mom smoked, [another girl's] grandmother did—yeah! That's crazy! All of our parents, like, or our parental guardians, they smoked. So ya know, we can play, ya know how people play. And then, I don't remember who was like, "do you have a lighter?," or something. I don't remember who did. But, all of us did it [smoked], damn near choked, it burned like nobody's business. And then I remember us laughing because we didn't know whether to swallow it, or, or—because we wanted to do the nose thing, we wanted to do the tricks that everybody else did, so. I remember it burning like hell. And then I was like, "I'm gonna die," something, like, "I'm gonna die." And it burned out—well, I don't know if it was this—but we was like "it burned my nose." And, that was the same day we, um, I think it was—what was that [called]?—Beefeater? It's Beefeater liquor, like some really old people, like—it was my dad's type. So we had us a little drink back there, we had Ramen noodles, it was Ramen Noodles, our cigarettes, and Beefeater liquor. I remember—I don't remember if that's the name of it, but I'm almost certain, it's in red writing, and it's like a really older man, it's white liquor. Soooo, Ramen Noodles and cigarettes, Beefeater (voice changes back to more confident "feeling cool" mindset she was in at the time, after being unsure about the brand of liquor), we in there, we smoking.

---

[81] A PhD Criminology student remembered feeling "hurt and resentful" after learning from someone else that her best friend in high school had tried cocaine without her, as she thought it meant they thought she was "a square." In high school she also worried that turning down cigarettes and weed because she could not inhale would instead be misconstrued as not being accepting of people who used.

> We all shared that cigarette, we shared that glass of liquor, and we had some Ramen noodles. And my momma came in there and caught us.

The passage conveys how the distant memory was pieced together, and the attempt by the children to emulate what they had all seen adults do, which she realized while telling the story. She went on to elaborate that the Beefeater was selected because it was the only bottle they could reach, they shared a glass that “was way too big,” decided not to use any ice, and that she woke up the next morning feeling sick and went to school. The positive aspects of this first experience included sharing a memory with friends and getting a chance to act like adults, while the negative associations with alcohol and cigarettes included the burning sensation, being caught by her mother (see “Segmented identities”), and the hangover.

By contrast, a student working towards his PhD in Biology tried cigarettes for the first time by himself. He reported that everyone in his family smoked and explained how he developed an aversion after that first experience in his parent’s bedroom:

> I took a cigarette out, and I sort of lit it in my hand, and then I inhaled it once. And the taste, the flavor to me was so disgusting and revolting that that was it—that was as much as I did, I shredded the thing up, I flushed it down the toilet, I couldn’t get the taste out of my mouth. My mom, incidentally—I don’t think she suspected—but she happened to make that night like my favorite dinner that she makes, and I couldn’t taste it. All I could taste was the nicotine, tobacco, and, um, that was it. That was just a negative experience that made me forever averse to cigarette smoking, so I’ve really never done it since.

As he was by himself at the time, his first experience was unique in the sample. Whereas his negative perception was strongly influenced by the taste and inability to enjoy food, the Criminology PhD student had enjoyed the social aspects, if not the physical, before being caught. However, the results for the Biology PhD and the Criminology PhD were the same in the long term: avoiding cigarettes. In hindsight, one MBA student reported that he now felt bad about how he and his friends used to pilfer vodka from their parent’s alcohol collections and replace it with water so as not to have the quantity diminish noticeably, providing another example of negative associations with taking alcohol from parents.

Nevertheless, the experiences of family members can also dissuade some from using drugs, either due to personal observations of drug effects or resultant health and legal problems. One informant dealt with each of these issues in her family. For the precocious South Criminology PhD student, in spite of her early introduction to alcohol and cigarettes in the home, the negative aspects of her first experience with drinking and smoking were reinforced when her father was diagnosed with smoking-related cancer shortly after. Cancer afflicting a loved one dissuaded her and her siblings from cigarettes: "It was like, 'Oh no, it was because of the cigarettes.'" Furthermore, she explained that she chose her field of study "because all of us [in my family], except for my younger siblings, have been in the criminal justice system, me included." Her older sister also had problems with crack cocaine, so the Criminology student had never tried cocaine herself because, after helping to raise her nieces and nephews, she had seen what it could mean for the user and those close to them. Her family members were unable "to dominate" their legal predicaments, and she did not have the "permission to escape" the responsibility of helping to raise her sister's children (McIntosh, 1988: 13-4). Instead, she focused on amassing "earned strength" (McIntosh, 1988: 13) by dedicating herself to academic studies and extracurricular pursuits, i.e., developed skills that would allow her to attain a privileged education. As she did use some drugs, date a dealer who sold a range of drugs for some time (including to professors and high-status customers), and had a non-drug related encounter with the criminal justice system, it was clear she enjoyed altered states of consciousness, could have tried cocaine if she wanted to, and was not immune from social sanction, respectively. However, as a college student, a university employee in the know helped ensure she would pass a drug test required to obtain a job. Therefore, avoiding known pitfalls while working towards educational privileges to improve the self can also create social connections that offer their own advantages, and help those who come from less affluent or impregnable backgrounds overcome attendant disadvantages to attain new status that surpasses those modeled to them.

Others also reported being cautious about drugs that had been problematic for loved ones. The Social Entrepreneurship MBA had two cousins who “have been through extensive rehab,” one involving legal trouble, stemming from one’s use of marijuana and “another host of drugs,” and the other’s abuse of painkillers; it was unclear if either of these cousins were the same “older cousin” who introduced her to marijuana. Knowledge of the potential for abuse with painkillers led to “arguments” with her boyfriend when he took one that was “leftover” from a prescription obtained after a sports-related injury. Similarly, the European Corporate MBA mentioned a cousin who came to New York City in the 1980s, got addicted to heroin, and spent ten years trying to get out of it, devastating the family. He therefore saw heroin as being on a different level, socially exclusive, the domain of “junkies” and “the low-status in society.” A Master’s of Urban Planning student used slightly less strong terminology in stating that smoking cigarettes is “moronic,” disclosing:

> I had two grandparents who died because of cancer because they smoked. … I mean I know that I might not get cancer if I smoke cigarettes, but why risk it? That’s why I think it’s moronic (smiling).

When I asked if she had ever tried cigarettes, she laughed and replied, “I have but I’ve never smoked an entire cigarette, never,” going on to describe her first experience smoking with friends as a fifteen or sixteen year old. Therefore, lessons learned and beliefs instilled at home are put to the test when adolescents come into contact with other influences, such as peers, a topic explored in the next section.

4.2 Adolescent social circles

Different social factors and actors were identified as playing a role in early encounters with substance use. Peers in the same grade at school were most likely compatriots, as youth spend lots of time with their classmates, but older students were also influential. Other relationships that students cited as playing a role in their formative experiences included those forged with intimate partners, at boarding schools, summer camps, and on vacation with family

during the summer, in the neighborhood or with “Townies,” and with friends from work. While some of these opportunities may have involved degrees of peer pressure, others reported denying initial opportunities to partake for a number of reasons, including athletic commitments or, as one JD student put it, because “I told myself I wouldn’t do all the drugs I eventually did.” By contrast, other students purposefully decided to use substances to mark a special occasion, such as completing their Advanced Placement (AP) exams.

There is a relationship between familial indoctrination and use with peers, and the range of opportunities available to children of affluent families, including those provided when parents travel on business or pleasure. The Urban Planning student first smoked cigarettes, and then marijuana, while on trips away from home. First, with cigarettes, after noting that she had tried them in spite of her grandparent’s health problems, she described where use occurred:

> Interviewee: I was at my friend's farm—a lot of kids had farms—and I was just with a few friends and we were out on the lawn and they were smoking (long pause).
>
> Oren: And?
>
> Interviewee: And I tried it and I didn't like it and I didn't really try it again, I guess until maybe I was in college, and it didn't go well then.
>
> Oren: How did you know you didn't like it?
>
> Interviewee: (Laughing) I coughed a lot? (Voice getting progressively higher pitched) And it just made my mouth feel bad? I just didn’t like it. And I just like think I heard my mom in my head being like, (said in her mother’s voice) “that is sooo stupid!” Well, clearly I think I get some of my negativities towards cigarette smoking from my mother.

The aside regarding being on a friend’s farm demonstrates the offhand way that aspects of privilege were conveyed, in this case indicating financial affluence to the extent that they were friends with many youth whose parents owned multiple homes or sizable properties.[82] The voice of her mother, who never drank in her youth, loomed large in spite of the remote setting. She mostly seemed to remember it as a negative experience involving coughing, to the extent that

[82] That is, while no interview questions specifically asked about living accommodations or vacationing, several students mentioned that their families owned seasonal houses, or that they traveled and visited those belonging to relatives or the families of their friends.

she avoided cigarettes for several years. After initially being a bit reluctant to talk about illicit substance use on the record—laughing heartily, she asked "This gets destroyed, right? … it's so embarrassing!"—she revealed: "Um, I have smoked pot in my life, not… a lot, and I actually don't think I've ever really been high." She then spoke about her first experience smoking marijuana as a sixteen year old with five female friends from camp, which also coincided with underage drinking:

> Interviewee: I was in high school, and I went on a camping trip with my best friends from camp, who I like have known since I was ten. And we were all in a cabin by ourselves. And, um, I was *definitely* the least experimental of anyone. I guess, yeah, you would call me the prude. And that was the first time that I tried it… yeah.
>
> Oren: What was it like? What do you remember about it?
>
> Interviewee: I do honestly have a hazy memory, but I do sort of feel like I did feel something. But we were also drinking like, Smirnoff Ice (laughs heartily), which was cool in high school, so I was probably affected. But I didn't have a negative experience, I didn't throw up or anything like that.

Relative to her camp friends, she used a word generally associated with sexuality to describe her status as the girl who had not tried marijuana, perhaps showing that she felt social pressure to finally do so, or had been called such in relation to drugs. In spite of indicating earlier that she was not sure if she had been high—perhaps akin to her pronouncement that she never smoked an entire cigarette—she was unsure if the alcohol or pot had affected her; rather than being a positive experience, it was felt not to be negative, as indicated by lack of vomiting. I asked how they got the alcohol:

> Interviewee: I don't remember. I think maybe one of my friends had her older sister's ID, and I remember we had to drive from a, drive from a dry county to a wet county to get it, because we were in [a state with such laws], but, um, it actually shockingly wasn't an issue for our very very young age.
>
> Oren: How old?
>
> Interviewee: I think we were like 16, so we certainly didn't look 21 I don't think. I mean, maybe I did, I'm pretty tall (laughs). But I didn't have the ID, so.

In thinking back on it, she was surprised by how easy it was for them to obtain alcohol, though it required transporting alcohol across state lines to a "dry" county while underage and carrying

false identification. In addition to providing siblings with IDs, she went on to detail how "in high school people have their older siblings buy it for them, or some parents are willing to buy it for their kids." Meanwhile, the absence of parents also provided such opportunities, as noted by a Master's student in Criminal Justice who received her first beer from an older sister in 7th grade:

> My parents were out of town, she was having a party, and… just, I guess, I thought I was cool or something and like I got her to give me a beer.

These issues relate to the overlap between family and adolescent experiences with substance use, and the private spaces parental homes provide for alcohol and perhaps drug consumption.

Family can also have an indirect role in first experiences with adolescent substance use, as exemplified in the account of a medical school student (hereafter "East Coast MD") who first used marijuana at the end of 7th grade with his school friend. Noting that he smoked pot before he had his "first real drink of alcohol," he explained how he felt reassured in smoking marijuana with "Tony" after learning that Tony's parents also did so on occasion:

> I think at the time I had, I had known some, even, even friends of mine whose parents had, ya know, smoked marijuana, and they held respectable jobs, and made good money, and were, ya know, good, good people. I, ya know, I guess, I guess you sort of, I guess it was, it was a less informative more rationalization based on the information that I had at my disposal. So it was sort of, ya know, "if Tony's parents smoke marijuana, and Tony's dad is an accountant and his mother is a nurse," ya know, obviously it's not doing, not affecting their daily lives and how they function—uh, I certainly don't know their home life as well because I don't live in the house, but [it] gives you a-a, a way to sort of rationalize use.

The excerpt conveys how the ability of parents to use drugs while pursuing professions may influence savvy children who take note of adult use and are particularly attuned to issues of status. It was unclear if the same rationalization was in play at the time, or emerged in retelling the story in the context of an interview about substance use among professional students, as several students in the sample only realized in retrospect that parental figures in their lives had smoked weed during their childhoods. The interviewee still kept in touch with Tony, indicating he worked for a private equity firm in New York City at the time of the interview.

In addition to reporting first experiences with same-age peers, some were introduced by older influences. These included boyfriends and girlfriends, those they became friends with during annual family vacations to the summer house, and co-workers. One male Ivy League JD student (hereafter "Criminal JD") first smoked as a 10th grader. He knew his older brother smoked, but:

> He never really invited me to participate or offered me any. You know, he let me drink beer a few times when I visited him at college, and, uh, I think he would go to a different room to smoke sometimes but I was kind of already overwhelmed by drinking and being at a party so I didn't really know what was going on.

Though he attended a college house party before doing so with fellow high schoolers, he got the sense that his brother did not want to be the one to introduce him to marijuana. Similarly, several participants who had younger siblings noted they had purposefully not introduced them to drugs, though a few had created pathways, and most reported using together after learning their younger siblings had also independently started to use, which was true for the Ivy League JD and his brother. After turning down initial opportunities to try marijuana—which he noted was influenced in part by his brother not offering him any in the sense that he wondered why his brother did not want him to smoke—he did so for the first time with his girlfriend, who was a grade ahead of him at the same private school. She took out a box from underneath the bed they were sitting on that contained a wooden pipe and some marijuana; they smoked, coughed, had sex, and then she drove him home. By contrast, the South Criminology PhD who first tried Beefeater gin before becoming a teenager dated an older man who did not attend her school and dealt drugs. One day, in 9th grade, she asked him: "hey, let me do it, one time," referring to marijuana. Impersonating his mumbling, she said he replied: "You don't know what you doing, you can't do this." "One time," she insisted. Similar to her experience with the gin, where she could picture the man on the bottle, she recalled how he prepared a blunt:

> It was… the brand with the red and white box (note: "Phillies Blunt"), not any of these spectacular flavors they have now. I remember him, like… this 10 minute process that, as time went on it turned into a 2-minute process because he was doing it that slow for me. But, he got the razor, he slit the cigar open, emptied up all that stuff, ya know, placed the

> weed in, licked it, rolled that thang up, lit it, ready. I mean, he was like, (mumbling voice) "you pull-pull it, then you release." Talking about, (mumbling voice) "when you swallow, don't take too much in. Take in a small amount, let it go." And then the rule was, "you pull on it twice, and if you're smokin' with somebody, you," you know, "you pass it on." The idea of puff puff pass. Like, "no, you will get beat up if you don't follow the rules because there's only so much weed to go around." And then, as time went on, you know, you learn how to do that thang yourself; I'm rolling them for him and things of that nature.

Here, rather than the older significant other offering drugs, she asked to become involved, at which point he obliged, and took the time to teach her step-by-step until, eventually, she could do it herself. Both she and the Criminal JD had been around drugs before, but decided to use them in one-on-one situations with sexual partners. Whereas his relationship soon ended, she stayed with her boyfriend through high school graduation, when he first provided her with "boomkies"—a crushed up ecstasy pill rolled in a marijuana joint—her only experience with drugs other than marijuana. Similarly, the JD student reported never using anything other than marijuana and alcohol, but for different reasons: political aspirations.

Relationships established working after school jobs (e.g., in the service industry) and over the summer provided additional opportunities to try alcohol and drugs. A male MBA student (hereafter "Management Consultant MBA") who grew up on the East Coast was twelve when he first drank with friends who were from six months to four years older, though it was not his first opportunity to do so, as they had been drinking around him for a few summers: "the environment was one where alcohol was sort of easy to get." He did not recall planning to drink that summer or evening, and noted, "I'm not one, really, for peer pressure, but that may have played a role." He explained how he distinguished alcohol from other drugs:

> I hadn't—a lot of things related to substances I feel like I tend to make a conscious choice of "that's something I want to do," or "that's something I don't want to do." Or, at the very least I'd make a decision if it's, it's something I do not want to do, and alcohol was not one of those things where I had said "I do not want to do it." Um, so I started then, and then sort of, probably, sort of naturally progressed over the next couple of years drinking with that circle of friends more frequently and with my school friends more frequently.

Therefore, he had thought about these substances previously and developed internal narratives that distinguished alcohol from other drugs. Distinctions were not only based on which were legal

or illegal, as at the time of the interview he had yet to ever use tobacco, though it was well into college before he experimented with marijuana—in a city where it was legal to do so (see "Waiting until college or graduate school"). While summer drinking in a walkable beach community with older students who represented a range of schools, social circles, and experiences provided the pathway, there was soon spillage into use with friends during the other nine months of the year. This occurred, most commonly, in "small-group settings, like a couple of people at someone's house, or a full-blown house party with 50 to 75 people," but also included "a decent amount of drinking in the woods, or drinking outside." The Social Entrepreneurship MBA described such an outdoor venue:

> So in our high school we had a field where people would drink on weekends, someone always hosted a keg. So it was mostly weekend drinking, either at this venue or people with less-vigilant parents' basements, things like that.

Though she noted that the "cops broke it up every weekend," these outdoor socials did not lead to legal trouble. Many students expressed that drinking and driving was an issue among their high school friends, though others noted that parents who provided basements did so on the condition that nobody drove—a way of providing a safe space for the inevitable. For the Management Consultant MBA, "driving was always sort of like a convenient excuse not to drink in large amounts," and he explained that, on most occasions, he essentially served as a designated driver after not drinking or having only one or two drinks.

For youth, being employed is thought to demonstrate maturity and help in developing a sense of responsibility. It can also provide access to drugs and the money needed to buy them. A Criminology PhD student who grew up in the Midwest first tried marijuana in her mid-teens when, after a night of earning good tips, her 20-something-year-old coworker invited all the waitresses over to celebrate. Compared to the MBA student's resolve not to try certain drugs, the Midwestern Criminology PhD student did not "remember thinking it was super bad. Maybe neutral? I don't remember having an opinion one way or another." As for the experience itself, she could also not recall how they had smoked—"They showed me what to do, I'm sure that they

did… they were my friends, they invited me"—but did have a recollection of her host informing them that some opium had been "sprinkled" on the marijuana, and eventually driving home:

> I do remember everything being funny, I just remember everything being funny—it sounds stereotypical—but everything on the radio sounded funny and everything, just, like things sounded different, it just sounded clearer, everything sounded super clear.

She had waited for an hour before driving "like two minutes down the street," as her girlfriends told her "you can drive after you do it" and she had a curfew to make. Though she arrived home safely, she had an accident soon thereafter:

> My mom and step-dad were already asleep. And it was Christmas time, and so we had this (chuckles to self)—my mom used to have like this glass, like, end table or whatever that she kept in front of the window, but because it was Christmas time the Christmas tree was there, so this glass end table was like in front of my bedroom. And it, I walked into it, and I knocked a glass lamp like over the bannister, and it shattered, and it, my mom woke up. And I was like, "shit," because I knew if my mom walked out and saw me, like, it would be over, like it would be a dead giveaway, 'cause I just knew that I was like, I just knew that I looked high, so, um. She got up, and I was like, "it's okaaay!"—well, I'm naturally klutzy anyway, so—when she got up I was like, "oh, no worries, it's ok, I just walked into the table," so its very believable because that's something I would do regardless [of being drunk or high]. So I went downstairs and picked up the lamp and cleaned up all the glass and I went to bed. And the worst thing is-is that I woke up the next morning and had like a huge gash in my hand and I had no idea I didn't even feel it. So it was just like, "oh, I'm not doing that again," like once I realized I was actually really hurt, I was like "I don't want to do that anymore, I can't believe I really hurt myself and I was so high that I didn't even know that I hurt myself." So…

That she was able to construct such a detailed memory of almost getting into trouble, but not the interactions associated with the drug use, suggests the importance of particular people and places for drug-related stories and experiences. Namely, she was able to regain focus in her altered state of consciousness enough to leverage her clumsiness and avoid direct contact with a potential source of social control (see "Segmented identities"), though she did not notice her wound; this was likely due in part to the opium's pain-relieving effects. She then avoided drugs for some time, at least "til the next time somebody offered," but then changed high schools. With the associated adjustment to a new setting and social group, she did not know anyone else who used marijuana, and did not seek it out. She did not use marijuana again until after college—though she did drink heavily during her undergraduate years (see "Involuntary Disclosure/Losing

Control")—and this was also attributed to lack of access, ironically discovering later that her uncles had been smoking in close proximity the entire time she was "dry." There are some similarities and differences between the Midwestern Criminology PhD and the Management Consultant MBA. They both started using drugs and alcohol, respectively, with older friends outside their social circles, and then had periods of time without illicit drug use. Yet one social circle was more clearly associated with affluence and leisure time (Veblen, 1994/1899), and the other with physical work and celebrating achievement. Their stories also highlight the different approaches to driving under the influence. At the time of the interview, while the Management Consultant MBA had smoked marijuana fewer than a dozen times in his life, she and her boyfriend shared half an ounce of marijuana each month.

Relative to lack of familiarity with other forms of drug ingestion (e.g., injecting, snorting), those who had experience smoking cigarettes felt better prepared to do the same with marijuana when the opportunity presented itself. These differences are illustrated in the accounts of a medical school student, "South MD," who described her first time trying marijuana, and then cocaine, and whose approach to substance use is noteworthy given her decision to pursue the experiential education generally offered in medical schools, where students are encouraged to "See one, do one, teach one":

> I was in a car with a few of my friends in high school, like, and then someone had rolled a joint or whatever and asked me if I wanted to smoke it. So I was like, "suuure," and I had smoked a few cigarettes before, so I kind of… that process didn't really scare me as much, like how to physically do it.

With marijuana use, she could apply a skill from an old endeavor to this new pursuit, and her familiarity with the process of smoking made trying marijuana when it was offered less intimidating. She was not worried, and felt she knew how to do it correctly. She continued to smoke throughout college and graduate school, though "I still to this day can't roll a joint," highlighting different levels of expertise and immersion in the doing of drugs. She did, however,

learn to experience marijuana as enjoyable (Becker, 1953), and towards the end of the interview she smoked. I asked her to describe what she was doing:

> So, I light it, I breathe in the smoke, I hold it in. I have to, you have to inhale, first of all, you can't just hold it in your mouth. So you inhale, you hold it in for a few seconds, and you exhale. And, to me, the taste is very pleasant. Um, it doesn't, ya know, it takes a few times for me to actually feel the effects, like, the sedation, supposedly. I find I'm just more relaxed. To feel the sedation, the relaxing feeling for me; to feel smiling, and happy, to find things more humorous. My eyes start getting really really red and squinty. Um, but it feels good when I exhale, maybe not… the first time it's fine, because I know what's coming later I think. I know the feeling that's gonna come later, is what is so appealing to me about the smoking, I think. The physical smoking itself is enjoyable, more enjoyable with friends, because you pass it around, and everyone jokes, and whatever. But yeah, it's very enjoyable. It gives me a sense of being at peace.

These two excerpts show her journey from marijuana novice who felt prepared to try it because she had smoked cigarettes, to one who has learned to enjoy marijuana. Benefits included the physical process of smoking, associated feelings of sedation and happiness, the social aspect and likelihood of laughing, and knowing that, if patient, it could help to achieve desirable effects. Negative aspects included red and squinty eyes, and slight discomfort in the throat while exhaling, which the medical student tried to avoid by using water pipes or vaporizers—two "healthier" options—when possible. Later, before trying cocaine for the first time in public while in college, as she had never snorted anything before, she practiced sniffing it in private by first crushing up a prescription painkiller.[83] Other students expressed similar reservations about how to perform this unique physical maneuver before realizing it was not very difficult, some felt confident after seeing it done in movies, and a few, to the chagrin of their facilitators, erroneously exhaled, sending the powder onto the bathroom floor.

Rather than the physical process of ingestion linking different forms of use, friends can

---

[83] This passage describes how South MD prepared to try cocaine:

> … junior year, second semester of college. … I don't know what, what changed my mind, but all of a sudden I was like, "ok, I wanna try it." But I was scared of actually physically like doing it. Like, the actual doing was scary to me. So I decided to practice first by like crushing up a pill, I don't remember what it was, it was some kind of a pain pill. And I remember learning. I was like more afraid of how to physically rather than the effects of it,

serve as conduits between pursuits. A law school student (hereafter "Civil JD") who also tried cigarettes prior to marijuana did not make reference to the similar processes involved, but rather noted that his initial encounters with each occurred with the same friend from grade school, and predated "drinking to get drunk." On both occasions, they were at his friend's house. To him it made sense that he would bridge new social experiences with friends from academic settings, as "the two will always go together because you make friends at school… it's like, you can't help going out with your coworkers." I asked "So how did you first become involved in the use of cigarettes?"

> Hoo, uh, I was pretty young and pretty curious. Ya know, you watch movies and you look at music videos and you think it's cool. And, ya know, I thought it was cool. And because I was never raised, like I said, I was never in a really austere domineering environment. Both at home and at school, I didn't think I'd get in a lot of trouble. So, I think I bought cigarettes maybe when I was in 6th grade. Or had someone buy them for me, ya know? So we would smoke… 6th, 7th, 8th grade, that kind of thing. And, obviously, as you push your envelope in one direction generally you push it in other directions too.

He wanted to discover what made smoking so cool, and was undeterred by potential blowback in his middle-class home from his parents—a writer and a curator—or at his private school, let alone at his friend's house. Furthermore, both he and his friend had influential older siblings. Cigarettes sustained him for a few years, but in 8th grade he and his good friend—"we're still good friends"—decided to try marijuana together.

> I can remember getting really stoned. It was like a big plan, obviously. We went out, bought a bunch of Snickers ice cream bars, and like Dr. Pepper and shit. And had the munchies, like people get. And, uh, I remember being really paranoid—I remember being really paranoid all the time when I would smoke weed, but I was especially paranoid that first time—and, uh, it was fun. It was fun enough that I became a pothead… who smoked weed every day for six to eight years.

Whereas movies and music videos had introduced them to cigarette smoking, they became more enjoyable to watch while stoned, and the first few times getting high "you think food tastes great, music sounds nicer, it was great." To describe what it was like to get high, he paraphrased a viral

---

> which I thought—now looking back on it is interesting. So once I was able to do it, which it's not really that hard, I was like, "ok, I think I'd like to try cocaine."

YouTube video, *David After Dentist* (Booba1234, 2009),[84] of a 7-year-old child filmed in the back seat of his car after a dental procedure to remove a tooth that involved an anesthetic: "'is this real?' Like, 'is the timing right, when is this gonna end?' 'This stuff is crazy,' because there's that little bit of a delay when you're high, so, it was just—it was pretty weird, it was fun."

Soon after, they continued "always gunning for the next thing," which involved both "drinking to get drunk"—consuming "two 40s" of malt liquor (eighty fluid ounces)—and socializing with older classes: "As freshman, we wanted to hang out with sophomores. As sophomores, with juniors, as juniors, with seniors." While other participants had indicated that, when it came to substance use, there were "good" classes and "bad" classes at their school—in the sense that some entire grades contained few students who used drugs, while others had many—here the law school student noted that "Booze was a common thread between boys girls short tall black white" and, apparently, older and younger students. There were several options for procuring alcohol when underage: siblings, stores frequented only because they did not ask for ID, older students who were likelier to have fake IDs, and eventually, fake IDs, which generally cost $100 and could be purchased at several stores in the city.[85] While he first tried cocaine as a senior in high school, and "continue[d] to struggle with alcohol," he felt "lucky" that he never got into "harder drugs"; based on his history, such drugs might include opiates, crack, acid, or methamphetamines.

Friends from the neighborhood also influenced the influx of substance use into some social circles, and living within walking distance made it easier to socialize after school or when parents were out of town. The student working towards her Master's in Criminal Justice drank her first beer in seventh grade at a house party thrown by her sister when their parents were out

---

[84] As of May 15, 2015, the original video uploaded in early 2009 had been viewed 129,184,708 times (See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=txqiwrbYGrs).

[85] One student avoided this cost by taking her older sister's birth certificate and social security card and getting a State ID that said she was 21 with her picture and her sister's name. The primary motivation was not to drink, but to be able to hang out with older gay friends who liked to go to clubs.

of town. The following year she began drinking and smoking marijuana with peers when guys in her grade, and in turn she, became involved in obtaining and consuming alcohol with friends who lived in the neighborhood:

> When I was in eighth grade some of the guys in my grade, they had like older neighbor friends, and they had started drinking and smoking pot. And then maybe a year later they tried to get me and some of my girlfriends, and then we started doing it with them… Well they were our age, but they started doing it because of like their neighbor friends, and brothers and stuff...

In her experience, first male peers learned from older youths, and then attempted to recruit females. Yet her first time drinking with peers came about after she went with female friends to procure booze:

> My friend's parents were out of town and so me and some of the other girls went and got a [random] guy to buy us alcohol at the liquor store, and then we walked to [our friend's] house and we got drunk there… We just like laid around his house and listened to music, nothing special happened.

This suggests that perhaps the young women were also recruited for their ability to help get alcohol. Confused by this discrepancy and about who was purchasing the beer, we had the following clarifying exchange:

> Oren: How was he able, was—I'm assuming he [your friend] was underage as well?
>
> Interviewee: Yeah.
>
> Oren: How was he [your friend] able to get alcohol?
>
> Interviewee: Well, (said triumphantly and with emphasis) WE did it. Like, we used to go to this liquor store and just like wait until we saw a guy who looked like he might buy us beer, and then we'd go ask him.
>
> Oren: Ohhh, so this is just like a random person.
>
> Interviewee: Mm-hmm.
>
> Oren: Oh nice (i.e., different story than anticipated). And how did you, how did you approach him?
>
> Interviewee: We'd be like, "can you do us a favor?" And usually they'd immediately know what we were trying to ask them.

Though she did not remember how she knew what to say that first time, it worked, and asking men to buy them beer continued to be a successful strategy. Other students reported similar experiences. A female JD (hereafter "Non-profit JD") noted:

> And then junior year, some point, I don't know. Obviously we found a liquor store that sold to minors and a friend whose parents were gone a lot, and so we started drinking. I mean on the weekends, not always.

This statement highlights the nexus between access and a suitable drinking location. When I asked the Master's student if she "remember[ed] ever being afraid" that the practice of recruiting strangers to help them buy alcohol "might get [her] in trouble," she replied:

> Yeah that was definitely always a thing, because it was in our neighborhood, so obviously our parents easily, one of neighbors easily could have seen us. But, I don't know, it never happened. Or the police (she laughs) could have seen us. But I don't know, it never happened.

Again, the potential risk did not deter them from trying, and they never got caught, reinforcing that such "open-air" deals could be conducted in their community with seemingly little scrutiny. There are several points of contrast with the example of the Civil JD student described earlier. Whereas the Civil JD lived in an urban setting, the Master's in Criminal Justice grew up in a more rural environment. Therefore, the JD had more potential stores to go to, and also older siblings and students who he relied on as a novice before obtaining fake credentials, whereas her sisters had already gone to college. Meanwhile, she provided for herself and others after purchasing from a store within walking distance by asking male strangers to buy her beer. There was also a culture of drunk driving among him and his friends, whereas she would sleep over at friends houses, or walk home. Neighborhood influences also played a role in initiation into substance use. For example, the Non-profit JD who drank with her private high school friends on weekends was first exposed to marijuana through "the 'Townies.' You know, the 'Townies' have the pot. So we started smoking."

Several students initially denied their friend's advances when it came to marijuana or alcohol, including the Master's in Criminal Justice student. She recalled that "He had been talking

about it for a while, like, trying to get us to do it, and one day we just did…”—but not what made her decide to try it on that particular day. They had used a “pen hitter”:

> It’s [one of] those Bic pens that have the metal top on them, and you take everything out of it, and you take the bottom off and all the mechanics and the ink. And then you take the top off, and you melt the part where the tops at, and then you stick the metal part in it. So then you put the weed in that metal part and smoke out the bottom where that clicky part would be.

Though she had not smoked cigarettes at the time, she started to shortly after, and was in the process of trying to quit at the time of the interview. One MBA student who grew up on the West Coast (hereafter “West Coast MBA”) did not drink until his senior year of high school or smoke marijuana until sophomore year of college (see next section, “Waiting until college or graduate school”). The son of physicians, he described himself as “extremely focused as a kid… (3 sec pause) which probably led to my pendulum swinging in the other direction” eventually (see “Involuntary disclosure”); he felt his trajectory was a bit backwards, as usually children are more carefree before becoming more serious. Growing up he was a very serious soccer player who tried out for and made a European club, living there with a host family for several months as a teenager. Even after returning to the states, everything revolved around soccer: “sometimes at a [high school] party [where my friends were drinking], [I’d] just do push-ups or something, ya know, something kind of extremely disciplined.” He described his first drink:

> It was just like a beach, it was chill, it was like [an affluent seaside town akin to East Hampton, West Palm Beach, or Malibu] (he lets out a high-pitched giggle). Uh, there was hard stuff, and we were just taking shots, I took like, probably, a baby shot. I was very timid. Alcohol has never been a big thing for me.

Akin to the student who referred to herself as a “prude,” he had no qualms about portraying himself as shy about drugs. I asked if he remembered why he wanted to try that particular time:

> (High-pitched) Yeaaaah, it was probably like, ya know, I mean obviously there’s some of the social pressure. It’s prolly also about time in some sense, there’s—I think the majority of people in my situation had already tried alcohol and I was late to that. Yeah, it seemed kind of like, an envy, or, I, it seemed semi-comfortable, [I] didn’t—there wasn’t a peer pressure, ya know, per se, it was kind of like, people doing it.

Without indicating that pressure had been directly applied on that first occasion, he felt most all of his friends had already started drinking "probably a year or two earlier," though he was not really sure. He went on to use a range of substances in college, including cocaine, opium, mushrooms, and Adderall, before stopping regular use three months before a drug test for a new job. By contrast, another student who did not drink until his senior year of high school remembered that he planned to have his initiation coincide with celebrating the completion of his last AP exam; this involved an impassioned speech to his friends before drinking a can of Red Dog beer.

4.3 Waiting until college or graduate school

Some students in the sample who did not experiment with alcohol or marijuana before college decided to during their undergraduate years, and a few had graduated from college already at the time when they used their first drug. This section focuses on the experiences of those who were introduced to alcohol or tried their first illicit drug during or after college. For those who began drinking or tried their first drug before college, their pathways to involvement with *additional* illicit drugs during initial years away from home (i.e., college) and afterwards are integrated in subsequent chapters.

Only one participant—the PhD Biology student who took a drag from a cigarette in his parent's bedroom (see "Family contexts")—had not tried alcohol recreationally or with family before attending college. In his second semester of college, at a party "with people I trusted—my roommate—I drank beer and got tipsy, and enjoyed myself." He continued drinking socially in college, twice a week at most, including binge drinking and hard liquor. "I didn't know my limits" the second or third time drinking, which is when he recalled taking his first shot of liquor—"a bizarre experience for me at the time." He elaborated:

> I didn't know what it was going to be like. Just, I would see people drink, you know, this liquid, and then they would grimace—you know, you know that response? And I was like, "what is it? what?" It's just liquid, ya know, it's just this drink that, you know, is supposed

> to be palatable and potable. Um, so the first shot I ever took was Absolute Citron, and I was with some friends, and I drank and then I understood exactly where that face comes from, because I made it. Um, and, I, I don't care for liquor all that much either, but as the night continued there was just more of that. And so, I, that was my first experience with being, ya know, full-on what I would call drunk, actually intoxicated.

Observing people taking shots was not as useful as experiencing it himself for understanding what generated the physical reaction, reinforcing that he had never so much as taken a sip up to that point. Switching tenses, he seemingly comments on his own story to indicate that he presently does not care for liquor, perhaps "projecting" this sentiment in light of being asked to reflect on his initial foray and other episodes of getting "blackout drunk," including one that involved getting caught by an ex-girlfriend while peeing on their sofa. On this first occasion of getting drunk, one shot turned into several:

> I… there are portions of the night that I didn't remember, and of course still don't. I do remember the end of the night when I was, ya know, puking, and, ya know, flailing, and being a belligerent drunken idiot. It was, uh, just something I had never experienced before, and as such there was that novelty factor to it that made it appealing.

The social interactions associated with drinking were not as memorable as the end result. Despite the negative aspects conveyed in the statement, it became a semi-regular "exercise for a Friday night party" that he "basically maintained … throughout college":

> … one to two occasions per month, maybe more, where I would say I was drunk, and maybe one occasion per month when I was… when I had difficulty remembering things that happened when I was intoxicated. So, frequently enough.

These patterns eventually changed in graduate school (see "Professional socialization and drug use"). Later in the interview, the Biology student was "frank" about his "interesting family history," providing further context regarding his decision to abstain from alcohol until college. He had attended a religious high school, and had a circle of devout friends who engaged in bible study rather than experimenting with alcohol or drugs. As a child he observed that his father was a "completely non-functional" "alcoholic" whose "abuse *severely* impacted his ability to work and, um, to maintain a family." Then, as an adult, he realized that his mother had "smoked weed all the time" during his adolescence; though his younger sister and mother smoked together, he had

never broached the topic with either parent. These experiences induced a sense of cautiousness about ingesting substances and hence account for delayed involvement.

Some participants in the sample did not try marijuana, or any other drugs, until college, including three MBA students, a female student in a 2-year Master's in Communication program, and a male student working towards a PhD in Neuroscience who all attended Ivy League undergraduate institutions. The Neuroscience PhD student recalled first trying marijuana in the fall of his freshman year with a friend from a performing arts group. After a long night that involved manual labor preparing for a party and concert—including building a stage for a band to perform on, carrying kegs, working security to restrict access, and interacting with the campus police—and before breaking down the stage and cleaning up, a friend produced a joint from his pocket and suggested they smoke it. As it was around three in the morning, and he was "curious and exhausted" and unable to drink anymore, he was willing to try, but first informed his friend that he had never smoked:

> I was like, "I've never smoked before." He was like: "don't worry about it." … He told me, he told me, uh, you know: "Puff gently, don't suck on it really hard," he said. Uh, and then [he said] "inhale into your lungs and hold it, hold it there"—so he was giving me advice, practical advice, on how to do it.

With this guidance, he took a hit or two: "enough for a naïve, novice smoker" to feel "different from normal"—he "definitely got high" and had an "aha moment" where he felt, "this is cool." As he had never smoked cigarettes, the "new physical sensations" were most memorable; he was amazed that he "could feel my throat was damaged, was burnt," though it did not feel painful. While others in the sample also reported this burning sensation when first encountering cigarettes or marijuana, the Master's in Communication did not, and this was perhaps due to her method of ingestion. Having never smoked cigarettes, she decided to first try smoking marijuana at the end of her freshman year with a group of friends who all smoked regularly and knew it was her first time—"I'm a very vocal person," and had already had "a few drinks." To help facilitate her indoctrination, they gave her "shotguns," which involved her friends putting the burning side

of a joint in their mouths, at which point she put her mouth up close to theirs, and then the experienced smoker and initiate would simultaneously exhale and inhale, respectively. This process took a few seconds, and was repeated with several friends; though perhaps the method moderated the damage to her throat, she ended up vomiting that night, but began to use periodically thereafter and eventually more regularly. Meanwhile, the PhD's use "sort of snowballed from there" as well, and he contrasted this early experience to later awareness of the potential for more of an "introspective" "head high" that could help "explore inner mental space." The First Semester JD student also distinguished between a "mental" high, where he might enjoy discussing intellectual topics or participating in a research interview about drugs, and a "body" high, which usually involved a sofa and television.

The West Coast MBA student who played soccer in Europe and took his first "baby shot[s]" as a senior in high school recalled smoking marijuana in the fall of his sophomore year, again highlighting the physical aspect of early intoxication:

> I mean, god, (said under breath) I can't even remember if I remember the first time (5 second pause). I don't remember the first time… probably too much pot (4 second pause). I remember one of the first times. I was in my room, and I was eating olives, and they were tasting so good. I was like, rubbing them against my tongue (he laughs loudly). And, uh, yeah, it was just awesome.

Though here he alluded to his future involvement as a rationale for his inability to access his memory of the first occasion, throughout the interview this informant used silence to collect his thoughts. Yet he seemed bothered by this perhaps momentary lapse, a sentiment expressed by other students who could not recall their first time when asked: "it is funny," commented the female Non-Profit Ivy League law school student, "because I feel like this is something people remember." Enjoyment with the taste of food—and physical activities more generally, including masturbation—was commonly cited by many as a highlight of their early and continuing use of marijuana. For example, the First Semester JD student, when asked how he would describe being high to someone who had never experienced it, replied "Never-ending hunger," before

comparing perceptions of being high to those of different colors in that when two people say they see “blue,” that does not necessarily mean they perceive it the same way.

The Social Entrepreneurship MBA student who first drank with her cousin in the Caribbean played varsity sports throughout high school and while attending an Ivy League college, and therefore did not smoke marijuana until her senior year after her season had ended. Her first time using drugs was also outside of the U.S., highlighting the relevance of physical place and the financial privilege necessary to travel abroad. She did not really have a “philosophical reason not to [smoke marijuana],” and realized her parents—a successful large business owner and a physical therapist—smoked marijuana long before trying it herself:

> I think I actually knew before even I um, uh, had experimented with anything that my parents had [used drugs] [while I was] in high school—I think there was a phase where my dad was like a more heavy marijuana user, and my mom like, periodically; and they both smoked cigarettes, less so as we were around, but when they were younger.

However, she worried about periodic drug testing “before a tournament, or things like that, and I didn’t want to deal with any [associated] implications [of testing positive],” so instead drank with her teammates, who provided social support and looked out for one another when going out. Therefore, she smoked marijuana for the first time on spring break after her varsity career ended:

> We were on a boat, and I-I think I had been wanting to try it, and some of my guy friends used, so that was like their activity for the day. … I think I thought I’d get high instantaneously, and I was not able to and I was really frustrated by it. So I kept trying throughout the day, like sixteen times, and just not getting high. And I don’t know if it’s because I'm bad at inhaling or not. I think I’d always found out that when I was smoking cigarettes too I wouldn't really cough when I took a drag because I think I was just not inhaling correctly. So mostly it was poor, poor form.

As an athlete accustomed to getting the desired response from a tool (e.g., her body, equipment), her initial assessment of the failure to get high related to the process and her inability to inhale. Essentially, she was not activating the right muscles. During her numerous “repetitions” (my turn of phrase, not hers):

> people would be like coaching me through it but I was so just not great at the lung action I guess. Now, it was a group of friends I was fairly close with, so I felt people were having fun with it, I wasn't feeling pressured to continue going, it was more like, “let’s see if she can actually inhale this” kind of thing, yeah.

Again, the athletic terminology—“coaching”—also works with initiation into drug use, but she was unable to achieve the desired result, though not for lack of effort. Perhaps anticipating perceptions of peer pressure and “hazing,” she was quick to note that was not the case. Her marijuana use increased thereafter, and she continued to have ongoing problems when trying to smoke that she reasoned were “a breathing problem or mental thing; I don't know but it doesn't always have the intended impact.”

The Management Consultant MBA student, by contrast, did not have any such trouble getting high on his first attempt. This occurred when he was 21 while on a trip with Ivy League college friends that included a stop in a European city famous for its marijuana. He worried about not knowing how to smoke, as he had never tried cigarettes:

> I think I was a little nervous about it, um, just because I had never done it. I was using it for the first time with a bunch of people who are, who are pretty experienced with it. Um, so I think there was a certain nervousness that I would look stupid, do it wrong, what have you, but, um. I was pretty open with them about the fact that it was my first time and, so, it went fine.

Like the female MBA (who happened to attend the same institution), both of their first experiences were outside of the U.S. However, whereas she had previously taken drags off of friend’s cigarettes, and felt her colleagues were trying to help rather than pressure, he was a bit uneasy and unfamiliar with how to smoke, and equated the fact that his friends were more experienced with the potential for ridicule. Contrary to his expectations, he did not report such judgment after smoking:

> We were in what’s known as a coffee shop, um. And we were… um, (said to self) what the heck were we smoking out of? I think we were smoking out of… a “bowl?” Is that what it’s known as? I don’t even know. I’ll call it a “bowl.” I mean, that’s what—ya know, it was some sort of pipe-like contraption. Um, and, ya know, I think there was a lot of coughing, um… and I think I didn’t, ya know, I had a hard time understanding what exactly I was doing at the time, but I did feel like I felt the effects of it the first time I used it and then the subsequent 5, 6, whatever times it was after that.

Though he was able to use them to achieve the desired effects, the excerpt clearly illustrates his lack of familiarity with the tools of the trade. He searched for the word “bowl” as if it was foreign,

without the confidence displayed earlier in enumerating his professional ambitions, reasons for enrolling in his graduate program, and his criticisms of its curriculum and social interactions. Overall, he enjoyed the drug effects, and felt “there was something nice” about having finally partaken in a social activity that so many of his friends had experienced. While not prepared to rule out using marijuana again in the future, he did not continue seeking out the “lethargic and lazy” feeling on a regular basis.

A pair of PhD students who eventually attended the same Ivy League graduate institution made it through college without trying marijuana, the only students in the sample to do so. One, the Biology PhD student who first drank in college, was likely in the same social or user network as the second “Late Bloomer,” a woman pursuing a PhD in Neuroscience who grew up in Asia and did not attend college in the U.S. She had taken a few shots of alcohol while at boarding school before trying cigarettes, which she continued to use off and on since age 17, but did not get intoxicated until attending college, where she spent a good part of her first three years “embarrassingly drunk” before saying to herself, "ok, now I'm going to pull up my socks and take care of things" as a senior. As an example, during her first week at college she recalled getting so “hammered” that she could not take a test the next day, instead leaving a blank page on her desk and spending the period sleeping in the bathroom. Though her first experience with marijuana occurred after arriving in the U.S. to attend a Master’s program, it was not the first illicit drug she tried, as she initially shared a suburban flat and spent most of her time with a friend from home; it was not until moving into a nearby city in her second semester that she first encountered marijuana. In the interim, she had returned home during the holiday break to find that her friends from boarding school and college had begun to use cocaine and ecstasy; “this is what their party scene had turned into, even in a house party doing cocaine and such.” Activities pursued with friends in college, when they drank 3-4 times a week and danced to trance and techno music until six in the morning, were now augmented by drugs taken at raves or music festivals:

> It was fantastic… the first time I had it, um, and it was really the best time, it was in a capsule with just—a clear capsule with the crystals in it. So it was really just pure MDMA, it wasn't cut with anything. … so the first time I took, it was the first time actually—I took MDMA and cocaine for the first time on the same day. Um, it was around New Years, I was going to a music festival, and somebody had brought MDMA. And I remember I had no idea—of course, you know, it's happiness in a pill and people tell you "you're going to be ecstatic," but then you never know, right?—there's always that sort of, "well, what's it going to be like?"

The Neuroscience student's statement included an oft-heard refrain regarding ecstasy and another reflecting her ongoing curiosity with altered states of consciousness that led her to take these drugs, and later marijuana, at the very first opportunity presented. Seemingly making up for lost time, her decision to start off with polysubstance use was unique for the sample, as was her "skipping over" marijuana as a "gateway" to illicit drug use, as all other participants who used multiple illicit drugs started with marijuana due to access and perception. In relaying how events unfolded, she took the MDMA before leaving for the festival, and the cocaine at the venue:

> I remember taking it, we took it in the house before we were going to go for this music festival because (clears throat), it, you know, it—different people take different time for it to set in, but then they were like, "oh, it'll take a while to set in." And I remember going—I took it and we got into the car, and we drove down this really sort of it was hot and dusty, this crowded road and we had to get off and like navigate through this bizarre traffic to go into where the musical festival was by the beach. And I got [out of the car], and I was jittery, I was, I was worried, I was sort of, um, I didn't know, I was like "oh my god," I felt *terrible*. I was *really really* jittery is the best way to describe it. And I was like, "oh my god, is this going to be the rest of the night? Am I just going to be a shriveling mess in the corner somewhere?" And, um, I couldn't like keep thoughts straight when we were trying to buy the tickets, I was just, (laughs) you know… I was very very jittery. And then we went into the arena and I heard the first chord of the music and it was like a light switch had been turned on. And I was ecstatic in a second, I couldn't stop dancing—I had a *really* really fantastic time… somewhere through the course of the night, yeah, there was cocaine, yeah, we did some cocaine. Yeah, which was just sort of an added … I've always felt nice and chill and happy on cocaine … And then we danced for 10 hours straight or something like that…

The processual nature of her storytelling is complemented by the consistent integration of external and internal discourse, creating a stark contrast between how she felt during the onset of the drug and after hearing the music that helped her to overcome the initial displeasure associated with the car ride and jitters. The overall experience "was fantastic," including the

addition of cocaine at some point in the evening. Unable to sleep soundly as her "legs wouldn't stop moving," for the

> first time in my *life* (starts laughing) I went for a run at 5 AM in the morning because I couldn't—I had so much energy I didn't know what to do with myself!

Other students reported similar difficulty sleeping after first trying cocaine.[86] While her use of MDMA and cocaine continued on subsequent visits home, and she also used cocaine in South America during graduate school, she had never used it in the U.S., where she instead pursued marijuana and hallucinogens (e.g., acid, mushrooms, DMT[87]). This was more an issue of access and shifting preferences, as she now preferred festivals and concerts to clubs; she felt the latter were scenes more regularly inhabited by business people and lawyers, who in turn were likelier to use cocaine.

The Neuroscience PhD may have facilitated the Biology PhD's first experience with marijuana, though this was not stated or addressed directly and can only be inferred. Similar to his experience first trying a cigarette by himself, the "Late Bloomer" Biology student also first smoked marijuana on his own, though he waited until his mid-20s to do so. The following passages include his initial statement regarding his experience, and then increasing levels of detail in response to follow-up questions:

> I was in graduate school, well into graduate school. I, a friend had some, and I had never tried it, and for some reason I had this interest in trying it. I think, prior to graduate school I had never been around people who smoked, ever. I had never seen it, I had never been around people who were using it. I, um, I learned what the smell was—when we get into family history, it turns out that people in my family would smoke it all the time, but they hid it really well—but, um, but I never knowingly observed it happening. So, even in college I'd not had a single experience with it.

While he had never seen it until graduate school, the nested story-within-a-story acknowledges that he had in fact been around it earlier than he realized. Still, it shows how he was able to go

---

[86] For example, one informant who first tried cocaine as a GAPSS reported having sex three times in the span of a few hours (see "Professional socialization"). A few students experienced similar physical reactions as early marijuana users, including those who used alone (i.e., masturbation).

[87] She referred to DMT as "the businessman's trip" because of its relatively brief effects.

so long without trying, as those in his high school and college social circles simply did not use in his presence—perhaps at all—or offer drugs to him. Based on discussions with his peers, he wanted to try it, and felt like it was time:

> Most of the people who I've asked who I know smoke tried it for the first time as teenagers. Um, and that always surprised me a little bit too. So, I got the impression that being a 20-something was late; it seemed like even being a *college* student was late for some people. It seemed to be something that people tried around the first time they first tried alcohol. I don't know statistically whether that's late, but anecdotally that would be my guess. It felt that way.

His research training is evident in the distinction between anecdotal and statistical evidence (see "Professional discourse and leveraged expertise"). Feeling like a bit of a "Late Bloomer," he took what he felt was the first opportunity he had to try it:

> I… became a bit curious about it in graduate school, and [after] finally being offered some, I … A friend who lived in the same apartment complex as me—it was another graduate student—had some that she had obtained from an acquaintance. And it was just sort of sitting in her refrigerator; she wasn't doing anything with it. And, so we had been talking about it once, and she's like, "well, I have this stuff in my fridge," ya know, "help yourself to some." And, um, and that's what I did. She actually left some for me when I was cat-sitting for her while she was away for Christmas break.

Again, this was something he had discussed with classmates, and was curious about. Then, a series of seemingly mundane decisions and activities provided a pathway into solo experimentation: cat-sitting for a friend at school during the holidays with nobody else around while studying for his PhD qualifying exam, which is why he had himself not gone home. He then "did some extensive research on the internet" to learn how to ingest the marijuana in the refrigerator:

> So, um, I had—what I had was just sort of a bag that was just full of, ya know, "shake," sort of ground-up leaves. Um, and I had no idea in terms of quantity, like (said as if to convey that these were internalized thoughts he had at the time) "is this a lot, is this a little?" I had *no* idea. … Um, so, I knew, first, like, "Ok, well I don't have any sort of paraphernalia or any device that would normally be used to smoke this. I don't even have any rolling papers, and even if I did I wouldn't dare try rolling a joint because I don't know what I was (sic) doing." So, um, I looked online, and said—I think I searched for some combination of words or phrases that, that got across the impression to the search engine that I needed a way to smoke that, ya know, just using items available around the house. And the two that I came across were a "gravity bong" that you could make out of 2-liter bottles—which I didn't have so I would have had to get them at the store, but I knew that I

> could—and then just using an apple, which I happened to have, so I was like, “Ok, I’ve got all of necessary ingredients and accessories here” (he laughs).

His experience “flying solo” as a graduate student in the age of “search engines” offers contrast to the organic way in which the opportunity to do so presented itself and was pursued. After realizing he could smoke out of a fruit, he set about constructing the apparatus:

> So I understood the basic mechanics, right? You-you-you make a bowl, and then you have, you know, a mouthpiece, and then you just need to draw the smoke from the bowl through, so I knew I needed to make two bores in the apple. So I took a knife and I carved out the core, and then I took (said as if remembering and amazed at how simple it was) *just a pen*, took out the ink, and took the bore of the pen and jammed it through there and dug out a hole. Um, and I think I actually left the pen in as a spout. I took aluminum foil—and this is *all* what I read online—took aluminum foil, put it where the core was, jabbed it through to make a screen, and then I just, not knowing how much of the weed to use, I figured, “the smart thing to do here is just to start with a little bit, try it, see if anything happens, and then if nothing happens, then alright try a little more.”

On the one hand, his detailed description revealed he vividly remembered the event, or had followed the same procedure since. On the other hand, he accentuated the fact that this information was all ascertained on the internet. Having decided to take a measured approach, and with his converted apple in hand, at this point he was now ready to try:

> So I just sort of took a pinch and sprinkled it into this screen. Um, I sat outside of the back of my house and—and remember that even smoking was bizarre to me, I had never really smoked before except for once, twice, my whole life—so I took maybe two or three puffs out of it. Uh, nothing happened right away. I, I left the apple outside, I walked inside and I sat down on the couch and I was just kind of waiting for something to happen. And nothing was happening. I was like, (disappointed, decrescendoing) “what’s the big deal?” And then I knew I had to go back to my friend’s house to feed their cats. And I got up and I went to reach for my keys on my key ring, and I missed.

Like his perception of the face people make after taking a shot of alcohol, the idea of breathing in smoke was odd, and he initially did not feel any effects. Only after standing up did he realize that he was indeed experiencing a new sensation:

> … it’s not like being drunk, you know, it’s not like—my motor control was fine, it’s just my perception of everything was different. And that was the first feeling in my life of that, that intoxication. Um, and then I walked outside and, the walk was—she [the person I was cat-sitting for] was literally across the street—it was a 30 to 45 second walk. I felt like it took me 20 minutes to get to her house. So this feeling of time distortion, that was brand new to me and I felt that right away.

Seemingly constant constructs—time and distance—suddenly seemed in flux, altered by internal perceptions that also affected other senses:

> I didn't get the munchies per se, but I was hungry so I ate. *Food tasted awesome*. Just, ya know, the soda that I had, the food that I had it just tasted amazing. It was just—it tasted the same, but more intense. Right? Just everything was amplified and better. I thought I should watch some movie that was appropriate given the circumstances so I chose *Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind*—[indecipherable aside]—which I had seen before. It's kind of a trippy movie anyway, I don't know if you're familiar (Oren nods). But watching it under the influence, um, it was just, just… deep to me, and impressive and… sort of, uh, impactful and uh, I just remember feeling very emotional. I felt like I was experiencing it on a different level than I had before. So, I had sort of a control, because I had watched it once before and I knew how it made me feel at the time. So that was sort of interesting. Um, and then the effect probably subsided after an hour or two. And that was it. I didn't smoke anymore [that day], and I didn't smoke again probably for a month, when I bought my own for the first time.

Again, his use of research-based terminology emerges ("control"), and the passage further illustrates his reflective way of articulating an event that occurred as an adult, as those who experienced marijuana earlier in life did not articulate their experiences with the same breadth of emotion and analysis. Therefore, the late onset of his use was unique in the sample, and so was the insight that beginning later in life afforded. As he indicates, it was not long before he decided to become a more regular marijuana user by procuring his own supply that would allow him to pursue involvement without having to wait for such an opportunity or offer. For most GAPSS, a longer period of time elapsed between first encounters and making the decision to buy their own drugs; some waited until socially rebuked for "mooching," but in one case a PhD student bought so someone he felt was a "kindred spirit" would not think the student valued their friendship only because of the free weed. A few students sold marijuana during or after their undergraduate years, while others never progressed to the point of purchasing, and continued to be opportunistic or special-occasion users.

4.4 Conclusion

The initial experiences of GAPSS in the sample occurred in the home, with friends, and at school, representing three major influences on adolescent development. Some proceeded to use

again shortly after, in most cases the same drug, whereas others refrained before eventually becoming more regular users or experimenting with a range of substances. The excerpts portrayed youth who were either active or passive in deciding to first use, but in the years that followed, for some a tenuous relationship began to form between patterns of substance use and other routine social activities, particularly during college. As users in the sample continued to evolve into GAPSS, distinctions emerged based on a combination of the a) extent of past use, b) regularity of current use, c) drug(s) used, and d) extent to which use occured with colleagues. Several students were past or current dabblers who, though they currently drank a lot, had used marijuana on few occasions or currently did so infrequently, and may have tried other drugs (e.g., cocaine), but only once or twice. The next level of users included past polysubstance users and current social dabblers, mostly students who had “gone hard” in high school or college but were, at the time of the interview, less likely to procure their own drugs, though they might blow a line of cocaine if offered. Another type of student used marijuana regularly (e.g., daily), but not other drugs, while the “highest” level of users included those students who tended to use marijuana frequently, but also had sought out other drug experiences while in graduate school—mostly Neuroscientists interested in altered states of perception (see “Hallucinogens with colleagues and alone”). Regardless of how frequently they used drugs and the number of drugs they used, most continued to drink with regularity, save for those who preferred the effects of smoking marijuana to alcohol. Those who tended to have experimented with drugs earlier and continued “aggressive” use in high school and college were now likelier to be social dabblers with drugs, whereas those who first used in college tended to still be pursuing polysubstance use. Diverse pathways and patterns of use emerged, demonstrating that many types of users eventually become GAPSS; the dynamics of postbaccalaureate socializations continued to influence usage patterns, as described next.

CHAPTER V. PRIVILEGED SPACES AND SOCIAL CONTROL

> … it was a colloquium [and afterwards students and faculty were seated at tables eating dinner]… And a professor came up—a *really really* prominent philosopher—came up and said, "I hear you have a source. I would like you to get me an ounce, money is no objective." In front of the entire banquet [hall].
>
> –PhD Neuroscience student

Research participants' experiences with law enforcement, professional socialization and workplace deviance help illustrate how the social spaces that they inhabit organize the practice and meaning of substance use, buffering them physically and psychologically from associated sanction and stigma while allowing them to maintain an upward professional trajectory. The settings in which illegal drugs are socially consumed may be privileged to the extent that the activities that transpire therein do not result in overt blowback or become known to potential mechanisms of external control, but instead may lead to fortified social bonds with colleagues and mentors.

For graduate and professional degree students, the decision to reveal to classmates and other professional contacts that they use controlled substances tends to be carefully weighed, but can also be thrust upon or made for them. Similar to the rules of religious "confessionals" or meetings of self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and Narcotics Anonymous (NA) (cf. Weiner, 1995; Coleman, 2005), when someone decides to share old or create new drug-related stories, it tends to be understood that what is said and done will remain privileged or confidential—barring some unforeseen development (e.g., violence, health problem, social control). However, behavior—of which drug use is one example—that occurs in most settings is not confidential or inviolable, and can become the focus of unanticipated conversation, and hence scrutiny, celebration, ignominy, and legend. Some exceptions exist, as disclosures to certain professionals have greater legal protections than those to peers (e.g., psychotherapists, doctors, lawyers), and even these have their own allowances (e.g., duty to warn). As lamented by a member of Cocaine Anonymous, financial privilege is sometimes required to access these more legally honored spaces:

> This just points out another middle-class hypocrisy—money buys privacy.... If you have the money, you can have the protection. A lot of people in [Cocaine Anonymous] can't afford a fancy shrink (Weiner, 1995: 245, citing Baum, 1994: E7).

Mindful of how privilege begets privilege, the bulk of this chapter describes how graduate and professional students come to learn about and become involved with substance use occurring among peers and professors. Before examining professional socialization in graduate school, however, as approaches to drinking had already begun to change since college and prior to continuing with school, other factors in this process are considered, e.g., time in the workforce, negative experiences, relationships. The chapter concludes by describing the process of keeping substance-user identities separate from student identities, and other interactions in more broachable spaces, e.g., with police or other potential forms of social control.

Most participants did not proceed directly from college to graduate school, and first spent time in the workforce developing relationships with colleagues. These jobs—including as paralegals or research assistants, at creative companies in the public and private sectors, and some with six-figure salaries—helped to build their resumes, but also provided socialization into post-college substance use. Expressly, patterns of use may have changed independent of schooling. Among those who first tried alcohol or drugs early, but infrequently, though alcohol use varied during college and thereafter, their involvement with drugs tended not to increase. For those who began regularly using alcohol and drugs earlier in life, though there might have been periods during which they did not use at all or as regularly, substance use in some form—but often many—tended to continue throughout college and in the period between college and the next round of schooling, at which point some level of regular use was either maintained or purposefully avoided. Those arriving to the party a bit late, by comparison, either did not develop regular patterns of use, “burned out” after using heavily in college, or were “late bloomers” who increased their experimentation in graduate school—most such participants in the current sample were PhD students. At the time of the interview, just as acquiring alcohol no longer became an issue for all participants, the ability to use drugs differed from opportunities

available during college, when some illicit drugs were not pursued because they were not known to be available, or unable to be acquired. At the time of the interview, most felt they could find someone to help them locate drugs they might be interested in using, with a few knowing growers or producing their own, e.g., marijuana, hallucinogenic mushrooms, acid, and DMT.

By considering their involvement during graduate and professional school, and interactions with law enforcement and other potential forms of social control, this chapter further addresses how is it possible for these students to have simultaneously consumed such large quantities of illegal drugs in their lifetimes on thousands—likely tens of thousands—of occasions while rarely getting in serious legal trouble for their use. Maintaining such segmented identities requires navigating a range of interactions, or avoiding them altogether, in order to ensure that drug use does not negatively influence professional ambitions, e.g., due to legal trouble or others' perceptions. Privileged substance use provides opportunities and contexts in which to consume drugs that others might not get, while also allowing for non-stigmatized use that is responded to differently and deferentially by those around them, and in turn society. The same types of events that provide professional and social status, such as conferences, departmental functions, and group meetings for class projects, can also expose students to the substance using proclivities of colleagues and mentors. Practicing social control involves learning how to use in particular ways and in relation to their identities as students and professionals, while avoiding social control entails attempts to minimize the potential for external sanctions. The following sections contrast general features of the different degree programs, social situations and expectations of the applicants, and the culture of substance ingestion.

5.1 Alcohol's ebb and flow after college

Students in the sample reported drinking copious amounts of alcohol during college, so much that it would have been hard for many to continue at the same rate after graduating. This did not make them unique from those around them at college, as their behavior was portrayed

as socially acceptable, with few exceptions (see “Segmented identities”). Beginning with orientation, alcohol helped in the adjustment to being away from home and navigating new forms of social interactions. More than a quarter of the participants pledged fraternities, sororities, or were members of athletic teams, performing arts groups, or “senior societies.” At events ranging from “sink or swim” happy hours, Greek parties, and homecoming, to spring concerts or while on spring break, many drank enough alcohol to lose control of their bodies, “blackout,” and wake up hungover and not remembering periods of the previous night. These events happened throughout college, including senior spring. A student described the one time she “blacked out” from alcohol consumption as a college junior while being “initiated”—or hazed—into a “secret” society:

> Interviewee: I remember one time I was getting initiated into this—this is the only time I really remember, or I was told afterwards what happened. I think pretty much the only time I’ve blacked out. I’ve forgotten a few points of the night [on other occasions], but this was—I really didn’t remember anything. And I was getting initiated into my secret society. Which already, ya know, it seems, is such a pledging [experience]. I did pledging for my sorority, and it revolved a little bit around drinking. But this was just *pure drinking*. And it was a group of, I think six of us who were getting initiated. And then we had two pledge masters that were actually both in my grade because I was initiated, umm, a little bit older, like the year after, like usually you get initiated sophomore year, and I was initiated junior year. So these two people were juniors, my age, and yet they still, ya know, I guess commanded that respect, like I was talking about. And so, they brought this huge bottle of vodka, and this bottle of mixer, which was like, horse radish, Tabasco, (inaudible), soy sauce, flour, eggs, like gross. And we all had to stand around (clears throat) and basically finish this entire bottle of vodka. And one guy was able to, he, ya know, had a soccer game the next day or whatever, he was on the soccer team and so he didn’t have to drink, and so it ended up being between five of us. And I don’t even think we finished it, but I just drank so much and I wasn’t even enjoying it and they made us drink that gross mixer and they were throwing eggs, and flour at us, and dumping ketchup on us, and making us roll around in the dirt. And just, such gross stuff. Ya know, after that somehow the initiation, we moved about, we walked about ten blocks, at this point I started losing it. I didn’t even know where I was. And we ended up in our back yard, my back yard, and at the time I lived with seven other girls, and we shared a back yard with three other houses, so it was a very big back yard. And, uh, apparently I saw my roommate and gave her a huge hug on purpose and got her all dirty, and she was really upset with me. And then I just started crying and crying and crying, and this is, I don’t remember this, this is other people telling me this. And I had to go inside, I was like, “I need to go inside,” whatever, I call my boyfriend at the time, uh, and he came *right* over. Ya know, I was like “I need to go to the hospital, I need to go to the hospital, I can’t,” like, “I’m so sick, I feel like I am

> going to die, I need to have my stomach pumped," my stomach was hurting so bad supposedly, I guess because of the mixture of the gross food (speaking over each other)–
>
> Fiancé (in next room playing video game): –Did you get your stomach pumped?
>
> Interviewee: No no, nuh-uh. … And I was like "I need to go, I'm sick I'm sick, take me to the hospital." And he was like, "you're fine, you don't need to go to the hospital." And he just stayed with me in the bathroom. And I had massive massive amounts of diarrhea, which is so embarrassing. And I had massive vomiting, so he just showered me somehow, because I was covered—I smelled like maple syrup and mustard combination for the next week. But, he showered me, and he put me to bed, and the next day I just remember waking up and feeling horrible.

The passage demonstrates how access to exclusive groups within a privileged Ivy League institution can, on the one hand, be based on academic merit and social reputation, but on the other, require alcohol use and embarrassing or risky behavior. The social codes of the group subverted generally acceptable etiquette. In this case, initiation and inebriation seemed synonymous, even for someone who had pledged a sorority, perhaps an example of what can happen when those charged with initiating a peer into a society have themselves only recently been admitted to the ranks of legal consumers of alcohol. Fortunately, her boyfriend eventually arrived to take care of her, and his involvement may have been part of the reason why, based on his question, her Fiancé had not previously heard the story (see "Segmented identities"). Other than a hangover and smell, she was not too adversely affected. Generally, students reported that these occasions often involved public drunkenness and sometimes-spontaneous sexual trysts. For the purposes of the present effort, a few examples of college drinking are provided, but suffice it to say that the vast majority of participants reported their most extensive drinking occurred in college.

Regardless of the shift in patterns of drug use, students indicated that alcohol's ebb and flow had changed in demonstrable ways since their undergraduate years. Reviewing these changes reinforces the influence of professional socialization and other "real world" processes.

Here are two examples of students who described incidents where they got very drunk in college, one a female, one a male:

> We actually lived in a single-family home, me and six other girls rented out a single family home when we were in undergrad. And we had a back yard, it was awesome, it was awesome, because we lived in this huge city and we had the entire house to ourselves so it was super cool. But we had, like, a fire pit in the back yard, a fire bowl where you put logs and light a fire. So we had a *biiiig* Halloween party, and I just got belligerent really fast and didn't eat dinner, and was just, like, doing tequila shots at eight o'clock at night. So it was pretty bad. And then, um, at some point I went to go outside because I was hot and I, like, fell down the stairs and I was wearing my girlfriends boots and I broke the heel off her boots. Didn't even—and they were *boots*, 6-inch heels—didn't even notice, I was *so* belligerent that I didn't even notice that I was missing a heel off of one of my shoes. So I was like, walking funny, and because of that I was standing by the fire bowl just talking to people, and, because I was drunk, literally almost fell into the fire. And luckily there were like three people standing there who were able to like catch me and bring me out and then they brought me inside and were like, "she needs to go to bed." So my girlfriends were like, "ok, let's go," and they took me to my room and I went to bed. So, yeah, and they were like, "we kept coming by to check on you," 'cause they like, would put [their hands near my nose to see if I was breathing], to make sure I was not dead I guess, so, yeah.
>
> The worst occasion—maybe this will be of interest to you—what I would think to be the worst is: one night I—there was a girl who I used to date many many years ago. We were out partying, she wanted to go home early and she did. And then I came home much later. I got home and urinated on my own couch. Alright, you've heard many stories of this, of people peeing where they're not supposed to pee, I've seen it, I've, you know, watched other people do it, I know it happens. I had never done it myself, this was the first and only time. And she caught me doing it because she heard it, and it woke her up, and she came out, and she was like (annoyed voice but not angry) "what are you doing?" Right. Um, and I remember that sort of. And then, the next morning, right, having to have that conversation with her about it, just thinking, "how was I drunk enough that I managed to do that?" Man, really bothered me; I've never been that drunk since. And, um, that was, it just bothered the hell out of me. I know people who have done it and just laughed it off. For me it was… to be at a point where I am capable of actually urinating onto a couch means that I am just, ya know, so out of it and so incapable of controlling myself that I could potentially make some really really bad decisions and do things that are really dangerous. That was a scary and eye-opening experience.

The informants provide relevant background factors (e.g., having not eaten dinner, continuing to drink without his girlfriend), demonstrate how alcohol affected their awareness of their surroundings (e.g., broken heel, peeing on sofa), and indicate how others around them responded to their behavior. While the student who peed on his sofa and the secret-society initiate continued to drink with some regularly and gusto, the student who almost fell into a fire pit found herself drinking less in the past couple of years, preferring marijuana. Whereas college

drinking involved consuming copious amounts rapidly (i.e., “binging”), college graduates might drink more regularly, but usually in smaller amounts.

Overall, as the Literature PhD student put it, in graduate school it was rare to hear those “I got so fucked up narratives” or “braggadocio with alcohol” more generally. Several students, while indicating that their approach to and perception of alcohol had shifted fundamentally since college, nonetheless shared stories suggesting a struggle to have stated views of alcohol align with actual approaches to its use. The following are examples typical of new patterns of alcohol consumption practiced *after* college. The narratives of students were selected that contrast old and new approaches to drinking with recent experiences getting drunk and exemplify how it is possible to regularly drink in small amounts but sometimes overdo it. Additional students then help demonstrate how the influx of marijuana as a drug of choice can play a role in patterns of drinking.

For those who drank more than they used drugs during and after college, the tempered use of hard liquor was characteristic of the transition from college drinking, with beer and wine more regularly pursued, usually in smaller amounts. These might be accompanied by changing attitudes towards alcohol consumption, new friendships or older colleagues, and more intimate relationships that shifted the contexts in which drinking occurred (i.e., “settling down”). The Master’s in Urban Planning student who used marijuana a few dozen times and tried cocaine at the last big social event of her senior year of college reported that she now enjoyed drinking socially, with meals, and “just sometimes casually in my home.” The following passage demonstrates a deepening appreciation for beer inspired in part by going out to eat at good restaurants with her live-in boyfriend:

> So I guess my alcohol of choice is beer, mostly, I really like a good beer. Um, I love Gumball Head, Three Floyds [Brewing Co.], and I’ll drink a, you know, a Kirin at the sushi restaurant, or a Heineken. I'll drink wine, I like wine. I'm less of a hard alcohol drinker, although I’ll have a martini, dirty martini, or a gin and tonic. But usually, I'll drink hard alcohol at events like weddings, I’ll drink hard alcohol more. Or if I am really (pause… said in an exaggerated way) “*hitting it hard*” at a birthday party.

As opposed to college, where the taste of the beer was not as important as how warm it was, distinct brands and flavor profiles had become desirable. Other students expressed similar sentiments, indicating that they generally avoided hard liquor, save for special occasions. When asked what about drinking she enjoyed, she explained:

> Well I didn't really used to enjoy the taste of beer or wine at all, which is actually really interesting to think about, but I do now. And I like how you can pair it with food and, ya know, have a delicious steak dish with mashed potatoes, and then a delicious Pinot Noir or a Cabernet, you know. I guess the same thing goes for beer too. (Asking herself) Um, what else do I like about it? I like the social aspect of it and going to a bar and drinking with people.

While in college it was common to eat a large meal before or after a night of binge drinking to avoid getting too drunk or hungover, now it was about integrating the drinking with fine dining or social interactions that served as the “main event” of the evening. Based on the order in which they are mentioned and respective descriptors, it seemed she enjoyed the taste (“love”) and process of pairing (“delicious”) more than the company (“I guess”). Describing how his drinking had evolved since college, a comment by the Biology PhD—who first drank in college and used drugs as a graduate student—reiterates this point in:

> So in college it was drink infrequently and binge, and then now I drink all the time, but not very much, ya know? I probably have, at most, one drink… maybe almost every day. But one to two drinks at the most. … [I] Usually [drink] beer and occasionally wine. But like, so last night for example, um. With dinner, I had a beer. I didn’t finish it. I got half way through the bottle. That’s pretty typical for me. I love beer. I really enjoy it.

That he did not finish his beer the previous night might seem to be in conflict with his professed love of beer, or indicate that sometimes the bottle can play as much of a role as its contents, e.g., if he ordered a drink because his dinner companion already had. For both students, drinking in college had been a social lubricant that made it easier to interact with a range of people, but now was enjoyable for other reasons, with less overt pressure to drink for the sake of perceptions or to get drunk. However, it did continue to help in social situations, including those encountered while attending graduate and professional school.

Students reported having fewer hangovers and nights of drinking to the point of intoxication in the years following college. This was true when working 9-to-5 jobs between college and graduate school, and after returning to school as well. Excessive drinking did occur on occasion—the First Semester JD reported drinking heavily, “not waking up until noon, having your head be hazy until, like, 2, and the next thing you know you’re not cracking open a book until 4 o’clock”—but was avoided because the “lost day” could be problematic for work or school performance. Therefore, heavy episodic drinking was curtailed. Regarding hangovers, the Master’s in Urban Planning student commented:

> … some nights, like, um, probably once or twice a year these days in my life I will get so intoxicated that I will have a hangover, but not to the point where I can't remember things.

While, for some, like the Master’s in Urban Planning, memory loss was rarely associated with drinking, for others, the transition was more precipitous, i.e., from drinking, to getting drunk, to being inebriated to the extent that alcohol would still be affecting behavior and thinking the next morning (or afternoon). This seemed true for the Biology PhD, who, after noting that he did not finish the beer he enjoyed with dinner the previous night, stated:

> *I don’t like* being drunk very much. That’s not an experience I find very pleasurable anymore. I guess I used to in college, but now, it *just doesn’t sit well with me*. *I don’t like*, *I don’t like* not remembering things that happened, *I don’t like* when I get so disinhibited that I’m willing to do things that I wouldn’t do otherwise. I think in college there’s, there’s a reason that you do that. But now in my life *I don’t need or want* to have that experience. That’s not to say that I don’t, every now and again, ya know, drink enough to get to the point where I’m full on enjoying myself. But, um, that’s a rare experience, and I would say that I’m actually intoxicated from alcohol once every couple of months at the most (emphasis added).

While he enjoyed sipping on a beer, being drunk was portrayed as more negative than positive. In spite of having been a drinker for fewer years than anyone else in the sample, the time, place, and reason to drink to excess now seemed to have passed. Experiencing memory loss and uncontrollable behavior disturbed him greatly, and he conveyed a sense of remorse for getting drunk.

After graduating from college, “special occasions” where drinking could be pursued more aggressively became increasingly rare. This perhaps caused some to overdo it when they did go out. The Biology PhD had recently gotten too drunk at a surprise thirtieth birthday party that he organized for his girlfriend at a karaoke venue where he had arranged for an “open bar.” After spending time planning and inviting everyone, he felt relieved that the evening was going off without a hitch, and took full advantage of the *prix fixe*. When he awoke on his sofa early the next morning, he did not remember returning home, or why he was sleeping on the sofa; fearful that his girlfriend might be angry at him for getting so drunk on her birthday, or that they might have argued to precipitate his banishment to the sofa, he woke her up at five in the morning:

> I was like, “what did I do, are you mad at me? Why am I on the couch?” And she said, “oh, nothing’s wrong, you fell asleep there because we just got home and that’s where you passed out, and I left you there.”.That panic, it’s a familiar feeling, and I hate it. And it really bothered me. And then I saw a video of myself singing karaoke the night before—drunkenly—and sort of falling asleep while I was doing it because I was just tired, and drunk, and… I wasn’t proud, I wasn’t happy about it.

Perhaps not saved from immortality, he nonetheless felt comfortable letting loose among friends on a special occasion, and retelling the story. In this instance and many others, GAPSS who were very drunk or experiencing a drug effect found themselves shepherded to safety by friends, colleagues, taxis, and even the campus police. He was transported from one place where he felt comfortable letting lose to another. Regarding his mixed emotions, this sort of story arch emerged for several students who conveyed, on the one hand, more tempered use of alcohol, and on the other, recent experiences where they overdid it, including the next example, which considers new relationships and drinking.

Sometimes, recent drinking events were influenced by memories of yesteryear. A few months prior to the interview, the Master’s in Urban Planning and some friends did “an adult version of a power hour,” a drinking game from college that involved taking “a shot of beer every minute for an hour.” She first explained how the power hour materialized as a “pre-game” for a more formal party, and then what it entailed:

> We were going to an event that we didn't really want to be going to, so we decided to like, have some [friends over] before … It was just four of us at a friend's house and we, they had had a New Year's party and someone had brought all of this Icehouse, real shitty beer and—am I allowed to curse? (Oren chuckles: Yeah)—and, they, so they had a bunch of beer [left over]. … So we even downloaded a mix of music, "the power hour mix," where [the song] changes (swallows) every minute … That beer was terrible. I did not enjoy it. And plus then, I kept pouring the shots, and the foam was too much on top, and, ugh (revolted noise) that'll make you nauseous, taking all those shots of beer. … They were very popular in undergrad in college.

Even with the proper beer and playlist, their inability to execute the power hour was indicative of a changing approach to drinking, which was now more intimate and "more like a joke than anything." As for what made this particular version of a "power hour" more "adult":

> [We] had a really nice dinner, our friends made dinner beforehand and then we moved into the power hour. … it was much more civilized. Like, there were just four of us sitting around a really lovely wooden kitchen table after enjoying this delicious prepared food with like, an egg over this amazing sort of tomato dish and this delicious arugula salad. And she had even made a cake, I mean so, yeah, it was just, felt more adult. Plus we were in our own apartment, and, yeah.

It is clear from her description that the meal was the main event, replete with cake. After such a homemade feast, the actual "power hour" was decidedly anticlimactic, though not for lack of planning. It soon became clear that the night got worse before it got better:

> … and so we were going to … It was a birthday party … Um, but we thought it would be, I guess, funny. I mean it was kind of mean, actually, of us, to think that it would be okay to show up drunk because it wasn't exactly a big party. … it was an intimate adults party.

Similar to the Biology PhD, she scolded herself a bit for seemingly immature behavior, acknowledging that, even though it was beer and a drinking game she associated with college, it was perhaps inappropriate to pregame so ambitiously before a different kind of party than those she had attended while an undergraduate student. Nonetheless, even though the drinking norms had changed, such that their spirited arrival was perhaps perceived as "rude" or "inconsiderate," rather than "getting after it" or "thrifty," their behavior was accommodated under the assumption that they belonged in the privileged space in spite of the violation.

Students who preferred marijuana as their "drug of choice" noted that this influenced the amount of alcohol they drank in college, while transitioning from college to the workforce, and in

graduate school. This relationship evolved over time, as illustrated in the following excerpts, first from an Ivy League JD student:

> I was in a sorority, and drank a lot there, particularly freshman year. And then… am I supposed to talk about pot too? … Because at some point the pot became more prevalent than the drinking did… well, that happened—junior year [of high school was the first time I smoked pot]… I don't really remember if I smoked a lot senior year of high school… Not freshman year of college, that was a big drinking year. And THEN, sophomore year of college, and then through the rest of college pot was more my drug of choice, [more] than drinking—I mean, I still drank a lot—but I was smoking a lot more.

Providing an integrated timeline, she highlighted the peaks and valleys of her marijuana and alcohol use, thinking aloud for the benefit of the tape recorder while trying to figure out when marijuana became her drug of choice. For her, increased alcohol use was related to rushing and pledging her sorority, and then decreased as marijuana use increased with her more firmly entrenched circle of friends. She continued by addressing the transition that occurred after college away from marijuana and back towards alcohol:

> And then, after I graduated college… in my first year, no, well, yeah, for the first year after I graduated I was still smoking a bunch and drinking a little. And then it kind of phased out. My husband is extremely anti-pot. He loves the alcohol, but he's very anti-pot, so… that slowly got phased out.

The bottles of wine and hard liquor displayed in their apartment and observed during the interview lent credence to her statement. Similar to the Master's of Urban Planning student's approach to alcohol, the Non-profit JD's significant other influenced her attenuated use of drugs. Others reported the opposite, as they were in relationships with partners who used drugs or alcohol more often, and with more people, acknowledging that their own use of some substances had increased since the relationship began.

Unlike the Non-profit JD, a PhD Criminology student did not smoke marijuana in college but was instead a heavy drinker, then switched to preferring marijuana in graduate school and at the time of the interview. Her aversion to marijuana in college was due to a perceived lack of access, only to later realize that family members in close proximity had been using all along. She explained her current experience with alcohol and marijuana:

> Alcohol makes me feel sick. I get sick pretty quick, even after a couple of drinks, I just don't, I don't feel good, I wanna go vomit, I just want this out of my stomach. … [Marijuana makes me feel] good (laughs). I don't know how else to describe it, just good, relaxed, super relaxed. Happy.

Others also equated marijuana and alcohol use in direct ways, such as the Literature PhD, who felt that one hit of pot was equivalent to a shot or beer, and the female Neuroscience PhD who always smoked before drinking socially because it made her feel like she would have to drink less to enjoy the gathering. Some who smoked less marijuana after obtaining their bachelor's degree instead nearly maintained their college drinking, such as a male JD for whom alcohol remained "a big problem" at the time of the interview; others drank more when they had to stop using marijuana before taking a drug test.

In reflecting on the ramifications of the distinction between licit and illicit drugs, the South MD explained that society seems to lack an alcohol code analogous to the drug code, which itself is developed through experiences, and is not officially written down:

> You know, there is a drug code, I feel like. With every kind of drug you do there are certain rules, and certain things. For example, with marijuana, let's say if I'm smoking, I always offer it to everyone else around me, ya know? Or, if it's someone else's marijuana, they always get like the first hit, which is called "the greens," which is supposedly the best hit, or whatever. Or, you always, there are just certain rules and etiquette. Like, with cocaine you always split it up evenly, no one ever saves one [extra line] for themselves unless they already told you, and that kind of thing. But, but for some reason with alcohol, I guess maybe 'cause it's so socially acceptable, I feel like instead of having etiquette rules, it's almost the opposite. People find ways to abuse it, find ways to overdo it or try to push their limits, or, or just go crazy with it. For me that's not fun and, ya know, everyone I feel kind of knows how much [marijuana] they can handle, and it's very easily controllable more with marijuana, especially, and cocaine, versus alcohol. Like, people always say, and I'm sure everyone's heard it, "ok I'm not gonna drink that much tonight, I'm going to be good tonight." And then it escalates to that point: You know you can only drink four, but then somehow you're always five, six, and seven. And it just feel like there's some more abuse potential because maybe it is legal so people don't find it so, ya know, "sneaky sneaky, I have to go around and," I don't know, I don't know what it is. But that's how I feel.

Other students also spoke about the "etiquette of the green hit," or "The idea of puff puff pass," which one student learned from her boyfriend: "And then [he told me] the rule was, 'you pull on it twice, and if you're smokin' with somebody, you pass it on.'" Only a few were so well-versed in

the equitable distribution of cocaine, including an MBA student who, in spite of knowing the rules, locked himself in a room in his college fraternity house with “a large amount that I was supposed to give to other people, and I kind of kept it for myself”:

> I had a friend come by who was like, “dude, what are you doing, that’s ridiculous.” And I was like, “yeah, I know,” and he was like, “I’m taking it,” and I was like, “alright, cool.”

He preferred using cocaine alone, “unfortunately,” as he felt that doing so seemed like “addictive” behavior. Even though he was holding out on his friends, he was gently rebuked. Yet, aside from those who frequently used marijuana, experiences using other drugs alone were remarkable (see “Hallucinogens with colleagues and alone”). For most, it was alcohol that, similar to prescription pills, provided a legal path towards altered states of consciousness that could be abused or consumed publicly and, sometimes, lead to illegal behavior. For many in the present sample, this societal stamp of approval seemed to be more important than their own experiences, as some continued to drink in excess in spite of intending not to. Therefore, professional socialization into appropriate alcohol consumption continued for GAPSS.

The importance of alcohol for professional socialization cannot be overstated. It continued to function as a social lubricant for graduate and professional degree students as they gained insight into their classmates and professors and began to discover that their colleagues and mentors might also be involved with drinking and drugs. The occasions that allow for these discoveries often revolve around alcohol as the protagonist that reveals the range of behaviors pursued by the characters that inhabit their classrooms and laboratories. The following sections highlight the circumstances and social evolution of such encounters, including the transition from drinking to talking about and then doing illicit drugs.

5.2 Professional socialization

Like substance use, professional socialization exposes students to semiotic codes, collective schemas, hierarchies of practices, and communities that, over time, are meant to help

them reach and navigate their chosen field of study (Holley, 2011). Students accepted to professional and graduate degree programs bring certain skills, attributes, and experiences with them to their new schools, both scholastically and in terms of their substance use histories. Programs recruit incoming students who have been influenced by “differential prior socializations” (Bucher, Stelling, & Dommermuth, 1969: 213) that inform their expectations for the program, how they might utilize its resources, whether their interests align with the expertise of the faculty, and if they will be a good fit for the culture (e.g., socially). For longer programs in particular, the experience usually represents a major turning point: “specific skills and specific professional philosophies are acquired, and commitments to careers are laid down” (Bucher, 1965: 197). Rather than perfecting routinized tasks, “the socialization of individuals into the cognitive and affective dimensions of social roles related to the practice of learned occupations” (Weidman & Stein, 2003: 642) is meant to enable students to eventually create and complete their own novel tasks in the style of their area of specialty. Additional activities and opportunities for professional development are provided by programs that extend beyond campus, such as learning about events in the community, attending talks or conferences, or mingling outside of school with others interested in similar issues who were selected and elected to join the same professional and social circles. Professional socialization that occurs while pursuing a career influences how individuals understand their roles in the workplace and area of specialization, yet it also has implications for identity performance in other social contexts, including those involving substance use.

5.2.1 Initial discovery and occasions

Socialization into a professional or graduate degree program can involve substance use even before deciding which school to attend. This can occur in isolation, or through interactions. For example, a PhD student successfully applied to their current program while drinking copious amounts of white wine and smoking marijuana in Europe, which to her indicated that she might

be able to get by in that program while maintaining her habits. Meanwhile, a PhD Neuroscience student described first mingling with eventual mentors and colleagues socially on a recruiting trip to his eventual program:

> I would say my first experience with that kind of thing was department recruiting. So when I was accepted to the program—or not accepted—before I was accepted to the program they had interview weekend. Where you come out and you do an interview. Uh, it's basically like a pre-admission kind of thing, where you're basically in the program but they want to make sure your research interests align with the people, so you talk with all the professors.[88]

The overt purpose of the PhD on-campus recruitment visit was to ensure some level of intellectual compatibility, yet the time commitment increased the importance of the social dynamic:

> It's really well organized: you show up on Thursday night,.[and] they're like, "oh, well, your interviews are at 9 AM, but we're going to the bar, so… join us or not." And that's how they tell who the cool people are (Oren: Oh yeah? [laughs]). Yeah, and then Friday, there's the interviews, you meet with all the professors, you meet with other postdocs and people in the department. And then after that, it's just, they're trying to show you a good time. So they've organized a party, usually at some professor's house, and you go to the professor's house and professors are there. Sometimes the professors will come out to the bars with you afterwards. So, it was the first time I had seen sort of, like, serious scientists, like big name people, um, have fun. And I think that was, sort of, enticing and appealing. For example, my [current] advisor, 9 AM on the Friday of recruiting I was in his office being interviewed, 9 PM we were at the bar doing Jäger[meister] shots. So there's two sides of the coin, in that sense.

For him, the recruitment visit positively influenced his decision to attend, as he enjoyed the balance between serious and fun. He now had experience as one of the recruiters, and commented that drunken prospective students would sometimes let it slip that they were attending these events to be "wined and dined" even though they had no intention of going to the school. While some undergraduate schools may have a reputation for partying, or even be ranked among the "Top Party Schools" by services such as *The Princeton Review* (n.d.) and

---

[88] It is worth noting here that PhD programs often involve a commitment of several years by a mentor to a mentee, including hands-on training, collaborative writing, and other pursuits that can establish a relationship that continues after the degree is conferred. This distinguishes PhD programs that involve 4-7+ years, potentially followed by 1-3 years of post-doctoral training, from Master's (1-2 years), MBA (2 years full-time, more part-time), and JD (3 years full-time, more part-time) programs that are shorter in duration, and MD programs that require similar

College Atlas (n.d.), this may also be a part of the equation or allure when it comes time to select a graduate program, perhaps especially for PhD and MD students.

Whereas PhD students had a more-or-less open-ended length of time they might spend in graduate school, it seemed that MBA students arrived on campus expecting to enjoy a relative vacation after working long hours in fast-paced and high-stakes jobs for several years. This seemed to lend itself to a party-like atmosphere, though for some the experience did not compare to college on multiple levels. An MBA student commented on what she noticed about her classmates:

> I's interesting, I think (laughs a bit, let's out air through mouth, "heh"), at business school you get a lot of people who—I fortunately had like a pretty balanced job before coming to school—but you get a lot of people who, um, were working really hard prior to coming to school, so [they] didn't have a lot of free time, and are going to work really hard when they graduate. So they see it as a 2-year vacation of time they'll otherwise never get back, and party and travel accordingly, which is nice.

Not only did the MBA environment afford students newfound free time because it required fewer hours of work than "the real world," but for other MBA students, even the academic material that was offered seemed less challenging than their undergraduate curriculum. The question then arises: how did MBAs spend their free time? Whereas the Social Entrepreneurship MBA commented that "people party a lot, a lot of people drink a lot," the Management Consultant stated "the alcohol is more moderated," which he found unsatisfactory, as "there's something about the bonding that is missing that happens in those uninhibited moments." Both the Social Entrepreneurship and Management Consultant MBAs felt that socializing in their program was less explicit, particularly overt sexual behavior. For some, then, relative to college, business school involved less intensive partying and less demanding coursework, and some MBA students got back into the social swing of things more fully than others.[89]

---

time commitments (7+ years) but involve less of a one-on-one training relationship.

[89] Those MBA students not as invested in their program's social functions provided several reasons for not spending as much time with classmates across various settings, or the paucity of new meaningful relationships. For students attending schools located in urban settings, there were many options for entertainment, and schools and cities also offered ways to socialize that

5.2.2 Orientation to school-sponsored drinking

Across professions and degree types, programs organized functions paid for by the institution that offered spaces in which to drink and socialize under professional auspices. A few of the MBA students who were interviewed attended the same program that held "happy hours" multiple days each week, both on campus and at local bars:

> Interviewee: There are regular happy hours, basically, twice a week on Wednesdays and Thursday nights. Um, the Wednesday one is really student-led, and it happens at a bar off campus. The Thursday one happens in the main business school building, um, and they have three, three and a half hours on Thursday evening, they have kegs of beer and boxed wine, and various food that, you know, is essentially free to the students. … And it's very much like a school-sponsored thing. You know, it happens on school property, the school is pretty involved in procuring the various stuff. I think [extracurricular] clubs actually pay for some of it, like clubs seem to sponsor happy hours from time to time.
>
> Oren: What's the scene?
>
> Interviewee: Um, there's. I mean, it's often pretty crowded, loud music. Mostly people kind of standing around talking. There is some dancing that happens, not a lot. So people are drinking, beer or wine, and, you know, people generally drink in moderation but there are *definitely* some instances of people going overboard.
>
> Oren: In the school?
>
> Interviewee: Yeah, in the school. So they have, um, they have, like, school security staff that are at the party and outside the party making sure that people coming in and out are only business school students. Although there are some trespassers… but yeah, it is very much a school-sponsored thing. It's interesting, ya know I heard that when they were doing budget cuts recently here, one of the items they looked at was alcohol, like the amount of alcohol spent per head as, um, one of the items that was really too high (indecipherable). There's a lot of alcohol at our, that's like, "officially provided"; there tends not to be [hard] liquor. I don't know if there is officially a no-liquor policy, as there have been very few instances where there's liquor, but there's a lot of beer and wine at… not only at happy hour, but there's just a multitude of events that are occurring every single week, whether they are school-sponsored or club-sponsored, almost every event that happens post-6 PM has alcohol.

---

did not involve drinking (e.g., intramural sports), or to instead spend time with family or friends from high school, undergraduate, work, or other social circles that lived in the same area. Therefore, some socialized with potential MBA friends less because they already had many other relationships to maintain and invest time in. Students in relationships were using the opportunity to transition into a new phase of life (e.g., marriage, kids), and other students were not transitioning much at all, such as the MBA student enrolled in his program part-time while working full-time who reported hardly socializing with classmates (though he already got his fill in college).

Held in private spaces fortified with quasi-bouncers to dispatch those not eligible to participate (e.g., undergraduates and those who had not paid the associated fee for social activities), some attended these events for the alcohol, while others drank to help generate informal discussion. The school was transformed so that it could essentially function as an exclusive drinking space for privileged up-and-coming businesspeople, and enough was consumed for students to dance, go "overboard," and raise some administrative eyebrows. It was unclear whether the clubs that sponsored events received funding from the school, student dues, or some other source. The frequency of these types of events ranged from weekly, as was reported by MBA and PhD students, to intermittently throughout the semester, as reported by MDs and JDs, to once or twice each semester, as some PhD and Master's degree students relayed. An MBA student was the only one to point out that these events were not truly "free": "we're paying for it in tuition."

One interview was conducted in a room adjacent to an MBA happy hour while it was going on. When the European Corporate MBA was asked, "Were those people [who were] cheering shouting 'drink, drink, drink?'"; he replied sarcastically, "No, they were shouting 'cocaine, cocaine, cocaine!' (both laugh). No, this is business school!" His statement either implied that cocaine was the drug business students would be chanting about, or that he thought it was a silly question in light of how obvious it seemed that they were very much drinking. He went on to explain:

> Interviewee: They are probably drinking, as you can see (gestures towards students looking jovial and holding red plastic cups). Yeah.
>
> Oren: How does it strike you [i.e., this scene we are observing]?
>
> Interviewee: No, I mean, drinking is very common in this business school. Every Thursday we have free drinks, wine and beer, no hard-hard stuff. It's paid [for] by the school, sponsored by some class or group. But, yeah, every other day we have events, conferences at night or whatever, in which you can even have beer. So it's very common. … *The reason business schools allow this is because you are strengthening networking faster. So, that's part of the business* [Emphasis added].

As the double doors to the adjacent room opened and closed, it was clear from their spirited revelry, accessories (e.g., cups, ping pong balls), interactions with one another, and the

transcription process that they were playing drinking games. Several students were overheard speaking Spanish rapidly, and it was overall a very diverse group. He reported that he knew from friends attending other Ivy League business schools that similar events were held there that were also "open" bar, hosted on campus, and regularly-scheduled each week.[90]

Whereas the focus in MBA programs was on bonding within classes or cohorts, early in the semester medical schools also held "mixers" that provided students with opportunities to meet peers and those further along in their training. East Coast MD, still in his first semester of school, described such an event as "a little small med school mixer event with 3rd and 4th year [medical school students]" that had "very good catered buffet food":

> Interviewee: And, just, just give us an opportunity for the older and younger classes to sort of mix and meet up and ask questions. I think they like to provide as much opportunity for the younger med students to interact with older, ya know, med students, or get advice in any way they can.
>
> Oren: What do the older kids get out of it?
>
> Interviewee: Nothing. Free food. Maybe a feeling of… giving back a little bit of mentorship… Maybe some of them are looking for some younger ladies or men, I don't know.

It was unclear whether alcohol was served at these events, but it seemed to be that, at least at a beginning-of-the-semester mixer, the food and socializing were more of a draw for the soon-to-be overworked medical students. He also seemed to imply that some of his colleagues were interested in meeting older and younger potential romantic partners that had been pre-screened by the institution for aptitude, sociality (i.e., someone wrote letters of reference), criminal background (Association of American Medical Colleges, n.d.), and perhaps socioeconomic status, who were also likely to be interested in health and hygiene.

There were still opportunities for medical school students to celebrate with classmates, such as after finishing a particularly long stretch of "work work work" followed by "a night or two

---

[90] An MBA student who did not participate in the study confirmed this; another student who attended a prestigious business school in the Midwest invited me to a penthouse party thrown

of release; these people go crazy," as South MD described:

> Every time we have the medical school party there's always someone vomiting, or too drunk, or, ya know, clearly doing some kind of drug, or—I more see it with the alcohol: people just have this, everyone wants to relieve the stress, relieve the stress.

As she was further along in her schooling, she had more perspective on what a semester of stress could feel like. She had just experienced a stress-related incident while preparing dinner before the interview, during which a little mishap—a broken taco shell—had caused her to become very angry and throw the taco against a wall, shattering it into many small pieces. Her stress was brought on by all the studying she had been doing, and needed to continue to do for her exams, though she was happy to take a break for the interview—towards the end of which she smoked marijuana. Compared to socializing in MBA programs, which seemed geared towards training in the "networking" profession, therefore, the socialization process on the way to becoming a doctor seemed more about helping those that would eventually help others in healthier ways, and less likely to be fueled with alcohol provided by the school. That is, at least early in the semester, before learning gave way to testing that caused stress and required release with classmates or older suitors.

Law school students also engaged in drinking during orientation week, and thereafter. The First Semester JD student felt he was older than many students in his "counter-culture law school," and early in the semester "kind of had a 'too cool for school attitude,' but I tried not to let it show." After noting that initially he was "actually pretty averse to, um, socializing with classmates," he described doing so early in the semester:

> The first time I went out with law school friends was after they had a welcoming ceremony for our whole class after our orientation week. And we all went, and [had] wine and cheese, "yadda yadda" [making small talk,] and then afterwards everyone's like, "oh, we're going to this bar X," [bar] whatever. So I show up in X bar and it's a ton of kids, majority of the class I would say, 75-cent Miller Lights, and everyone was just gettin', fuckin', "schwasty."[91] Um, not that I wasn't included in that bunch (laughs).

---

by one of her classmates where students were smoking marijuana, but declined an interview (i.e., was not included in the sample).

[91] A term used to describe someone who is very drunk; perhaps a combination of "shit-faced," "wasted," and "nasty."

His story illustrates how drinking that begins at a school-sponsored event can soon transition to bars steeped with their own traditions, such as cheap beer. These more public places tended to allow for a wider range of discourse and behaviors. Regarding drinking that had occurred since,

> [I]f it's a couple of us hanging out having dinner that's one thing, but I mean when it's in larger groups it does revolve around being at a bar, uh, it does revolve around—not like, not drinking to get drunk, but obv-that's—but people normally wind up doing that.

While larger groups of lawyers were generally associated with more aggressive drinking, another law school student reported that transitions from drinking at school to drinking at a bar could also be more intimate, and include faculty. She relayed how, following a symposium at school after which beers and wine were served, drinking continued at a bar; she then saw her professor leaving with a handful of male students that she knew to be more affluent than herself. Whereas she had grown up "in the boonies" hunting small game, and was the first in her family to attend college (and therefore professional school), the majority of students who continued drinking with the professor had attended private colleges, and some had suffixes suggestive of privilege (e.g., Adam Smith IV)—perhaps allowing them to feel more comfortable socializing with a superordinate. That is, privileges that predated their academic affiliation made them more similar to their professor than social statuses associated with their program might normally entail; at the very least, they were all white men. The next morning, she awoke to find that the professor, who was also a Dean, had sent out an email in the wee hours of the morning, well after last call, cancelling class later that day; she then heard from colleagues that this was necessitated by the amount of drinking he had done with his students after leaving the bar.

5.2.3 "Folklore" of substance use in profession

PhD students similarly reported departmentally-sponsored drinking, including one program that had a "Happy Hour" where beer was served every Friday. Contrasted with MBA socializing that was geared towards "strengthening networking," PhD events were said to

“promote collaboration” with other students, but also facilitated different types of interactions with professors. During these events, “alcohol [is] freely flowing. I’ve seen drunk professors try to pogo stick and fail at this party, it’s not just the students who are enjoying themselves.” Furthermore, several PhD students in the same department indicated that their weekly or annual events had storied histories—such as the “department tradition of taking the afternoon off” on Fridays—that they felt connected them to their predecessors and mentors:

> For example, there are a couple of professors in the department who, um, back in the [19]80s—ya know, once a week there is always “Happy Hour”—and after “Happy Hour” they would (mimicking another person’s voice) “smoke a joint in the fume hood” so that the smell wouldn’t carry everywhere. So they’d use the laboratory fume hood, and, like, stand around it and pass a joint around.

Unlike the smoke and smell, word had spread about how an Emeritus Professor had incorporated marijuana into the weekly “Happy Hour” using a tool designed to help safely conduct research experiments with noxious chemicals, as it was mentioned by more than one student. Examples specific to the department and more general to the field were cited as relevant for understanding opportunities for use, including with professors. All of these stories could be shared among classmates, frequently with a joint or drink, though this was not true in all Neuroscience departments: a student at a different university likened his mentor to “Chairman Mao,” and rarely socialized with the majority of his classmates, sharing a beer on rare occasions, let alone the marijuana and mushrooms he grew.

The tradition of substance use among lawyers was portrayed in a less positive light. A First Semester JD student remarked that, though he "had read articles about alcoholism among lawyers, … they specifically told us” about the related issues during orientation:

> There’s definitely a proclivity towards alcohol use I think in the legal field. I know, um, I know that there’s lots of—I think it’s called “Lawyers helping lawyers”—I know alcoholism tends to become, uh, a problem amongst attorneys. So they have organizations that help, you know, counsel and help people get them through that.

On the one hand, the program warned incoming students about excessive drinking in the profession early on, and students in other disciplines did not report formally discussing

substance use during orientation. Yet, on the other hand, the first few weeks involved lots of socializing with alcohol. For example, a student attending another law school witnessed a different version of “Lawyers helping lawyers” that also pertained to drinking: an event during which law school professors replaced the bartenders and served their students drinks for an hour (i.e., physically going behind the bar at a public venue and making drinks). Many students took this opportunity to buy shots to down with their professors, a different kind of Socratic questioning. Their orientation had also included a presentation on alcoholism in the profession.

Even among MBA students who felt they socialized with classmates relatively infrequently, there was a sense that others were doing so with tenacity, and a more general “folklore” of substance use in their profession. While alcohol and marijuana were used to facilitate business deals and perhaps innovations, respectively, it was less clear if cocaine was being used for purposes of work. Regarding alcohol, the European Corporate MBA—interviewed while his classmates enjoyed happy hour—explained that business deals were often closed over “long dinners or lunches with a huge amount of wine and even shots, liquor, whatever,” adding that this was “part of the culture” in parts of the world where he had secured a job and would be doing business. The Social Entrepreneurship MBA had worked in a “really well resourced and innovative” firm where a few people who were part of the creative process were known to use marijuana. With cocaine, even among MBA students that did not use it, there was a general sense that their classmates were likely doing so. The Management Consultant MBA student who had never used cocaine and had not witnessed it being used directly by colleagues in graduate school still “suspect[ed] it is [being used], but, um, I think people are just more covert about it than they were in college.” When pressed as to what made him think that cocaine was being used given that he had not seen it happening, he added:

> I just always heard that cocaine use was very prevalent in intense business environments, and I never saw it at work either, but I heard that it was happening among some of my coworkers. … People saying “our coworkers are doing it,” … hearing that someone in particular was using cocaine… And… it was often like folklore that it was happening among, um, folks in investment banking. So… based on that hearsay, I

> assumed that it was going on in those circles, and those are the same, those are the same type of people that end up at business school.

He therefore inferred that it was probably being used by some of his classmates based on historical knowledge derived from the media, popular culture, and his work experience, where the cocaine use made sense to him as an explanation for the ability of some colleagues to work long hours into the night. As it turns out, one of his classmates—the European Corporate MBA—did report having used cocaine with "five to six classmates" in their program, so his hunch was correct. However, it was not used in the context of work, but for partying at clubs, and they tried not to tell anybody. Perhaps students heard some of the details through stories. Overall, because "so much of the ethos I think of business school is like this hard-charging, leading kind of get it done mentality," it seemed to the Management Consultant MBA that cocaine and alcohol were more compatible than marijuana for this type of student and program. A PhD Neuroscience student referenced a similar idea when she commented that cocaine "would be easier to get if I hung out with bankers and lawyers." This was based on knowing bankers and lawyers who continued going to clubs more conducive to stimulant use, and hearsay from friends who would say things like: "'my friend who is a banker went to this party and snorted cocaine off of a hooker.' Not a 'hooker,' but, you know, like, snorted cocaine off someone (laughs)." Social scientists tended to prefer marijuana and different music scenes, and Neuroscience PhDs also sought out experiences with hallucinogens.

5.2.4 Additional discoveries and occasions

Complementing school-sponsored events, classes that involved group projects provided another reason to meet with colleagues at the bar. The Master's in Urban Planning student offered an example of how the students in her Wednesday evening class "all go to the neighborhood bar after class and have drinks." She explained how this came about:

> [T]here are these two guys who are the designated leaders of the class, I guess you could say (smiling and laughs)… And they're both smart and outspoken, and … this

> small class is now split into three groups, and they're team leaders of two of the groups, and there is a team leader for the third group. And so they just sort of sent out an email to the whole class saying, "Hey guys, I think it would be great, 'cause we're gonna be working on this project together all semester, that"—ya know, that's basically our grade, this project—"if we all got to know each other better. Let's go to the neighborhood"—it's just down the street from school—"let's go to the bar after class every Wednesday."

Though she had not been attending since the first week due to previously scheduled "dinner with friends … at a restaurant we'd been wanting to try," she felt people were generally excited about the opportunity to get to know their classmates. For students in shorter one- or two-year programs, particularly those some years removed from college who had professional work experience, were in relationships, and had other networks of friends, they were aware of such informal social happenings, but were less likely to be the driving forces behind them. Younger students seemed to pursue professional socialization more aggressively, and those with less work experience felt a greater need to make connections with others interested in similar issues.

Seemingly innocuous events on campus (i.e., those without any alcohol involved), including classes and job recruitment presentations, also helped students become aware of colleagues who might use drugs. A Criminology PhD student who had not revealed her marijuana use to anyone in her current program—but had smoked marijuana with colleagues and a professor during her Master's (see "Segmented identities")—recalled a new professor essentially beginning the first class of the semester by asking: "who here has smoked marijuana?" Though the question elicited a few moments of pensive looks as students waited to see if others would self-identify as users, it did not surprise her that nobody raised their hand. A similar interaction was described by the Social Entrepreneurship MBA in the context of talking about how marijuana came up with classmates in conversation:

> Interviewee: (8 sec pause) I'm trying to think, like, more generally. I guess, uh, like, maybe people travel—more jokingly, people are traveling to different places, like if people are going to Amsterdam on their travel or things like that (Oren: right) (both laugh). But… what else was I going to say… oh, there were, the government agencies—like the CIA and FBI—were recruiting applicants (Oren: right). And they have very strict rules on past drug use, so there was kind of a funny moment where like a number of us in a room acknowledged that we could not meet their hiring requirements, and it was clear that that was why. So I think maybe a more unspoken thing…

> Oren: So when the government agencies were there, people kind of self-identified to one another, ya know (makes a face with clenched teeth, tugs at collar)…
>
> Interviewee: Yeah, but in like a joking way, yeah, kind of like "uhh, well I can't be applying there" kind of thing, and it was clear that there was not like some GPA hurdles that people hadn't cleared.

Unlike the criminology student, who did not feel that anyone in her class divulged much, for the MBA, a possible opportunity to work in the U.S. Federal government instead became a "funny moment" to get a sense for which classmates had disqualified themselves from pursuing these careers for no apparent reason other than their drug use.[92] Similar to the South MD who seemed to imply her grandmother was going to Amsterdam for reasons other than the tulips, for jet-setting MBA students, "going to Amsterdam" seemed to be coded language implying that drugs would be used, as it was perhaps paired with a smirk. Overall, one third of the sample reported having used marijuana or hallucinogenic mushrooms while in Amsterdam. These examples reinforce the potential for pregnant moments in school settings, and that those in the sample had the financial means, desire, and savvy to obtain and use drugs while abroad.[93]

5.2.5 Marijuana with colleagues and mentors

The majority of socializing depicted so far has involved alcohol consumption at school events, with some reference to illicit drugs being discussed in academic and work settings.

---

[92] Given the diversity of her program, perhaps some did not meet citizenship requirements, though she did not mention this as a possible alternative explanation.

[93] Two thirds of the interviewees had used drugs while traveling abroad to countries and places perhaps less synonymous with drug use, including Africa (country not stated), Australia, the Bahamas, Canada, Chile, Denmark, England, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Spain, and Sweden. Drugs were easier to acquire in some countries than others. The children who "know the names of all the U.S. presidents" in Cusco, near Machu Pichu in Peru, also know where to get cocaine. "I bought some at a urinal." In Jamaica, they practically offered marijuana to an interviewee who traveled there in college before he and his friends had disembarked from the plane—it has since been decriminalized. In Japan, it was generally hard to come by, but was located in mountainous farming communities. In Spain, it is sold by vendors on the beaches of La Barceloneta. A friend had marijuana to offer in Ireland, cocaine was available at a house party with locals in Guatemala, and one student who flew to Denmark with hallucinogenic mushrooms purchased in Amsterdam tripped alone.

Socializing with colleagues, mentors, and alcohol in all of these ways increased the likelihood that illicit drugs would arise as a topic of conversation, but illicit drug use by colleagues was also discovered in other social settings, such as while attending conferences or house parties, and tended to be pursued in those places. In addition to using themselves, many lived with substance users, and also learned about classmates who used in this way. The following excerpts provide a range of examples of the transition from observing and engaging in drinking, to observing or talking about drugs, to doing drugs with colleagues and professors.

For some in the sample, based on what they observed at home, that a number of their classmates might use drugs seemed obvious: they lived with classmates who used drugs. The European Corporate MBA student reported that his roommate "loves" marijuana, information he divulged when asked about the last time he had smoked it, which had been the previous month:

> Interviewee: Yeah, I have a roommate who loves it.
>
> Oren: Yeah? (we both laugh)
>
> Interviewee: Yeah. So it's normal, there's no secret about it. Yeah, there's marijuana in my house all the time.
>
> Oren: So, uh, your roommate does it regularly, more regularly?
>
> Interviewee: Yeah.
>
> Oren: Is your roommate in school with you?
>
> Interviewee: Yeah.
>
> Oren: That's interesting. And you don't feel a desire to do it more often because it is available?
>
> Interviewee: No, no. Not at all.
>
> Oren: What was the occasion where you decided to do it a month ago?
>
> Interviewee: We were going to watch a movie, a comedy, with a couple of beers. Relaxing.

Based on how he had been describing marijuana up until that point—"I've never been a fan of marijuana"—this revelation nearly half way through the interview seemed surprising at the time,

precipitating a series of closed questions with short answers to situate this new information within the larger framework of the informant's narrative. Given his stance, it seemed odd that he would live with a frequent marijuana user. In the context of the present sample, it should not have been so surprising that he lived with someone who used drugs, as this was also true for many other students, including: an MBA student whose significant other smoked marijuana and sometimes abused painkillers; the medical school and Clinical Psychology PhD students who lived together; JD, PhD, and Master's students who lived with their pot-smoking boyfriends or girlfriends; an MD student whose husband sometimes used cocaine; several of the PhD students who shared apartments with fellow PhD student-users; and a Corporate JD student whose roommate was also in law school, had marijuana paraphernalia scattered throughout the apartment, and smoked during the interview while playing Batman on an XBox attached to a projector that cast a huge image of Gotham City on the wall. The Corporate JD student's roommate attended a different school, which—referencing the research topic—the informant noted was more prestigious than his (i.e., ranked in the top 10 by the US News & World Report). Both my informant and his roommate were towards the top of their respective classes, and both were on and had articles published in their school's Law Review. Overall, roughly two in five used more than their live-in significant other or housemate, the same proportion used less, and the remainder used roughly the same. In general, then, students who used drugs were likely to live with other students or significant others who also used drugs, and only a few students lived with non-users, including an MD, MBA, JD, and a few PhDs. Those that lived with partners who did not use drugs sometimes struggled with deciding how and whether to reveal their use of some drugs to their partner, or their frequency of use.

Aside from those who lived with users, going out to bars was most often associated with learning about substance use by fellow classmates. Bars were portrayed by a PhD student as "in between social spaces" that allowed students to commiserate about school, vent, and exchange ideas while having one, two, or uncounted drinks in a place that was neither a school

or home. This might occur regularly, if scheduled by the department, or once a week or every two weeks when informally organized by students. Amidst the drinking and discussions relevant to school and the profession, at some point students discovered that their classmates also use illicit substances. Attempts were made to identify these interactions by asking versions of the following question:

> Oren: So, can you tell about the first time you sort of realized that your fellow graduate students were, you know, enjoying some of the same extracurricular activities? How did that happen, how did you know?
>
> Interviewee: Yeah, that's a good question. Uhh, it must have just come up when we were drinking. Because it's not the kind of thing where I would, like totally sober, be like, "hey, you wanna smoke pot?" But, we went out and had, like, get-to-know-you bar nights and I'd have, you know, two or seven drinks, and I would be like: (confident) "I'm gonna go home and smoke pot!" And they'd be like, "We're gonna come!!!" (Stated melodically:) And that was iiii-iit! (laughs) So…

The above statement by a Neuroscience Postdoctoral student was indicative of the broad range of drinks some consumed earlier in their programs, as they either continued on with school directly after undergraduate or a brief stint in "the real world." While the Neuroscience Postdoc reported that she had likely introduced pot into the conversation, a first-year medical school student spoke about how, in his experience, someone else had put out the "feeler":

> (6 sec pause) People hanging out, drinking. Ya know, uh, nights going to end. "What are you doing later?" Just ask: "Do ya wanna, wanna go smoke some pot at my place?" Or "Wanna go smoke?" …. [The first time this happened was] Um, maybe three weeks. Two, three weeks [into the semester]. (5 second pause) It may have been approached to me, first, but then, ya know, you hang out with a few people enough…

A late-night smoking session precipitated by an evening of drinking was a consistent theme. Whereas for some, therefore, the bar space was more of a setting in which to engage in "shop talk" relevant to school and research, it could also serve as a "jumping off" point for involvement with drugs. For many in the sample who continued to smoke marijuana while enrolled in their graduate programs, they had "me to moments"—as one student put it—with classmates while drinking.

Bars were not the only setting in which students learned about their colleague's use of marijuana, and alcohol was not always portrayed as a prerequisite for divulging use. This was more common for students who broached the topic of smoking marijuana with colleagues through intermediaries, or in semi-private or private settings (Newman, 1972), such as a room or out in the open at "house parties" they hosted or attended, or at smaller "smoking sessions" in an apartment. Compared to meeting at the bar, "house parties" were likelier to involve more than just alcohol, and occur less frequently (e.g., once a month). For the First-semester JD student, the process of identifying classmates to smoke with was facilitated early in the semester by a mutual acquaintance:

> I remember the first time we did it, it was orientation week. … A kid in my class ended up rooming with someone I already knew, so I didn't really have to do the "dirty work" of figuring out if this kid smokes. We grabbed a bite to eat, then they asked "oh we're going to go blaze, do you wanna go blaze?" [I said] "Fuck yeah."

Over time, after commencing more privately, he developed a number of subgroups within his cohort that he felt comfortable and enjoyed smoking with. He described how he identified other users:

> … then I kind of got [i.e., understood] a couple homies did it. You could just tell by the way the conversation was going that they seemed to smoke as well. Uh, so, like, he touched on it, and then once you smoke with them it's all gravy. So I have a couple friends that I'll smoke with semi-regularly from school.

In addition to getting a vibe from classmates, he had also become "less rigid about who I will or won't say something in front of," the combination of which allowed him to identify them as fellow smokers, and vice versa. After the initial time smoking with someone it then became easier to smoke with them again. For him, "the most fun though are like the people that surprise you" when you discover that they share similar interests, and this tended to occur when using in semi-private places:

> Like, the people you would never peg to even think about smoking a joint, I had a couple of those. One is my homegirl now, and we hang out all the time—just 'cause she's clean-cut Asian, glasses, very, like (said quietly) soft-spoken and proper. And we were at a house party and I'm sitting up in my buddy's room and she makes her way up there and she sits down on the couch next to me [and says], like, "yo, pass that blunt." And I

> nearly—my jaw dropped to the floor. And uh, a girl who's kind of "nerd-herdy"[94] actually surprised me last night … [by] smoking in my friend's apartment before we went to the bar. … Uh, actually but prior to starting smoking I asked [the host] if it was cool, like, did she think I had to worry about any of the people she had over?

While demonstrating how drugs can come up and be used with colleagues in multiple settings, alcohol was noticeably absent from these three stories, relative to others that led to discussing or using marijuana with classmates, though its consumption may have been obvious so as to not require mentioning, or not perceived to be relevant. In the above excerpts, weed was characterized as a way to establish a common interest with a classmate, meet new people, or identify with them in new ways. Still, there was some caution about disclosing use, or to observe proper decorum, as evidenced by the question posed to the host (see "Segmented identities"). Others did not display similar caution, such as a PhD Neuroscience student who, when asked, "So how did you come to meet people in other departments, in other areas?", quipped: "When people ask me this I laugh and I always say 'I've always met people, and the people I've remained friends with, I've met smoking weed.' And cigarettes." Regardless of the spaces in which marijuana is used, therefore, it is valued for its ability to add a new dimension to social interactions and enhance impressions of classmates as perhaps more complex than initially assumed.

Marijuana can also add a new dimension to interactions with professors. A house party hosted by her mentor provided such an occasion for a Neuroscience PhD student. First, she described the laboratory environment as very "close-knit," as they work together most days of the week collaboratively and see each other a lot. "Where my advisor is concerned," she commented, "work is work. … Smoking with her didn't change anything, professionally. It didn't change anything with her because we would drink with her, with her husband." She then spoke about their first time smoking together, portraying the participation of her mentor in her social life:

---

[94] One who tends to associate with a herd of nerds.

> [I]t was a farewell party for an old labmate … I think we were all drinking, and at some point there was chatter—maybe now less so in my lab, but at that point in my lab everybody smoked—and so we were talking about something and then [my advisor] said, ya know, "why don't we smoke now?" … in fact my advisor was the one who was very interested, and she drove someone back to her place to pick up weed [to] bring [back] … And so then we went, I rolled a joint, and then we smoked it. Not much, just a little bit. I think most people, at least people if you're not used to it, people get social paranoia, so yeah, just a couple of drags.

Her statement reinforces the normalization of drug use in an environment constructed in such a way where opportunities for use are nearby. A special occasion and drinking helped her to discover her mentor's willingness to use marijuana socially, a spur-of-the-moment decision that contrasted with the typically stern and regimented manner that she displayed in her lab. In this sense, she learned that people have other sides to them that they do not ordinarily show, and was also able to exhibit her own abilities (i.e., how to roll a joint). Noting that some smoked little highlights the tenuous transition from being comfortable spending lots of time with people while working, and even drinking, to doing so while "high." She continued:

> I was surprised when she was very enthusiastic, that I was surprised [by]. But at that point we'd had, you know, we'd had a lot to drink, and it was very sort of chatty, friendly. And like I said, we don't have very many—work is work, but socially when we're out, we don't have very many of these sort of divisions and so, she's heard embarrassing stories about everyone, we've heard embarrassing stories about her. Like, an undergrad threw up all over her bathroom, that… it didn't feel like it was that huge [of] a jump from our usual interactions at the time.

The number of embarrassing stories already on the record helped allay fears that this encounter would potentially dint otherwise flawless identities. The bathroom had already been sullied by an undergraduate at a previous party, which was not presented as problematic, but rather as de-problematizing other forms of substance use with graduate students. While it was not a huge jump socially, the demarcation between work and social spaces remained firm. For example, the student had access to Ketamine in her laboratory, but had not taken any because her career interests and the professional reputations of her colleagues outweighed her desire to pilfer the drug, which was carefully regulated.

As there can be fewer private spaces when traveling, conferences provided

opportunities for participants to observe colleagues and professors drinking, and sometimes more, A Literature PhD whose professors spoke about their own experiences with alcohol in relation to course material relayed what he saw while attending two conferences:

> I was at a grad student conference at a major university and everybody was working hard. And then, afterwards, there was an extremely rowdy party where people ended up getting completely "lit" and dancing on the table, and there were people smoking pot outside. And I'm just like, "Oh, ok, this is what a lot of my colleagues are doing," and, like, "this is, this is a sanctioned kind of situation." … I was [also] at a major conference that was not for grad students that was in my home town so I was … kind of more mobile and more knowledgeable about places where things might be happening. And I happened into a bar and saw like, five senior professors who were drunk as skunks. And so it's just like, "Alright," [that] kind of helped me to crystallize the fact that I am not alone in these, sort of, issues, and that I may even be in better shape than a lot of other people are.

Seeing fellow students drunk and high at the first conference, and then professors at the second, provided a different perspective on professional socialization outside of the department by those affiliated with other schools. This reinforced what he knew from his own experience smoking marijuana with those in his cohort, where he was "not looked at askance" when he brandished a joint at a party he hosted early in the semester. Others in his discipline did not appear to mind being seen more publicly smoking marijuana, perhaps indicating that they did not have the same inner-battle about their relationship with marijuana (see "Professional discourse and leveraged expertise").

5.2.6 Cocaine with colleagues and mentors

Students in the sample had a range of experiences using cocaine with colleagues, advisors, and professors. Similar to marijuana use, opportunities to use with classmates usually arose in bars, but also in semi-private "house parties." A JD student who had "probably … blown cocaine twenty or thirty times" in his life since first trying it his senior year of high school, most frequently as a college junior and senior, explained his experience using cocaine with colleagues:

> I've blown cocaine with two or three friends from law school, but not consistently, and it's not even something that really stands out in my head. … I guess, they would be the kind

> of folks who are simultaneous gunners and focused students and also folks who like to crank the party up a notch from time-to-time, but there aren't many of them. … I guess it came out in the sense that, I mean, it happens organically like anything in a party. I mean, the idea is that a friend of mine would be like, "Hey, I got this," or "I have my friend 'Steve' coming with this," and it would happen. … And I won't say "no" next time, but I don't need to go get that, that's not, that's not me.

As someone who had experimented with drugs early in life, "gone hard" in college, stopped using marijuana after five to six years of daily use because he "got bored" with the drug, and continued to drink alcohol regularly, in regards to cocaine he felt "kind of lucky [that] it didn't turn me on to the point that I craved it." It was not a drug that he sought out—"I don't know any coke dealers"—but he had a large social network and was occasionally contacted asking for help locating someone who might know a dealer. He felt his colleagues sought him out when they had cocaine, or let him know that they had some, because he was a "sympathetic guy" willing to hang out with someone who was "having a tough time, or they want[ed] to 'party on'—those are the two ends of the spectrum" of people who use cocaine. Whereas law school "wasn't professional, it was all social," as he entered the workforce he planned to keep his cocaine use "absolutely" separate in his next professional setting. The sample includes at least one JD, MD, PhD, MBA and Master's student who reported using cocaine while enrolled in graduate or professional school.

During the final weeks of her Master's degree program, a female PhD student recounted how she had used cocaine with a classmate during a break in class and, on a separate occasion, with the wife of her advisor. This participant had "tried every drug I've been in the presence of," including ecstasy 8-9 times, acid 4-6 times, mushrooms, peyote, hashish, years of regular marijuana use, and semi-regular cocaine use during her Master's degree. She used the most cocaine during "a period of time, maybe two or three months, where it was every single weekend, multiple times, and then maybe even during the week." She acquired her cocaine from a female dealer:

> [M]y best girlfriend, my closest friend that I was doing the program with, one of her friends sold it. And we would hang out with her a lot… [The female cocaine dealer]

> would always have it and it was always just like, “Alright, let’s call her.” Ya know, and it was like, she would have it on her, wherever she was. You could just call her, and she’d be like, “Oh, I’m here now. Just come over.”

Money was not an issue, and cocaine and marijuana were everywhere: “I’ve never seen so much accessibility to cocaine.” She used cocaine to socialize, as a substitute for Adderall when her boyfriend stopped filling his prescription (i.e., she was taking medication prescribed to him), and during visits to the bathroom at the casino—“there would be some days where I’d lose *a grand* at the casino and just be like, ‘eh, whatever, I’ll just go.’” On one occasion, she reported using cocaine in an on-campus bathroom with her colleague in the midst of giving their final presentation to the class:

> I remember my girlfriend and I presenting in a class, and then we were going to have a Q&A, but we took a break and we went into the bathroom and did a bunch of coke. And then went and did the rest of the Q&A for the whole class just… (sighs). I don’t know, and it went [well], you know.

Whereas others reported using marijuana on campus, including with University daycare staff who approached one student after smelling the aroma, before and during classes if they thought they would not have to participate, or before conducting an experiment in the lab or TAing a class, this was the only reported instance of cocaine being used on campus before a foreseeable interaction with classmates and possibly professors.

As her program drew to a close, and on the same day that her now ex-boyfriend told her that he had been reading her e-mails and texts, she did cocaine with the wife of her advisor, who was also a professor. There was much academic discussion in the department about drug policy, and she had been in social settings where faculty used while discussing drugs. At some point, she had revealed to her mentor that she used cocaine, becoming so comfortable that, on one occasion, after buying disappointing cocaine, she told him about it, to which he replied: “Well don’t you know you’re supposed to test the product before you buy?” Therefore, prior to the day that she used with his wife, she knew that her professor used cocaine, but other issues had made her less interested in using with him:

> He always used to say: "We'll get some, we'll get some, we'll get some and do it." But I felt like that was right around the same time that he, that he, like, him coming onto me was getting pretty intense and pretty uncomfortable, and so I had to make a decision to where I could only—I told myself, "Alright, I can only meet my professor in public places." Because he was a pretty noticeable, like… I mean, he was pretty well-known on campus and stuff. And so, I was like, "Ok, only in public places, never behind closed doors. I'm not going to his office alone, where he can close the door and try to make out with me. I'm not… gonna do that," um. He called me all the time, at all hours of the night, and… So I just wouldn't answer. If it was inappropriate, I wouldn't answer it. If it was during a time where I felt it was appropriate to be talking to my advisor then I'd answer it.

Though she was seeing a school psychotherapist about other issues, she was afraid to reveal these issues with her advisor to someone at the institution, as it was hard to predict how doing so would play out (see Glaser & Thorpe, 1986).[95] With what had transpired with her ex-boyfriend, the end of her time in the program fast approaching, and feeling comfortable enough engaging with her advisor to attend an event in his honor in a public setting, "I was kind of in the mode where I didn't give a fuck, I just didn't care." After talking to her ex-boyfriend on the phone, she showed up to her advisor's birthday party three hours late:

> Interviewee: So it was his birthday, and I went into the restaurant and the birthday party was kind of wrapping up but there was, you know, some lingerers. And I just remember seeing his wife—it was actually his 60th birthday, but his wife is *maybe* in her early 40s? And she had this big bunch of balloons, and I just remember pulling up, and she's walking across the street, and so I came in with her, and uh, my professor was really drunk—he was hanging out with this *duuude* who had this, like, red silk shirt on, and he had bleached blonde hair and, like, leather pants. And I'm *pretty sure* this was the cocaine dealer. And they—her and I are walking into the bar/restaurant—and then this silk-shirted guy and my professor get out of a car right in front of the place. And I [just noticed them]—I mean, just sniffing and sniffing and—so I knew instantly they were doing cocaine. So then we all went in, and I sat down next to my professor, and he took the cocaine out of his, uh, jeans pocket and put it in the back of my jeans pocket. And then his wife and I went to the bathroom and did it. So I guess I didn't snort it with him, but it was pretty much… And I actually did cocaine with his wife on a couple of occasions and it's mostly 'cause we were in a public place and, where do you do it? In the women's bathroom, you know, so…
>
> Oren: On a couple of occasions that evening?
>
> Interviewee: No, and then the next year on his birthday (laughs). We did it again.

Her late arrival, in addition to reinforcing what she was going through at the time, likely suggests

---

[95] Though this specific example did not relate to substance use, deciding what to reveal to doctors is an example of the "Segmented identities" of drug-using GAPSS.

others were further along in their revelry, but also that this was a lengthy party; in addition to stress from outside the setting, she perhaps felt the need to “catch up” or alter her state of consciousness to distance herself from other thoughts while bringing herself closer to surrounding behaviors. In this instance her advisor, who lived in an area of town known for the “swinger” lifestyle associated with open marriages, was seen with someone who looked like a cocaine dealer, and therefore the PhD student knew drugs might be available before they were provided. That she did not provide the drugs herself in spite of using regularly and easy accessibility indicates a willingness to use without planning to, though she might have attended thinking it might become available, just as it was again the following year. Overall, the larger context of her Master’s program experience, combined with the processual nature of the interaction described in the last excerpt, reinforces how relationships that might seem out of place in an academic setting instead become part of the regular scene.

While professional socialization tended to occur with familiar colleagues or professors, it could also happen on chance encounters with fellow professionals, and therefore never become a central part of the graduate school experience. A Neuroscience Postdoctoral student who had a visiting research position at a university spoke about how her husband’s penchant for schmoozing led them to meet a young professor in another department at the same institution, and her boyfriend. When the bar closed, the interviewee described how they invited the other couple over to their apartment to continue the festivities, which culminated in her trying cocaine for the first time with the professor’s boyfriend. Told while drinking our second beers in a swanky downtown bar after work, she prefaced the following story—relayed without pause during the interview but here broken down into five parts to facilitate commentary—by stating, in part, that “I’m really interested in how drugs act on the brain” (See “Professional discourse and leveraged expertise”):

> So we were talking to these people, and it turned out that this woman was a Professor at the university where I was a visiting student. She and I got to talking about, you know, academia, we were in the same academic environment, and the guy was cool. At the

> end of the night the bar closed and we were like, "Oh, would you guys want to keep hanging out and come back to our apartment?"—because we lived nearby. And they did.

The first section conveys how the interaction began organically with a little help from some alcohol and her gregarious husband, but then continued, with the two women realizing they could socialize about issues pertaining to their profession and institution. That they were both academics at the same institution may have played a role in the decision to invite them over for additional drinks, and in turn the acceptance of the invitation. So far, they are all drunk:

> So we drove their *Jaguar* back to our apartment—my husband drove because he was the most sober of all of us, and he was like, (haughty voice) "I'm driving a Jag-u-ar," and was like, "I hope I don't crash this into a wall" (laughs). It was like, three blocks away, so we just rolled down the hill in the Jaguar. We went up to our apartment and then we kept talking and had drinks. And at that point, um, I announced—as I often do at that time of the night—"oh, well I'm gonna (laughing) go outside and smoke some pot, does anyone want to join me?" And the boyfriend was like, "oh yeah yeah, I'll come with you." I was like, "great." So I went to my room, I packed myself a little bowl, and then I went outside on the balcony and I took a drag, and I gave him a drag.

Several stories were told by interviewees that involved combinations of drinking and driving, and drinking, using marijuana or cocaine, and driving, over distances short ("one mile") and long ("an hour").[96] Rarely did these trips end badly (see "Segmented identities"). Similar to the discussion in the bar, the idea to smoke marijuana also was portrayed as natural "at that time of the night," so she quickly passed over this more regular occurrence before describing her first encounter with cocaine. Now, in addition to drinking, my informant and the professor's boyfriend were high on marijuana:

> And after that he goes, "Ok, my turn." And he, like, whips out of his pocket this like, cocaine inhaler, which I didn't even know existed. It was like, a little tube that, like, you

---

[96] The interviewee who drove for an hour did so after a night of drinking, at which point she joked to a friend that "wow, I don't even know how I'm gonna get home. I need to do a bunch of cocaine right now."

> And he was like, "Oh, ok." And I guess he had some on him. So he, like, reached in his pocked and like put some on his key and like stuck it in my nose. I feel like every time I do cocaine I don't actually physically put it in my own body, somebody else does it for me. And I was like (quiet yelling), "WOAH, FUCKING GREAT. I'M GONNA GO HOME NOW." And I was able to drive. Not one of my best moments, but… I mean, it was a great drive. I was *so* alert, and I was *so* aware of everything happening around me.

> put cocaine into (i.e., possibly a "snuff bullet").[97] And, well A), I was drunk and high, so I was not really on the ball. But B), he didn't even give me a chance—he wouldn't even [ask], (impersonating accent, with staccato) "do-you-want-to-try-cocaine"—he was like, "try this!" And I was like (quiet shouting voice), "WHAT'S THAT?" And, I think he just, like, put it in my nose, and was like, "inhale." I was like, (quiet shouting voice) "OK!" And then I was like, "woah." For some reason, it was really strange that I had this experience: even though I had never done coke before, I knew what it would taste like. I was like, (lifts index finger) "that's cocaine." Even though I had almost never been in its presence before, like why would I know that? But I just knew, I was like, (quiet voice) "oh, that's cocaine." And then, he was like, "is that ok?" And I was like, "yeah." I mean, obviously, everything's okay at four in the morning when you're drunk already doing drugs (laughs).

Like other instances of learning about or doing drugs, alcohol played a role. Her account of first trying cocaine conveys how the opportunity emerged from the pocket of a relative stranger, and her willingness to try on such an occasion is attributed to her already altered state of consciousness and his use of a tool that facilitated the rapid and easy ingestion of cocaine. Issues that others in the sample thought about before trying cocaine—literally, how to physically get it up their nostril[98]—were rendered irrelevant, both because she did not have time to think about them, and because the "little tube" made it so easy to do, even for someone who did not know what it was. Nonetheless, perhaps informed by the method of ingestion and her PhD training, she knew it was cocaine. Her previous boisterousness shifted to quieter introspection as she began to feel its effects for the first time. Then, after their fleeting acquaintances left, she was under the influence of alcohol, marijuana, and cocaine, while her husband had been drinking:

> I just remember the whole time thinking, "this is awesome!" "I feel so awesome right now!" I just felt like so energized, and, like, it-it was hard to dissociate the cocaine feeling from the fact that I was drunk and high. And so, I don't really know what it felt like, I just

---

[97] See, for example, http://www.ebay.com/bhp/snuff-bullet ("Snuff Bullets," n.d.).

[98] By contrast, the South MD student's pathway to cocaine use in college was more unique because she had never ingested anything through her nose. While smoking marijuana was not a problem, she had to practice snorting cocaine in private before doing so in public:

> I was like, "ok, I wanna try [cocaine]." But I was scared of actually physically doing it. The actual doing was scary to me. So I decided to practice first by like crushing up a pill, I don't remember what it was, it was some kind of a [prescription] pain pill. And I remember learning. I was like more afraid of how to physically rather than the effects of it, which I thought—now looking back on it is interesting. So once I was able to do it, which it's not really that hard, I was like, "ok, I think I'd like to try cocaine."

> know that I felt, like, completely energized and really with it, and, like, really just like totally on my game. I totally could have, like, worked on a paper, you know? Um, and then after they left I was like, (yelling quietly) "Oh my god, [husband's name], I just did cocaine!" And he was like, "uh, no you didn't." And I was like, "I did! I didn't know I was doing it, but I did it, and it was really cool!" He was like, "that's ok" (she laughs).

As someone who used cocaine for the first time in her mid-20s—she noted that using cocaine "is opening a doorway that… puts you in, like, it's putting me a step closer to an area that I don't want to be in"—with most of her PhD training complete, she was interested in thinking about how it made her feel relative to alcohol and marijuana. Her comment about being able to work on a paper demonstrates the frame of mind she was in at the time, or during the interview (see "Professional discourse and leveraged expertise"). Though her husband did not use illegal drugs, she told him about her experience, again indicating that she had not been completely aware of the decision:

> So then we went to bed, and um… and just had… *sex*. I just remember, he was like, "you *attacked* me. You were like, (quiet yelling voice) 'WE'RE DOING IT *NOW*! THEN WE'RE DOING IT *AGAIN*!'" And he was like, I was like: "OH MY GOD, RIGHT NOW!," just, "AAAAH!" So, that was pretty cool. And then in the morning, he had to wake up really really early because he had to go away [for work] for the rest of the weekend. So he was going to be gone for 48 hours, and so it was 6 o'clock in the morning and he was like "alright, I gotta go," and I was like (quiet screaming voice) "NOT YET YOU'E NOT!" And we had sex again, and he was like "woooaah, crazy person!" (laughing) So, he was like "I guess that is a benefit to your drug use, but I also sort of feel like I got raped a little bit" (laughs).

The passage further illustrates that she did not completely remember the interaction, and her husband recounted parts of it to her. Contrasted with the Neuroscience PhD student who could not sleep after first trying cocaine and instead went for a run (see "Waiting until college or graduate school"), here the drug led to another kind of physical exertion. In the larger context of how she portrayed herself as someone who did not want her bosses to know about how regularly she used marijuana (see "Segmented identities"), it seemed she enjoyed the experience in part because of the drug effect, but also because her use was more or less isolated from professional circles. Still, that another academic was doing it likely made the opportunity to try coke more tenable. Her detailed retelling provides another way that advanced

students might come to try illicit drugs in the presence of other academics, yet in relative anonymity in a private space.

5.2.7 Hallucinogens with colleagues and alone

Unlike cocaine, which tended to be used in semi-private spaces, even those within more public venues (e.g., bathrooms), hallucinogenic mushrooms ingested during graduate school tended to be taken in public (e.g., at a festival) or in private (e.g., in an apartment) but then enjoyed by interacting with the outside world. A Neuroscience PhD spoke about his experience using LSD with a colleague who had never used it before, demonstrating their more scientific approach to documenting the process:

> With the LSD I brought back [from a music festival after trying it there], it was one of these things where my roommate had never done it too, and he's also a very smart individual. So we set up a day of tripping where we took the whole day off. It was a beautiful, sunny day, perfect weather, nothing to do for twelve hours or whatever. And we brought notepads with us, and we basically went on a looooong walk around the surrounding area. Inside, outside, everywhere. All kinds of different things, just sort of experience as much different stimulus as you can. And we would take notes, and then my roommate's girlfriend accompanied us, and she was sober. And she was also taking notes—on us. And we took cameras and took photos and stuff like that. … And, uh, and so it was just sort of comparing her, my roommate's girlfriend's observations, with our own sort of experiences.

The Neuroscience PhD with experience using hallucinogens thereby introduced his friend to that class of substances in a way that framed the experience as a sort of collaborative research experiment. The use of notepads was inspired by the facilitating PhD's knowledge of the use of hallucinogens by predecessors in the profession (see "Professional discourse and leveraged expertise"), and complemented by pictures as a second data source, while the novice's girlfriend—also a graduate student—helped serve as a "control" to help interpret the "external validity" of their "findings" (my words, not his). It was portrayed as scientific, and not merely because scientists were involved, as it gave them a chance to experience and then discuss sensory and behavioral manifestations of changes in the brain. Furthermore, being outside,

exploring, and setting aside a good chunk of time were all important for being able to enjoy a "good trip."

So far, professional socialization involving substance use has been portrayed as occurring socially with colleagues and mentors. However, use with others can also facilitate or reinforce individual involvement, and many reported that they enjoyed using some drugs alone, particularly marijuana, if they wanted to think about work (e.g., "highdeas") or relax (e.g., television, internet, video games). Fewer reported using other drugs alone, though months after using with his colleague, the Neuroscience PhD took another dose of LSD, this time alone, highlighting the extent to which he was on campus in public while hallucinating:

> And I'd kept the LSD—it was on a blotter paper—in the freezer, and it had degraded with time, so it wasn't as strong the second time around. But it was the same kind of thing where I sort of went out into the world and tried to experience as much different stuff as possible. So I go out into the woods and find the bird observation platform among the trees. And then go into the science buildings, and look at all the cool geometries—there's some really interesting buildings on campus, for example, architecture. And, you know, one of the things when you take hallucinogens is that you are very sensitive to shape, and color. Um, so, and then just taking notes on my own, that kind of thing.

Taking notes just as before, he felt safe out in the open, not reporting fear of being "caught" or running into someone he recognized while "tripping," in contrast to others who avoided even marijuana use at times for fear that they might run into a professor on their insulated university campus. For those that did smoke on campus in search of the "sneaky thrills" (Katz, 1988) that doing so afforded, the effects were more fleeting and shakable than those of LSD. Transitioning from natural displays outdoors to more curated displays inside, interpreting the blended construction of nature and man-made structures became a focus:

> I distinctly remember looking at one of these glass and concrete buildings that was all sort of straight lines. And my perception of it was kind of like an exploded view. If you've ever seen these diagrams where they, they sort of take apart a mechanical component, like a drill or something. And you see all of the parts sort of, in the same spatial relationship, but exploded? So that's sort of how I saw the building. And, it was sort of like an observation of my own mental visual perception. Like, I was seeing how my brain put this perception of a building together from its component lines. And that was very interesting to me, as a sort of visual neuroscientist.

The Neuroscience PhD's statements about involvement with drugs were bookended by referencing the relevance of such visual experiences for his professional interests. The visualizations were informed by the training he had received—literally, how his brain had been "wired" over time to think about what he interacted with—and interpreting what he saw while hallucinating was of professional interest. Similar to how he transitioned from taking the drug indoors, to outside, back inside, and then outside again, the process of taking LSD began with a conscious internal decision to do so that in turn opened his eyes to features of the external environment, which were then internalized and reflected on before again putting it into the larger perspective, e.g., "like an observation of my own mental visual perception." Another student referred to the experience as illuminating "the relatedness of all things." While both cocaine and hallucinogens influenced perceptions of surroundings, whereas cocaine effects were portrayed as emanating from within—"energized"—those experienced after taking mushrooms were shaped in large part by external factors that in turn led to introspection. Though PhD students were no more likely to have used hallucinogens during college than other advanced degree students in the sample, they were more likely to have done so since, including while in graduate school, e.g., "maybe once or twice a year." The same seemed to be true for other hallucinogens, "whippets" (nitrous oxide), and marijuana, but less so for cocaine or ecstasy, the latter of which was reported as rarely being used.

5.2.8 Colleagues as open books

Some reported being very open about their substance use, not just in the interview but also with most anyone who asked. This was particularly true for a few PhD students who smoked marijuana with regularity and used other drugs during graduate school. In addition to the student who was not shy about telling colleagues that she met people smoking weed, a Clinical Psychology PhD student knew a great deal about the substance use histories of those in his program. This emerged when I asked him to talk about how his use was perceived by

those around him:

> Depends on the person… other graduate students I don't think they really bat an eye. They probably think, like, "wow, how does this person get away with smoking this much, because I have too much work?" And, you know, I have the same amount of work, I just use it during my downtime, I guess you could say with pot. I've definitely talked to other grad students about using cocaine as well. Uh, which they've experimented with. And it's funny, the most raaandom people, the people that don't even like smoking [marijuana] will tell me about their experiences with coke, or, like, ketamine; that's another one I was very surprised to learn. This person that doesn't seem to like pot—or, I'm not sure if she's ever smoked—has done coke a bunch of times, special K, is that ketamine?

For him, it seemed odd that someone would use cocaine or ketamine but not smoke marijuana, which perhaps made it hard for him to imagine what they might think about what they knew of his usage patterns. Similar to the JD who enjoyed learning about and smoking with colleagues he did not anticipate would use drugs, the sense that it was hard even for drug users to identify other current users, let alone predict their past experiences, is noteworthy. The Clinical Psychology PhD reported having smoked marijuana with all but two in his PhD cohort, as one was a recovering user, and the second "always pregnant." Classmates spoke with him about a number of drug-related issues, such as how to prepare to pass a drug test (e.g., before getting a job doing research on substance users), or letting him know they wanted to "hang out" next weekend, which invariably meant they wanted to smoke his pot or help procuring some of their own. Compared to the interactions discussed in the next section, then, for some students, like this PhD, socializing was often akin to "Get a few drinks in me and I'll tell you anything." Though he was not drinking during the interview, we did eat pizza, and he was very forthcoming, especially relative to a few participants who did more to maintain their "Segmented identities" while participating in a research interview.

5.3 Segmented identities

Professional socialization provides opportunities for students to combine or keep career and recreational interests separate, and interactions with colleagues and professors can be instructive in learning when and how to do so. This section considers how and why users may

make efforts to keep their drug use more or less to themselves, thus avoiding informal and formal sanctions stemming from involvement in illegal behavior. Who is kept away from certain information, in this case specific to substance use, can range from loved ones, to colleagues and mentors, to health professionals and police. Different forms of drug use, such as cocaine at a bachelor party, may not be relayed to a significant other or doctor, and methods for segmentation can also vary. The preceding sections have included a number of examples of how students differentially know about substance use by other members of their families and professional networks. Here, attention is given to more and less successful segmentation strategies, "close calls," and interactions with the criminal justice system.

The reaction to students who are unable to control their public consumption elucidates the role of identity segmentation, as such behavior is often noticed by colleagues. Students sometimes push the limits of permissible drinking in graduate school, including at school-sponsored events, with less successful segmentation noted by their peers and the administration. This was true across disciplines. In addition to aforementioned JD students getting "schwasty," and medical school students after exams, PhD and MBA students had similar experiences. These could lead to informal or formal sanction, such as the Management Consultant MBA student whose colleague's performance during orientation left an indelible impression more than a year later:

> Interviewee: Orientation… people really test their limits. ... So I remember at our orientation seeing, you know, there was a bowling event in which alcohol was served, and then a club event with alcohol and dancing. I remember seeing someone who, uh, who uh, had had way too much to drink, and couldn't, couldn't stand up in the line [to the club]. I think in orientation there was sort of an understanding or expectation that that happened. So there are orientation leaders who are on the watch for that. So in that situation they herded that person into a taxi and sent them off. So, yeah, people do go overboard, but not a lot.
>
> Oren: Did that change your opinion of that person?
>
> Interviewee: (surprised by realization) Uh, it did, actually. I still see that person around, and I still remember that… but I don't know, I've never, like… outside of maybe an off comment the day after, I don't remember that ever being discussed again, so… I don't

> know if there are lingering effects. I did remember that one instance, because that's one that stands out as a particularly egregious instance.

On the one hand, second-year students representing the school—perhaps based on their own experience—seemed to expect that orientation would lead to such inebriation and quickly dealt with it unceremoniously, but on the other, he was unable to forget such a display of an inability to manage oneself, let alone a business. PhD students attending several Ivy League institutions reported cases where drinking that started at school-sanctioned events led to behavior that then had to be dealt with by the administration. For example, the Literature PhD noted there were people in the department "with consumption problems" that "led to talks in other settings" about their behavior at events associated with the school; fewer people were getting drunk now, at least that he was aware of, which he attributed to the changing cohorts. Another informant described a classmate of his—a PhD student—who had a run-in with police for trespassing while drunk and also got in trouble for "groping" prospective students, which also led to discussions with faculty in the department. Informal sanctions were also applied by students, such as the aforementioned off-comment heard by the MBA, and PhD students who staged an "intervention" with a colleague who consistently brought flasks of hard alcohol to the "Happy Hour" that usually only involved beer, telling him: "No one likes drunk you. Everyone likes sober you." Therefore, both formal and informal sanctions were extended in attempts to control drinking. There could be negative repercussions when people were unable to distinguish between social drinking with fellow professionals and drinking that led to behavior that was inappropriate for the particular social space, and others. In this sense, departments and colleagues policed themselves.

It was also possible to learn about classmate's drinking patterns through indirect observation and inferences based on interactions that occurred in classroom settings or were associated with school. The Master's in Urban Planning student was supposed to give a classmate a ride to an early-morning fieldtrip:

> … a lot of the kids in my program are younger, and actually we had a fieldtrip one Saturday morning and one of the women who I was supposed to drive on the field trip didn't show up because she was so intoxicated the night before and turned off her phone, which was her alarm.

Unlike the Management Consultant MBA student who did not reserve judgment of his disoriented colleague, when I asked a similar question to the Master's in Urban Planning student—"How did you feel about her not being able to make it because she had been [drinking]?"—she replied:

> Oh. I actually really like her, so I felt okay about it, and she was really apologetic and wrote me a note—oh, an email—apologizing. And um, she felt silly, and it actually turns out she is going through a breakup with her boyfriend and, who knows, maybe that is what fueled her need to drink more than usual. Um, so I didn't feel, I thought it was too bad that, I mean, it was sort of important for us to be there, and she is actually in my small group, and she is probably one of the smarter people in my group so it was too bad she wasn't able to be there and so, like, we could discuss what happened. But other than that it wasn't really a big deal.

The Master's of Urban Planning student seemed more forgiving, and relayed many of the reasons that her colleague had seemingly provided for her absence. Whereas the MBA student noted that getting drunk during orientation was somewhat expected, getting *so* drunk was still out of place. Comparatively, her classmates had not observed the hungover Urban Planning student's drunkenness, as it occurred at a non-school event. Like the MBA student, a comment was made about the hungover student's absence: "one of her friends who was in the class was sort of like (uses a funny high-pitched voice) 'where *iiisss* she?'" Unlike the MBA, it caused her to miss an actual learning opportunity, though her absence went seemingly unnoticed by the older teacher. Clearly, a number of factors played a role in what kinds of drinking behavior were thought of as problematic or worthy of moral judgment. Perhaps it is likelier to be excused for those who are otherwise viewed favorably, or when out of sight. Or, what can be excused socially is still perceived as potentially problematic for professional interests, i.e., not necessarily wanting to hire or endorse someone who is enjoyable to hang out with.

Students who were comfortable drinking with professors sometimes did not want them to know they used drugs, as they felt that information might influence perceptions of their work

performance and be problematic professionally. A Neuroscience Postdoctoral student explained her reasoning behind not wanting to use drugs, specifically marijuana, with mentors or supervisors:

> And the other thing is just I think that people in authority positions, even if they're okay with it in theory, and they're like, "Ehhh, I used to smoke [marijuana] when I was in college," I still wouldn't want them to know [that I smoke marijuana] because on those days when, you know, I do slack off, or don't make it in to lab, I don't want them to ever think in the back of their mind, like, "Oh, is she a stoner?" You know, I want them to think, like, "Oh, she's like a normal person, she had to take her car to the shop this morning." You now what I mean? I want to be given the benefit of the doubt, and I don't want anybody to ever jump to the conclusion that any assignment I give them late or anything that I don't do a good enough job on it was because I was, like, (said ominously) "abusing substances," and not 'cause I, for whatever other normal reason, didn't get my work done.

Careful and thoughtful to segment her user identity because of the potential for professional backlash, she was attempting to avoid stigma associated with drug use, whereby "A person is reduced from a whole and usual one to a tainted and discounted one*"* (Goffman 1963: 3). As a young woman who planned to run her own lab—and had the track record and training to do so—it was important to keep this aspect of her life compartmentalized. Though she was willing to socialize with professionals outside her discipline and department, including on chance encounters, she had enough friends in other social circles, was outgoing, and married. Therefore, it was not worth the risk of losing "the benefit of the doubt" afforded to "a normal person" in the professional spaces where she conducted her research, implying that most of those who would be around her had been trained to view substance use as reflecting abnormal processes—likely of a neurocognitive nature. Her experiments literally involved "putting on the gloves," placing a thin sheen between her and the animals she sometimes worked with; she preferred a similar social buffer to prevent her substance use from coming into direct contact with coworkers.

The issue of how to segment one's identity as a substance user would seem more relevant for those who used illicit drugs more often, including those who used with colleagues but did not want professors to know. Trust played an important role in decisions to reveal

substance use, but could only go so far, and informants who used with colleagues were frustrated when their peers in turn told professors that the informants used drugs. A PhD student who had never discussed using drugs directly with any of her professors—"maybe primarily because I was not trying to get involved with professors in the first place"—spoke about how her classmate's relationship with a professor led to her being "outed" as a smoker:

> It's just that we had, some, there were some friends in the class [who] made actual, like, friendships with the professors… in a way that I felt was kind of inappropriate—more on the part of the professor. Like, I don't care that you're single, still, and so you feel—like, even though this student was 30, and the professor was, like, 38, and they were both single—so … they were sort of in the same demographic in *that* sense. But in the other sense, it's like, professor and student, so, just, find other people to drink with, and I always sort of thought that was weird that this girl was totally cool with it.

In this case, a female classmate and female professor would socialize together outside of class. Though they shared similar characteristics in many ways, their different academic rankings made the relationship seem inappropriate. Furthermore, their blurring of social boundaries in turn made the informant more transparent; she portrayed a typical interaction where her classmate would invite her to socialize with their professor:

> [My colleague would be] Like, "What uuup! Me and professor so and so," like, "we're gonna," like, "drink some whiskey, and then we're gonna get high!" She was like, "Wanna come?" And I was like, "Nooo, not really." Just because she's like [a professor], and even though you're telling me this, [which means] she's down with it, I still just don't want to do it with her. Because… she's a student, she's a professor. But it was too late because that particular friend had already told her [professor friend], "Oh yeah, [interviewee] likes to smoke, so we'll invite her too." And I was like (exasperated face)… and I was kind of annoyed at her. I mean, it wasn't a problem, because the professor, like I said, was down with it, but … that was a line I didn't want to cross.

The above excerpt provides contrast to earlier and upcoming portrayals of PhD students who broached the topic of use with their professors, or were eager to seek them out after learning of their use, typically while drinking at a departmental function or at a bar. Here, even after learning that the faculty member was "cool with it," the informant was not.

Other times, though students initially did not want to cross the line and reveal marijuana use to a professor, they eventually did. Here a student talks about how her classmate during her Master's program revealed her as a marijuana smoker to their professor, while at the same time

allowing her to discover that a professor—who wanted to become Chair of the Criminology Department—used as well. This occurred after walking with a few professors to a corner store frequented by the campus community; walking there with her professors seemed innocuous. A few of the professors left shortly after arriving at the store, at which point the other student, with whom the interviewee had smoked marijuana in the past, seemed to think that she already knew that he and the professor were planning to smoke marijuana, and began to make innuendo about doing so:

> The other graduate student was like, "Oh, you joining the party?" And I was like, "Whaat? What are you even talking about? No, you crazy." 'Cause I'm like, "You stupid dawg, shut up!" … But, um, he just kept saying, "You coming to join?" He was like, "Well, welcome." And I'm like, "Do I need to pull out my phone and text him, like, 'shut the hell up?'" Because what is going on? … And this other graduate student takes out a joint, and I'm just thinking like, "Friend, steady!" And he's like: "You gonna smoke?" "Nuh-uh!" I'm looking like, "Oh *gosh* no!" (laughs). 'Cause I don't know what you doin' and the professor is looking at me, like, like, [making a] "You smoke?"-[face]-type-deal. And I'm like, "Professor, you know this other student is crazy." And Professor was like, "[nickname for interviewee], I didn't know you smoked!"

Clearly, the informant did not want to smoke in the presence of the professor, or express her familiarity or interest. Even after the Professor indicated that he now understood that she too smoked, she continued to deny:

> And I was like, "maaan, you know this kid is crazy!" Professor was like, "No, it's ok, we are ok," you know, "we family here." [I replied:] "Oh, ok. He still crazy though." Won't fool me! But the other student was laughing, he was like, "Oh no, we be smokin' all the time!" And I was like, "What you talkin' about, I didn't know you played this game?" But, him and the professor who wanted to be chair, another professor, all of them "float" together [i.e., "get high"]. … Well I was like, hell, "Well, ok, let's go for it!" So me and my Professor [got high,] started talking, and he started talking about what he wanted to do in the department. So, shit, we happy together, walk back to campus, "I'll see you tomorrow Professor!" Like, that was that. Period. And it's like, these highfalutin people. My professor ain't got no business smoking. I mean, to each his own, but it's like—yeah, he the Department Chair now. The others, all these Associate Professors, it's like… chiefin'. Oh, ok! Go for it then. Hey, it's all good. It happens. It happens.

Though it started off shaky, the interaction ended amicably enough, and she smoked with the Professor again in the future. After this episode, she learned about how her colleague smoked with multiple professors in her department, and others, all of which gave her greater perspective on substance use in the profession as something that was being done by successful scholars

and those well-liked by their peers (e.g., Department Heads). Comparing her Master's degree and PhD programs, the former "definitely had a closer-knit department, definitely, where even the idea that [substance use] could happen [seemed possible]," as she had Thanksgiving dinner, went out of town, and took trips to football games with classmates and professors. Whereas she had not used marijuana with anyone in her PhD program, she still commented: "I think it be going on in my department now, but I don't know."

Similarly, sometimes professors did not want to take the risk of using with students, but the blurred boundaries between school and home life appeared to become particularly pliable during graduate school for PhD students. Traveling to conferences provided new contexts where mentors could easily become participants in the social lives of their students, and substance use might seem more episodic and, therefore, less problematic. Several PhD students told stories about smoking or nearly smoking marijuana with professors at conferences after previously having discussed doing so on campus. Generally, students might know that their professors had used marijuana in the past—"Professors will candidly talk about, um, not current use, but past use of cannabis"—but were less sure about current use. The following excerpt shows how a PhD student came to learn about one faculty member's past use through a conversation his friend had at the weekly social:

> So, this faculty member was talking to a friend of mine at a department party. They were both drinking, sat together, and they were just sort of shooting the shit for a while. And it got to the point where my friend brought up smoking to the faculty member. And they started to share experiences about smoking. He [the professor] was talking about how he would, you know, use it a lot in graduate school, but it was something that was more accepted and people were more open about it where he went to school. And my friend said, "well, like, do you ever want to get together and do this together?" And the professor said he'd be very interested in that because he wasn't able to get a hold of any.

Ranging from small talk to sharing a desire to obtain drugs of his own, the passage reveals how some simply do not know where they can find drugs, whereas for others in the same community, buying drugs is "like going to a grocery store—a secret grocery store," as one JD put it. This

initial encounter where his colleague brought up marijuana use with the professor, after being relayed to the interviewee, set the groundwork for future discussions on the topic:

> So, um, my friend came to me, told me about this. So I confronted this [professor], actually, because I was at his house for some occasion, I don't remember what it was. Um, and we were in his kitchen and he brought it up, actually. And I said, "Well, I knew that this was something you've been interested in," and we basically shared some of our experiences for a while. But at some point, he said, "how do you get it, who do you get it from, how do you even know where to find it around here?" So, I gave him what little information I had, because as we discussed it's sort of hard to come by in that town. And, I told him I'd be willing to, you know, if he wanted to get together at any time.

His conversation with his professor on the topic seemed hopeful, and also revealed the potential for a new relationship between mentors and mentees: that of "buyer" and "seller," respectively. Though the student mentioned "if he ever asked me to get some for him I would have reservations about that," the main obstacle to sharing marijuana seemed to be the professor's wife, who "worried that if it ever came out he was using it at all, especially with students, it might really make it difficult for him to get tenure." However, an opportunity materialized at a conference, i.e., when the professor's wife was not present:

> And so, I was in a city for a conference—several months ago. I was with a friend who I had smoked with plenty of times who was also at this conference. He got a hold of some there in that city. Some weed. And, this faculty member was also at the conference. So we approached him and said, "look, we got a hold of some. We're out of town… if you're interested, wanna join us?" And he said, "Yes, I do." And then he contacted us back and said he was with a friend who didn't want to, and so he wasn't going to join us. He appreciated it, and was sorry that he couldn't. I assume that was true, I guess it's possible he made up an excuse for some reason.

The missed opportunity left some lingering questions, "But it-it's just sort of out there, and I like that." Another PhD student attending the same institution reported a similar pattern of events, but with a recently-tenured professor and a different outcome:

> [M]y roommate went to a conference where this same professor [who my roommate had previously spoken to about marijuana] was at, and it was in [a specific city]. This was immediately after this professor had gotten tenure. So, he says, they all ended up …, in the hotel after their night out, like, somebody had found some, found some weed. And he [the professor] barges into the room and is like, "what's up guys?" Uh, and he told them that, "Oh, I really like smoking it, but I didn't want to risk getting tenure, but now that I have tenure, we can blaze!" (laughs). So they ended up smoking weed with him in [that city].

These contrasting outcomes are indicative of the fine line between voluntary and involuntary disclosure and the nature of segmented identities. Regardless of whether the students are talking about the same professor or event, or through their stories exemplifying how similar interactions can produce different outcomes, that these issues are being written about reinforces the wife's reservations about the potential for diffusion beyond immediate audiences. As both the professor and student felt that having their substance use become more widely known could hurt them professionally, "there was this mutual understanding of discretion, you know, I don't think it was even something we needed to discuss." Here, therefore, there was some trust, but also caution, at least until tenure provided a degree of job security and a bit more "academic freedom" to use drugs.

However, when the need for discretion was not discussed, uncomfortable situations could arise. This could occur with professors and colleagues, or when using with childhood friends who had also become GAPSS. Several students in the sample reported having used drugs with professionals and advanced degree students who were not in their program. For those whose high school or college friends had continued on to graduate school, this occurred during vacations and visits back home, and sometimes required making decisions regarding how to incorporate new people into the social circle, including significant others. A student working towards her PhD in Criminology spoke at length about the interaction between her clique from home—who used a range of drugs including marijuana, crack, and powder cocaine—and a "bougy"[99] newcomer who had recently married a childhood friend, first describing the couple:

> Ok, so, there's an individual who graduated from my high school and he went to a State school, and so did his wife, and they both went to law school, him an Ivy League law school. He has a book out, and everything. … And you have Mr. Ivy League JD's wife, she's a lawyer, she has her own practice, all this good stuff. … they have major money … they some money makers.

[99] Bougy, a derivative of bourgeoisie, is defined on UrbanDictionary.com as "Of or pertaining to someone who is not only pretentious but believes themselves to be financially and physically superior. Those who succumb to elitist ideals" (UrbanDictionary.com, 2015).

Though many of her childhood friends held or were working towards professional degrees, there were also a number of "hood folk." Generally, Mr. Ivy League JD, along with his new wife, were the most successful among her group of friends from childhood. However, their hang-out sessions tended to be informal affairs in the sense that everyone was familiar with the other's drug-using proclivities, and felt like they could let their guards down on visits home. Therefore:

> When it comes to us getting together like that, we're real funny about extra invites … ya know, "this ain't like a regular cook out." Like, all of us, people gonna smoke whatever whatever yadda yadda yadda. But I'm like, she—granted we know him, and we met her, but not in this capacity. So everyone looking like, "no deal." … So all of us looking real hesitant, because she, yeah, she like a bougy chick. … Like, high-functioning.

The bougy chick's reaction to their behavior was portrayed as disapproving, as she seemed taken aback at what she was seeing. Based on how she acted upon arriving, others did not want to be involved in explaining themselves to her, or use in her presence, as she seemed more judgmental than interested in involving herself in this kind of cook out:

> I'm like, "I'm not gonna be there because I just don't, I just ain't gonna be in that type of [situation]"—because, granted, we knew her, but she was a newbie here. We all know how everybody is going to respond, we done did this before, things of that nature. So [Mr. Ivy League JD] was like, "no ya'll, she cool," but a lot of people fell back. … like, "that's okay [Mr. Ivy League,] you [go ahead with that]." People trying to go to the kitchen, you know, 'cause you gotta chat that up [to discuss what to do with the interloper]. Like, "What's really going on?" "She be dying" [at what she is seeing,] whatever whatever. "That's Mr. Ivy League, this is his wife, that's what he want to do"; he should of probably told her beforehand, instead of being like, "well, we'll just see when we get there." That's not one of them things you just be like, "oh, we'll see when we get there."

While annoyed with the bougy chick, she was not fully to blame, as based on how she was acting it seemed that Mr. Ivy League JD had not properly prepared her for the scene before they entered:

> But she was just like, "ya'll are serious," and was asking us what we did and stuff. And I remember that being a joke about, like [I turned to a friend and said], "well, aren't you in a PhD program? When do you graduate?" Because a few of us were in degree programs, [and there were] other professional people in here who are doing really good or on their way to doing well in their life. And she was like, "Ya'll are blowing, and sniffing, and, just what the hell is going on?" So, um I don't remember who said it, it was like, "you know, if you're not comfortable"—they were speaking to Mr. Ivy League, versus her—"you're the one who brought her here, so if that's going to be a situation, you

> definitely need to deal with that," or whatever. But she was like, "I mean, no, I'll try anything once." I was thinking, "Bitch, you ain't in undergrad no more!"

The bougy chick's use of a line that the informant associated with younger people evoked a strong reaction. Eventually, things calmed down after Mr. Ivy League JD snorted cocaine off the tray of drugs they passed around, and then his wife, after vacillating back and forth, also did a bump. The effect of her trying on those around her was noticeable:

> [Bougy chick:] "Oh, ok. Am I going to be able to stand up?" People laughing, "relax, get her some water, no alcohol." … I vividly remember him saying: "get her some water, no alcohol." And he told her, "just relax and enjoy, you'll be back to normal by morning." She sat on the couch and vibed, and seemed like someone we'd hang around normally. Everyone kept checking on her, "you straight?"; "you ok?" And she was like, "yeah, are you ok?" And she seemed like one of us, but she was high.

For this tight-knit group—"it's just a nice mix of us, but you wouldn't know"—that included young professionals, graduate students, and other childhood friends who used a range of drugs together, an outsider was quickly brought into the fold and cared for after she decided to join in their drug use. Perhaps due to the range of users in their social circle, "home is home," where "all this other stuff is stripped down" and "none of these letters or accolades are [important]… None of the other extra luggage that we've picked up [matters]." Demonstrating that she was willing to worry less about the legal ramifications of what she was a party to by breaking the law in spite of her legal career seemed to put everyone on a more even keel, reducing the social ostracism for both her and Mr. Ivy league. Her use of drugs was equivalent to letting her guard down, and trusting those around her, so the others reciprocated, and they enjoyed the rest of the day together.

Lawyer interlopers are only a few degrees removed from other legal officials, e.g., police, perhaps alluding to the risk of one's illicit drug use becoming known to authorities. Whereas the bougy chick in the last example was perceived as less judgmental after herself trying drugs, the same could not be expected of police officers students in the sample encountered during their substance-using careers. Though not all interactions with police occurred while under the influence of or possessing drugs, a number of them did. The following excerpts convey a range

of these experiences, from close calls to the one student who was caught driving under the influence.

Students had a number of run-ins with campus security and law enforcement while in college and since, but managed to avoid serious sanction using a range of tactics. However, none did so quite like the Neuroscience PhD student who, after a night of partying at clubs, was in the back seat of a car that her male friend was racing on a street by the beach when they were pulled over in the early morning hours:

> Interviewee: In my native country I have been in the back seat of a car that's been, you know, like pulled over for drunken driving or speeding or something like that. But nothing major. And, uh, we bribed our way out of it (chuckles).
>
> Oren: Oh yeah? Can you talk about that a little bit?
>
> Interviewee: Well (laughs heartily)… it's kind of ridiculous 'cause we, we had a friend back home who, uh, he wouldn't drink and he was, uh. He sort of had, he spoke the language very well and had a way of sort of—uh, like strong-arming the cops maybe?[100] And so, we would call him and he would, like, wear all the bling he had (laughing) in his house and come to talk to the police to like, I don't know (laughing)—scare them.
>
> Oren: What kind of bling did he have?
>
> Interviewee: Well, gold, right? 'Cause it, I dunno, it's like a signifier of a certain—whatever, it's like a way to sort of, you can get away with saying, "Oh, I'm so and so's [relative]," like, you know, "and this politician will be on your backside in a second if you don't let us go," and… [it worked]. … Yeah, well, this is the way things have functioned. I don't know if it's this easy there anymore, but bribing, yeah, it's been bad. It's been way over the line.

Though she recognized that her story might sound outlandish, the statement "we would call him" implies that this had occurred more than once. Gold was known to serve the function of avoiding social control, representing a threat that a higher power could be contacted, i.e., a controller of the social controllers. A form of social control she was not able to avoid was her mother: she told several stories of being driven home by drunken friends and being greeted at the door by her mother, who refused to provide her with a key to their home. While it is unclear when in her life this particular event took place, her drinking subsided in her senior year of college, and she

then moved to the U.S. for her Master's, where she saw marijuana for the first time.

None of the participants in the sample who had been pulled over in the U.S. reported similar "strong-arming," though others used social wealth, such as the PhD student who grew up in a small town. On one occasion when he was neither drunk nor under the influence of drugs, he was pulled over by the Police Chief, who was also his brother's high school football coach, and was allowed to leave due to his familiar last name. The parents of another officer in town—"he was like the guy that gave us the D.A.R.E. courses and stuff"—lived right down the street from the informant's parent's house, where his father grew marijuana in the back yard. He had also been pulled over several times in college while high, or with weed in the car:

> Interviewee: You know, I was pulled over several times when I was high. They were pulling me over to see if I was drunk and I always passed the sobriety tests. And they never thought twice about it, and, ya know, nor did I. I was the designated driver, so I smoked instead of drank (chuckle). … Um, never been arrested… no, I mean, I've had scares. I've had times where I've, like, just been pulled over for speeding or something and had pot in the car somewhere, or worried I, or someone else in the car, had smoked recently, and worried they were going to smell it and arrest me, or something like that? Never, never has come up, never has been a problem. Nope, I don't think I've had any altercation with the law.
>
> Oren: How many scares like that have you had, or how many times have you been pulled over when you've been smoking?
>
> Interviewee: There was twice where it was like, once was on a trip—a road trip from my college to my cabin I was telling you about, my summer house. Once I was driving cross country from my home town to Colorado to see another friend at college, and we just got pulled over in a state in the Midwest. And then twice when I was at college.

With experience passing a sobriety test while high, being pulled over while high or in possession of marijuana without incident, and interacting with local police, he continued to frequently combine marijuana and driving. Sobriety checkpoints were for drinkers. On another occasion, while caravanning to a festival, his friend in the other car was pulled over for speeding, "But he sort of stupidly had all his drugs sitting out right in the center console, and I think they were just seen," i.e., in plain view. He mostly attributed this to luck, as he also had drugs in his car, and

---

[100] This statement was phrased as a question, perhaps because she was searching for the appropriate word to describe what she had witnessed.

was going the same speed as his friend through a corridor where the police knew many were transporting drugs to attend the festival. Social privilege also played a role in insulating him from investigation when in the community where he grew up, perhaps when visiting his summer home, and apparently more generally, as he had never been arrested in the U.S. or internationally, where he once flew in the EU with hallucinogenic mushrooms in his pocket.

When social wealth was not available, then, it seemed respondents in the sample relied on a combination of luck, demeanor, and, on rare occasions, good-natured alcohol-inspired vivacity to avoid sanction. First, the following passage shows what happened when a student and her husband were pulled over after making an illegal "U-turn":

> A number of times we moved across the country for [my husband's job], and we've brought all our guns in the car. And we're like, "Oh, we're driving through [this state] right now and we're in huge violation of the law." There was one point where we got pulled over on one of our trips for, like, it was, like, really really late at night and we were lost, and so I think we, like, took an illegal left-hand turn. It was something stupid like that. And there was a cop, and he pulled us over. … we both looked at each other, and my husband was like, "Shit, I have three firearms!" And I was like, "Shit, I have marijuana!" (laughs). He's like, "shit"—"how are you officer? Hi." I was [thinking] like, "SHIT, we're so screwed!" (laughs). … He wasn't, like, being aggressive or anything, he was just like, "What's wrong with you guys?" Just wanted to make sure we, make sure we weren't shady. Because we could have been, but we weren't. … And we were like, "We're lost, how do you find such and such road?" And he was like, "Oh yeah, everybody can't find that road." And we were like, "Thank you!"

In the above excerpt, the interviewee and her husband were given the benefit of the doubt. While transporting guns and drugs across state lines, they may have been unfamiliar with the local laws regarding either, but after initial trepidation at seeing the sirens, knew how to pull themselves together and act "not shady" or worthy of arousing the suspicion of a police officer. Though they were out of place, being lost there was not unusual, and they identified themselves as having a familiar problem or excuse the officer had heard before from others who had made that turn. The issue of whether there were guns or drugs in the car was never broached.

In another instance, a student used a less measured approach during an interaction with a police officer that took place one year after college and did not involve a traffic stop:

> I got off of a train in [a major city], and I had to pee really really badly. And I asked in a couple of establishments, "Oh, can I use your bathroom?" And they were like, "No, get the hell out of here." So I went over to an area, like, a side street where there were a bunch of cars parked. And I went in between a car and a tree where I felt like I was like very shady. And I went really far out of my way to, you know, not do it somewhere people could see me. And it was an unmarked cop car, and there was an unmarked cop in the unmarked cop car. So I peed right in between [the cop car and the tree]. And he was like, "Excuse me ma'am." And I was like, "Ohh," [i.e., "hello there"]. And he was like, "Did you just urinate in the street?" And I was so wasted that I responded totally honestly, I go, (innocently) "No, no, I urinated in the gutter." Like, I actually was proud of the fact that I had urinated in the gutter and I thought that made it ok. And he was like, "I'm a police officer, ma'am." And I was like, "Ohh, yeah, well, officer, sir, I-I urinated in the gutter and not in the street." And he was like, "You know I can arrest you for that?" And I was like, "No-no-no, I asked in the pharmacy, and they said I couldn't use their bathroom." And he was like, "Are you intoxicated?" And I leaned, like, really far towards him and said, "if by intoxicated you mean completely retarded, then yes." I said that to the cop. And he was like, "Get the fuck out of here." Like, I literally was so wasted that he didn't want to deal with me (laughs). My friends told me what I had said the next day. I was like, "Wow, my absolute drunkenness saved me." I would have been arrested if I had been any less drunk.

Notably, her initial reaction was not fearful, and she did not seem scared or embarrassed, but rather she was able to pick out a technicality that allowed her to reassert a modicum of authority, at least in her mind, quickly regaining composure after being caught with her pants down. By accepting responsibility for peeing, i.e., "the act in question," but denying its "pejorative quality" by noting that it took place in the gutter, she justified her behavior (Scott & Lyman, 1968: 47).[101] Next, by indicating that she had tried to use the facilities at a local business, she denied full responsibility (Scott & Lyman, 1968: 47).[102] Rather than her public intoxication being problematic, her willingness to up the ante to "completely retarded" apparently worked, perhaps suggesting to the officer that pursuing the arrest might lead her to further diffuse responsibility across local businesses for not allowing her to use their facilities, or the city for not having public restrooms available. Being drunk likely helped in that she was able to convincingly argue that her behavior was a momentary aberration, though others are punished quite severely for similarly transient acts.

---

[101] "Justifications are accounts in which one accepts responsibility for the act in question, but denies the pejorative quality associated with it" (Scott & Lyman, 1968: 47).
[102] "Excuses are accounts in which one admits that the act in question is bad, wrong, or

Although it seemed beneficial in the prior example to reveal that she was drunk, in the following instance a student had to maintain her composure and not reveal that she had been under the influence of drugs after getting into a traffic accident. The front of her car collided with the broad side of a car being driven by an older woman as it pulled onto the main road from a parking lot—a "T-bone" accident. The narrative is broken down into sections to facilitate commentary:

> I was actually on my way to the dentist, and it was one in the afternoon on a Wednesday, or whatever. And I-I was actually smoking weed on the way to the dentist. Because I would usually do that, because it-it helped with the pain, you know, like, from doing whatever. And I was actually smoking weed—I mean, the accident, it, I was on the main road and someone pulled out in front of me and I wasn't speeding or anything (laughs slightly), ya know. But I was smoking weed, and I was under the influence.

In the first stanza, the background factors help in understanding that she was navigating a familiar road, following a regular routine that also involved taking drugs. The accident created a jolt as she was going through these motions:

> And when that accident happened *everything* from the car, just, it was almost like, ya know, everything got thrown up and strewn, like rained on me, ya know, from the back and everything. And I had had my weed, I'd had it in a little plastic green Nalgene container. And I had that, my pipe, and my 1-hitter on my front seat. And when I, when everything stopped, and I realized I got in an accident, I looked at the front seat and (said as if reliving realization) nothing was there. And I thought, "Oh my gosh."

The second and third stanzas are remarkable in how they convey the unfolding nature of the accident, movement and frozen moments in time, and the informant's thought processes. Her first realization was that her drug paraphernalia was not in its normal location. She then took in more of the scene, before her attention shifted back to locating the drugs:

> And so (takes a deep breath), I was in shock, and so I got out—the older woman [who was driving the other car] was bleeding and screaming all over the place. So, I'd, and then I remembered, "Holy crap," like, "I know this accident isn't my fault, … but I will get nothing [from the insurance company] if they find weed. It'll *instantly* be my fault, and I need to take care of that *right* now." And so I got back into the car: there was a, um, all-women's retired women's golf tournament going on *right* at the corner. They saw it all happen, so [of] course, it's just, you know, twenty older women golfers come and they're trying to physically pull me out of my car. My car smells like weed, so I was not only, like, spraying this perfume stuff that I had in there, but I had found, I had found my container,

---

inappropriate but denies full responsibility" (Scott & Lyman, 1968: 47).

> and I had found the 1-hitter, but I *could not* find my pipe. And… I thought—and then I heard the sirens, and then I saw some ambulances show up, and I saw the cops show up, and I thought—"I'm… I'm screwed. Like, I'm totally screwed."

The frantic nature of her search is contrasted with the leisurely pursuit of golf being played by retirees, as the semi-private space of her car was now being scrutinized by people whose intention was to help, but through their interference were jeopardizing her ability to locate evidence that would portray her as guilty. Spraying perfume is an example of a tactic practiced to help segment identities that, though it may have looked odd for onlookers, demonstrated a degree of foresight or ability to apply a technique she regularly used to avoid detection when smoking during breaks in class to this new situation. It was unclear how long the search took place, but one item was unaccounted for as the sirens roared towards the scene:

> But then (takes a breath), and like, the women are like, "Honey, you need to get out, you need to get out," and they're pulling me out. And then two women grab my arms and I pulled one of my arms away and right at that moment I saw my pipe had lodged right where the windshield meets the dashboard, and I grabbed it and I stuffed it in my bag and… they never knew, they never knew.

Initially, her concern was to retrieve all illegal items from the car without the gaggle of golfers noticing anything was off, but then her attention shifted towards interacting with health care providers and law enforcement:

> Interviewee: And I even, I talked to a paramedic as well, and he did a whole bunch of, um, ya know, tests with my eyes and stuff, just initial, and… uh, I think he even asked if I was under the influence of anything and I said "No, no." And I, I had my sunglasses on and a hat on the whole time [I was talking to the police officer] and he never told me to take them off, so. Um, and I had *all* that stuff, I think I even had cocaine in my purse too. Um, but they never, they never asked [to search my purse]. And then I had to do the whole insurance thing, (stern voice) "Were you under the influence?" And I said "No." Because they couldn't prove it. … legally, they wouldn't be able to prove that I was indeed under the influence of marijuana at that particular point in time.
>
> Oren: That's an intense scene, that traffic accident.
>
> Interviewee: (exhales) Yeah. I know. Could have ruined my life.

Akin to the perfume, sunglasses and hats were props used to help keep the police officer at a distance, placing a physical barrier between them that was not challenged, i.e., wearing shades was not "shady." Locating the marijuana paraphernalia was most pressing at the time of the

accident, but the cocaine in her purse was also of legal concern, though she did not report having used it that morning. Having apparently succeeded in masking the smell of pot, at no point was her behavior considered suspect or as potentially playing a causal role in the accident, either by the golfers, first responders, insurance companies, or in her own estimation. As she noted, the discovery of drugs would have changed the dynamics, and in turn ruined her life by disqualifying her from receiving financial aid[103]; she did not mention more serious potential sanctions, which also meant the story was unrehearsed in the sense that she had not told it to a judge or jury, if at all. She had since flown domestically with cocaine and acid on her person, and a few years later made several trips during which she transported up to a pound of marijuana across state lines with the intent of distributing it. As shown in the traffic accident example and the one that follows, the purses of upper class women were inviolable during close calls for those in the sample, another tool of segmentation.

Similar to the PhD student who was in the back seat of a car that was pulled over while racing near the beach, another PhD student was a passenger in a car that was approached by police, in this case for being parked in a private lot without displaying the proper permits. Unlike the prior example, however, where the driver faced the bulk of the legal jeopardy for speeding while drunk, in this instance the PhD student had half an ounce of marijuana in her purse during the following interaction, which occurred while working towards her PhD. Again, the story is parceled to facilitate commentary:

> [M]y friends had just bought, like, a half of an ounce [of marijuana] that we were gonna divvy up with everybody, but it was still, like, together in one bag. And I was the only girl, so they were like, "Oh, put it in your purse…" (slight chuckle). So I had it in my purse, and then we got, like … we had done nothing wrong, except that we had pulled over in a place where you shouldn't have pulled over. … we were parked where we shouldn't be parked. … But then it turned out that the cops—once they [saw who we were]—wanted to fuck with us. It was in [a major city]… we were on the University's property, we were going to a baseball game… [We were] like, "Oh, we shouldn't be parked there." And [the police were] like, "Line up, put your hands on the car," searched the car, like…

[103] Losing financial aid would be problematic for school, but also for buying drugs, as she sometimes used aid money to do so. The use of financial aid money and school loans to "party" has been reported elsewhere (Perrone, 2009: 189-90).

On the one hand, the informant was doing something illegal by possessing marijuana, but on the other hand, did not feel like their innocent mistake justified such an extensive interaction. However, "we just couldn't say 'No' [to the search] because we knew that we were in the wrong, we were *actually* in the wrong, and had that sense of insecurity," and so they provided consent to search:

> They confiscated beer, they confiscated our beer bong. We were 21—we were *all* legal, we were over 21, we, um, all beer canisters were closed, we were like driving to a party. … And, they like, confiscated our *beer* bong. We were like, "it is a *beer* bong, you can't con-," like, "what justification do you have for taking away a beer bong?" It was just, they were fucking with us, and we were just lucky, I'm just, I'm just plain lucky that they didn't search my purse. Because if they had we would have been *totally* fucked.

While indignant about having their legally-purchased and possessed beer taken from them, "[Having the marijuana in my purse] disempowered me, it made me feel like I just need to comply and make this situation end as quickly as possible." Legal behavior was being punished, while illegal pursuits remained hidden. Though the confiscation of the beer and beer bong comprise the most severe penalty meted out yet, the story in some ways seems mostly unremarkable compared to others relayed by students in the sample: others had also interacted with police with drugs in their possession.

What makes the last interaction with police unique is that, in addition to involving the white female informant, it also involved black men. All were affluent. Looking back,

> … it was just one of those situations—I think it was like, sort of racially-fueled, because I was with a couple of my guy friends who were black, and the cops were black. And, I really think it was a, sort of, like, "oh, well, here's some black guys who are hanging out with white girls, and they're driving a Mercedes and they're wearing Ivy League t-shirts." Like… I really think it was one of those, like, the blue-collar black guys kind of wanted to, like, "haze" the, like, too good for their own good black guys? That's the *only* thing I can think of, because they really—it was one of those situations where I was like, "wow, if I didn't have an ounce of marijuana in my bag right now I would be asking for your badge number." … I woulda been like: "No you can't open my trunk… asshole." Like, "why you trying to open my trunk?"

A car and t-shirts that normally represented acceptance and achievement now seemed like bull's-eyes, stifling her courage that swelled under the surface (like the amount of marijuana she

reported having in her purse). Not sure of how to describe the interaction, she used a term associated with college fraternities—"haze"—and perhaps it was an example of strengthening social relationships by making "pledges" experience adversity together. Regarding how her friends had interpreted the interaction, when asked, "Do you remember talking to your black friends about it, your male friends?," it turned out that such discussions were the basis for her viewing the event along racial and class lines:

> Oh yeah, it was my friend Alfred. Um, the guy who I'm friends with who is black. He was the one who said that, he was like, "that guy did not like the fact that I was hanging out with white girls." That wasn't *my* idea, like, I never would've picked up on that. But [Alfred] was like, "that guy did not like the fact that I was hanging out with white girls."

Her friend's statement implies that he had previously interacted with police and had a basis of comparison. Though she portrayed herself in the interview as having been feisty with the police, or had at least thought about the moment since and what she *could* have said, it seemed her cool demeanor at the time helped them to avoid sanction, as her purse was not searched:

> And then the funny thing was that all the guys, like, applauded me. They were like, "Wow, [interviewee], you did such a good job!" I was like, (naïve) "With what?" But it was just, bizarre, I was *totally* green. And I was like, (said innocently) "Oh my god officer, what have I *done*?" And they all, all my guy friends, assumed I was acting and putting on this 'deer in the headlights' sort of thing, but I was like, "No, I'm actually just a huge pussy" (laughs).

In light of the discretion afforded to police, it is noteworthy that in previous examples white women and men tended to be given the benefit of the doubt; the one search that was reported involved black men.[104] For her, however, having her behavior become known to law

---

[104] Another PhD student reported observing a young black man stopped and frisked while in New York City. An MBA student—who in college locked himself in a room with half an ounce of cocaine he was supposed to distribute to friends—knew only one person who had faced legal consequences from substance use: "one kid who was smoking a doobie near a square, and he got arrested. He was also ethnically non-Caucasian. Um, that could play a role." When asked why he thought so, he explained:

> Interviewee: I don't know, 'cause everyone was smokin' doobies (he laughs). It just occurred to me, like, why would this dude be the one they picked out? I mean, limited sample size, but, ya know.
>
> Oren: What happened to him?

enforcement seemed less problematic than what getting in trouble with the law would in turn require her to do:

> I did not want to be in a situation where I was like, "Daaad, get me a lawyer." Like, I don't think I would've, in the end, gotten in trouble with the law. Because, I don't think they had any reason to be searching us? And, so therefore, even if we had gotten arrested, it probably would have gotten thrown out, or expunged, or whatever. But I didn't even want to prove that. I don't want to have to call my dad and be like, "please get me a lawyer and, by the way, I had an ounce of marijuana on me." Like, "We'll talk about that [part] later[, dad]."

Had the drugs been discovered, her last statement indicates that she had confidence that the legal system would work for her, and that the law could be used to shield her from punishment. Constitutional protections that are supposed to be available would benefit her based on her ability to access legal resources. Though she would rely on her father to provide guidance if necessary, she was also privileged in that she had an understanding of and believed in her legal rights. A recurring theme across several of the interviews was that students were more fearful of parental judgment or disappointment, or potentially causing them emotional harm due to being caught, than they were of legal ramifications. Whereas, generally, fear of the unknown can be daunting, such sentiments illustrate that the known connection with parents that could be altered by the stress of state intervention was more omnipresent, at least for those who spoke about having good relationships with their parents. In most instances, however, they did not comprehend the potential long-term ramifications of having a criminal record.

Students in the sample had interacted with the police on numerous occasions, sometimes when drunk or high on marijuana, and had violated domestic and international laws by traveling with[105] and mailing drugs, but only one student in the sample reported ever being "caught" by the criminal justice system. A law school student recounted his experience:

> Interviewee: I think he had to, like, go through some shit, ya know? Like, his visa or something was like re-processed, or something.

[105] For example, one informant's boyfriend flew her and a friend to Las Vegas, and she brought along two potato chips that had drops of acid on them. Another time she returned from Amsterdam:

> Yeah, I, um, I got pulled over, uh, very late in the morning… on the highway. Um, sadly I don't really remember very much, uh, before them, like, [the police officer] jostling me out of the car. Buuut, I was drunk. And, um, I had taken something else that night which I wasn't quite sure what it was. Um, it was supposed to be, like, Adderall, but I don't really know what it was. But it got me fucked up. Um, and I was trying to drive, attempting to drive back home. And they said that I was just speeding and swerving, uh. Yeah, but I got arrested and they took me to central booking.

While this occurred before he applied to graduate school, given his reference to Adderall it is worth noting that many students reported widespread use of Adderall in their schools, including MDs, JDs, PhDs, and MBAs.[106] It, and similar stimulants, were used to help study and also to party, as was the intent in this case. Whether it was Adderall, or something else, it could not counter the effects of the alcohol, or perhaps amplified them instead. He next described arriving at central booking, and attempting to place the "one phone call" often portrayed cinematically:

> And, uh, [they] let me call—well, no, I had to beg—I didn't have any change to call my dad, and I had to beg them to let me use the phone. As I expected my dad just berated me and screamed at me, so that didn't help and I hung up.

The first part of his story highlights the unpleasant reality of calling parents after an arrest that the PhD student described earlier feared. Though the JD expected the negative interaction, he informed them so they would not worry about his absence or so that they could help get him out if need be. His narrative then turned to his stay in central booking:

> Um, and… fucking went in the cell—took forever to get processed to go in the cell—and passed out. And next thing I know, I'm waking up on, like, a cold-ass metal bench next to

---

> [We] bought a lot of stuff, we bought three types of weed, a pipe, mushrooms, tons of hemp whatever, ya know, stuff you drop in tea or edibles. This was … before 9/11, so there was a little bit more lax rules for flying. But international flying was, was, you know, you didn't want to be caught for bringing something back. *But I did*. I brought back—I was *underage* for one—I brought back a lot of, I don't know, Italian Spumante and French wine and stuff. But mostly I brought back the mushrooms and the weed and the pipe.

They ended up making it through customs in spite of the presence of police dogs and not declaring anything, and she distracted the Customs Officer by saying all they had were chocolates from Duty Free, which she then offered to him.

[106] One PhD referred to it as "Diet Coke," as it was sometimes taken recreationally as a cheaper but often decidedly less thrilling alternative to cocaine. An African American participant stated that the first time she heard the word "Adderall" was when asked about it during the interview, and she did not like prescription medication more generally, preferring to self-medicate.

> a big Puerto Rican dude, another big dude on the floor, and some other guy. It was basically the drunk tank, just a lot of people arrested overnight.

First he described his immediate surroundings in the cell, where he spent 24 hours because of the time he had been arrested, which meant that they did not have as many magistrates. After interacting with the magistrate, he longed for his cellmates:

> … you go and you see him through a tele[vision], and he either sets your bail, or releases you and gives you your court date, and stuff. The magistrate, whatever, I forget what he's called. He was a[n unpleasant fellow] anyway. And, yeah, they just didn't care that I was cold or miserable or hungry or that I wanted to… not be there, um.

Having received no empathy from his parents or the magistrate, and realizing he would not be released immediately, he returned to his cell prepared for a longer stay. He then explained how he learned how to get by, features of the environment, and interactions with those with which he shared the space:

> And I discovered that the only way to get out of the cell was to say you had to shit, and they let you go to the cell down at the end of the hall. So I would do that periodically and just stand there. But I was fucking freezing. It was summer time, but it was super cold in there. They said they did it to prevent the spread of, uh, germs, but that may be a partial truth. Uh, and it was just, it was miserable, it was terrible. And met a lot of interesting people, most of who had been there before, um, for consistently engaging in behavior that they knew in the end would get them back there. Uh, one guy basically just said, "Yo look, I'm doing me. And if that gets in the way of what the cops like, then fuck it, I'll go to jail." Alright, homie.

The experience was uniquely memorable for him in spite of the hangover and drug effects, but it was not so uncommon for those around him. Amidst telling a sad tale about the time he spent a night in central booking, he spoke about "the best times" and told a joke, before continuing with the mostly difficult memory:

> But, it actually—the best times were when other people were in the cell. Being alone really sucked. Ya know, you didn't have, you couldn't play on your phone it was terrible (laughs at his joke). Uh, so, and, I mean, ya know, it was a little intimidating. There were, like, big dudes, dudes who like—not, like, murderers—but, like, people that like, you know, petty… petty criminals. And, um, but I-I-I—it was just kind of like, nobody wants to be here so, like, no one's going to be a huge dick head and, like, make it worse for everybody. And I think they could tell that I was, like, nervous and scared.

He developed camaraderie, or at least avoided antipathy, with those he initially saw on a superficial level—"a big Puerto Rican dude"—to the point where he preferred having others in

his cell to being alone. Still, contrasted with his earlier construction of himself as student who was careful about which of his law school classmates knew about his drug use, in the cell his emotions were laid bare for all to see. Though he felt better able to control how he presented himself in other settings and social circles, in the end his cellmates provided the sought-after empathy.

For those who are caught by the system, the night in jail is only the beginning of a longer process. The JD described what his diversionary program entailed:

> I got out, had to do all this shit, take driving safety school, and drug and alcohol group sessions. It was a whole ordeal. And a pricey one. … You have to pay all the costs. So court costs, fee costs, group session costs, it's fucking expensive. Um, and it just takes a really long time. Like, I don't know… first of all, it took me like a year to get a court date, it was ridiculous. … So I would never. I mean, some people say going to jail doesn't work, but it fucking worked for me (laughs heartily). It worked for me, I don't ever wanna be back in jail.

While the experience of being in a cell stayed with him, as a first-time offender he did not receive the full brunt of the system. The process and fines comprised the bulk of the punishment (Feeley, 1979), in addition to a suspended license. Eventually his record was expunged, allowing him to successfully apply to law school. Next, asked to describe whether this experience "came up" when applying to law school, he outlined how it had affected him and would continue to have ramifications for his professional career; in the short term, when applying to law school, and longer term when attempting to qualify to practice law by taking the Multistate Bar Examination (MBE), i.e., "the Bar":

> Yeah, I had to write an addendum about it. … [I also had to check a box on some applications]. Different schools have different language, believe it or not. Some school's applications had "convicted of," which I didn't have to disclose (yawns). Excuse me. Because I wasn't convicted of it, like, if, I don't ever have to put I have ever been convicted of anything on any application. But I just told them anyway, because I didn't want it to be a problem. … more so for the Bar, 'cause there's a character and fitness component. And they, uh, they subpoena all of your records and your law school application included. Um, that way, you know, if it turns out you're being, uh, dishonest, then that's just like… [a] capital, capital infraction [i.e., a "death sentence" for the application].

He realized his honesty might result in his application being thrown in the trash if the reader had experienced a personal tragedy due to drunken driving, but “I didn’t have to put all the details in there, like I didn’t tell them how severely intoxicated I was.” Being honest enough, but not completely forthcoming, allowed him to save some face, as would probably be expected in such a situation, i.e., the story told there would differ from the account provided here. This is a skill he would no doubt continue to practice in law school. He was enjoying law school so far, and now felt like “it’s not really a big deal. For me it was, but I mean in the grand scheme of things it happens to a lot of people.” Among professionals, his statement may be especially true for lawyers; notably, though JD programs were the only ones to provide alcohol awareness programming during orientation for this sample, that this was done indicated that drinking was a known problem associated with the profession.

5.4 Conclusion

Demonstrating the range of interactions that GAPSS can have stemming from their affiliation with an academic program and use of drugs, the preceding sections represent the fine lines between: new approaches to drinking, and that familiar hangover feeling; professional socialization, and socializing with professionals; successful identity segmentation, and having one aspect of identity come close to greatly impinging on others. Overall, PhD students in the sample used more drugs more often during their postbaccalaureate years (including with colleagues and professors), were in school for longer, had more close calls, and seemed more open to talking about their experiences in depth and at length—perhaps because of the perception that there were fewer repercussions in academia than in the public or private sector, medicine, or in legal fields. A straightforward interpretation of the excerpts reviewed so far would suggest that the sample, generally, has had lots of trouble with alcohol, and fewer such instances with drugs. The event that ended in arrest started with a drink, but excessive drinking also seemed to be protective at times—two contrasting outcomes. Alcohol was the great

intellectual equalizer, restricting brain functioning at the time of ingestion and later in portrayals of associated behaviors, as few attempted to put a positive spin on getting “the spins”—though less extensive drinking was reported to have social and business benefits.

The informants underscore how it is possible to navigate the academic and social divide by weaving them together, or by erring on the side of keeping their professional and private lives apart. Attempts to chart a course are sometimes controverted. Regardless, time in the program and its classes, lectures, internships, and social relationships can recalibrate or refortify minds that have been conditioned to obtain, interpret, and supply information; being an intellectual sponge does not preclude, and may very well improve, the ability of GAPSS to apply knowledge from one realm to the activities of another. As the next chapter proceeds to establish, this kind of leveragable professional expertise can emerge in thinking and talking about drugs, to the extent that one’s academic discipline directly pertains to issues of relevance, e.g., the central nervous system and brain function, interpretations and applications of the law, criminal justice practices or historical substance use, or principles associated with supply and demand or cost/benefit analyses. While many students displayed academic knowledge germane to their discipline, not all wielded it as proficiently—or felt the need to—in talking about their involvement with drinking and drugs; the extent to which material learned in the classroom will influence, for example, the tools used to ingest and meaning attributed to substance use may vary greatly for different GAPSS and professions represented in the sample. These issues are further explored in the next chapter through close inspection of the use of professional vernacular and concepts in the research interview space, the display of which allowed informants to transition from unflattering presentations of self by repositioning their experiences as those of more learned persons confident in their depth of comprehension or consideration of relevant biological or social processes. Privilege is also a process that helps high-functioning users maintain or increase their status, and perhaps substance use.

CHAPTER VI. HIGH-FUNCTIONING USERS

> In their opinion they consider themselves, "oh, I'm a high-functioning alcoholic," or "oh, I'm a high-functioning Ritalin abuser," or whatever, "because I only do it when I want to do it, and when I don't do it I can go to work and be fine, and it doesn't impact my life at all" … And for them I guess that means that they don't do drugs, it's only voluntary, and when they feel like they have the time, and they can recover from it or whatever, or not have to work, and then it's like okay to them. It's acceptable.
>
> –Medical school student

People pursue specific academic degrees for a number of reasons, including their interests, skills, ambitions, and ways of thinking about their roles in society, factors all influenced by early social interactions. The same might be said of drug use, which tends to be associated with joblessness, being unemployable or untrustworthy, lack of education or self-control, addiction, criminal subcultures, and harmful behaviors that negatively affect the perceived social status of many "users." Yet, the process of working towards advanced credentials, occasionally while under the influence of drugs, exposes students to classrooms, conversations, seminal theories, new concepts, real-world applications, and literature that describe discipline-specific practices using precise terminology—some incorporate these ideologies into their lexicon more than others. When high-functioning users are able to use drugs in a way that allows them to continue to realize their potential, rather than being users not participating in mainstream society and not pursuing long-term socially acceptable professions, their burgeoning education may also facilitate involvement in drug-using subcultures. The high-functioning user is privileged in their ability to use drugs without the same threat of being caught, their use condoned implicitly or explicitly by those who know about it and seldomly object to it. Rather, they use with friends, who help in the event of an occasional overindulgence, and who often themselves are GAPSS. Determined in part by how GAPSS users are responded to, but also how they conduct themselves, several students described themselves or those in the program as high-functioning users,

The final data chapter begins with examples that reaffirm how, for many students in the sample, privilege has been a process that began long before their GAPSS careers. Early

privilege is important to distinguish from the ability to leverage professional discourse that was later acquired, emphasizing how they got to the point where they could now portray their professional and substance-using careers in the same story. For example, parents provided pathways to college and first jobs in a laboratory, and features of high school and college communities also facilitated their ability to eventually become high-functioning users.

Whereas the first few chapters, and the first section of this chapter, focus primarily on experiences, the second section of this chapter features a close textual reading of statements and considers how turns of phrase are used to characterize social and chemical processes according to professional training and orientation; language, therefore, becomes another leverageable form of privilege. Quotes are closely scrutinized to highlight, for example, aspects of knowledge about drugs (e.g., physiological, historical) and research in those with related training, risk of disclosure among legal students, and privilege and status in the statements of business students. For some more than others, academic knowledge informed their approach to substance use, and was thus leveraged in how they conceptualized their use in particular ways. Issues raised by interviewees in discussing their own substance use reflect their ability to pursue particular strategies in relation to both drug use and portrayals of themselves as GAPSS users, highlighting the knowledge and reasons available to them for leveraging in explaining or talking about their involvement.

6.1 Privilege as a process

Privilege is a process comprised of enumerable components, one of which is the ability to engage in illegal behavior without consequence. The preceding chapters depicted initial socialization into substance use, and professional socialization that occured in privileged social spaces associated with graduate and professional schools and careers, considering the role of alcohol and brushes with social control along the way. So far, while participants have not been immune from drug effects, they largely have escaped social sanction to the extent that any

opportunities or relationships have been irreparably harmed. Mostly, in spite of some unanticipated disclosures (see “Segmented identities”), they have managed to project the desired image of self in professional settings or relationships, as demonstrated by their accomplishments and ambitions discussed during the research interview. However, many had already experienced privileged social interactions or social spaces before arriving in those afforded by graduate and professional schools, as shown through the following excerpts and commentaries.

The chapter on “Early socialization and privilege” provided examples of how early forays into substance use sometimes involved aspects of privilege (e.g., private boats, summer homes, international travel); there is a parallel process by which academic privilege starts in the home. Having parents who were academically inclined could help in gaining access to the next privileged setting (e.g., college); this could happen either more or less directly. A Neuroscience PhD student recalled his first work experience:

> I had some experience as a high school student working in a neuroscience lab. My mom is a psychiatrist and she was doing some research, um, and she said—one summer she was like, “you’re not sitting at home, you can either go,” like, “take classes or you can get a job.” And I was like, “ok, I’ll get a job.” And she was like, “Ok, well, you can’t get a job in food service or retail.” I was like, “what do I do??” She was like, “I know, you can work for the lab” (laughs). So I ended up doing some pretty rudimentary, like, data entry and grunt work. But I was sort of exposed to that, like, fast-paced research environment. And, since then, I think I was kind of hooked on that. So in college I sort of sought that out on my own.

Not all parents are in positions where they can hire their children, even for “grunt work.” Clearly, having that experience gave him the interest and “research experience” to launch him on a path where he sought out additional opportunities in related fields. After that first exposure, he got “hooked” on research, showing how drug parlance can also be applied to professional narratives, and was close to completing his PhD at the time of the interview. Many in the sample had parents who themselves had earned graduate or professional degrees, including multiple psychiatrists, an eminent cancer researcher, psychologists, medical doctors, large business owners, engineers, historians, dentists, nurses, physical therapists, professors, “experts” (e.g.,

witnesses), self-employed entrepreneurs, academics, musicians, photographers, and artists; by contrast, a few in the sample were the first in their family to graduate college, or attend graduate school—particularly JD students.[107] Other students also reported having worked for their parents.

Rather than merely setting them on the "right" path, parents could also help pave the road. The following excerpt conveys how the PhD student—who was not granted a key to her own home for a period during college due to her drinking—was afforded admission to the institution where she eventually did that drinking:

> Interviewee: … there are ways in [the country where I grew up] where you can go in not through the regular channels to get in, through the... There are seats that people reserve for you, or you know someone who knows someone, those kinds of things. And I happened to get into college that way.
>
> Oren: Oh, great (said genuinely).
>
> Interviewee: Um, well, not really (laughs).
>
> Oren: No?
>
> Interviewee: It's embarrassing, actually.
>
> Oren: Why is it embarrassing?
>
> Interviewee: Because it's, ya know, you don't go through the regular sort of, stream of, um, the regular rat race, right? Which is how I landed, landed up—I went to a really really good University, but that's the only way I could have gotten into a place like that.

---

[107] Parents who had successful professional careers reportedly used drugs, both in the past or presently, as did those whose parents were perhaps less career-oriented; some did not think their parents used drugs, or had never seen it directly, and it had only been implied. For the Neuroscience PhD whose mom worked in a hospital, for instance, he commented that "She deals with crazy people, and many of them smoke pot, so she associates pot with crazy." However, looking through photo albums with his mother on a visit home, he saw a picture of his father from the 1970s and quipped, "I didn't know dad smoked cigarettes." His mother replied: "I don't think that's a cigarette"—he had never discussed his use with them, or been given "the sex talk" as a child, making this tacit acknowledgement memorable. Even after turning 21, he "felt guilty" when his parents came home earlier than expected while visiting during break and found him and his friends drunk. Thus, privileged pathways to careers that begin in home can involve more identity segmentation from parents than colleagues and mentors, at least in regards to substance use. For some, successful academic careers did not mean they felt comfortable revealing substance use to their parents; others had done so for a long time, or more recently.

> Oren: Did you kind of realize that at the time or is that something you've come to understand more?
>
> Interviewee: No, I realized that at the time, I-I knew it, but I didn't... ya know it's not like I went in and said, "Ok, now I'm going to pull up my socks and take care of things." That only happened at the end of college, where I decided that I can't just keep going the way I was going, and, yeah.

Whether she landed up or was pulled there, she realized at the time that her pathway was irregular, but still drank to excess her first three years of undergrad before turning things around and applying to Master's and PhD programs in the U.S., where she was accepted to a Master's program and first encountered weed. Though nobody else in the sample reported going through irregular channels to get into college, over half of the cohort had attended private high-schools—which are themselves a way of "buying a seat" into college—before continuing on to college. Half attended one of the eight Ivy League schools, where the phrase "we work hard, we play hard" may as well be in Latin encircling the crests—*Fortes laboramus, fortes ludimus.* For some, privileges abounded: not only monetarily, but in the sense that, as the Master's in Communication put it, "I had a *great* childhood!" She mentioned this in passing while explaining her behavior after taking MDMA, which she did with her husband in a hotel room and involved jumping on beds, pillow fights, and child-like glee. Mushrooms were similarly accompanied by memories from childhood, which she felt allowed her to touch moss on the beach and imagine she was "hanging out with Snuffleupagus;" "so it was like I was totally resorting back to a child-like mentality," and was "constantly [thinking about fond memories] in my past, my child past" more generally. Another student reported eating mushrooms and then watching *The Wizard of Oz* (Leroy & Fleming, 1939) on mute synchronized with music from Pink Floyd's *Dark Side of the Moon* (1973).[108] These moments reliving youthful pleasures in new ways were possible because of the privileged spaces in which they now occurred, including hotel and dorm rooms, which mimic the dark side of the moon in allowing behaviors to remain in the shadows.

---

[108] See, e.g., *The Dark Side of the Rainbow* (The Legend Floyd – Canal Oficial, 2012).

When potentially problematic behavior is exposed to daylight, those who grow up in privileged communities can also rely on social wealth, complementing financial and other aspects of their upbringing. Whereas the section on "Segmented identities" described interactions with police that the informants navigated themselves, some had also been bailed out by adults. As part of the story in response to a question asking him to "walk me through" his first time drinking, a PhD student relayed his first two experiences drinking socially, one of which involved police:

> Interviewee: I drank six beers and wet myself in 11th grade (laughs), you know. … It was while I was asleep… I woke up in a puddle of urine. ... Uh, and so I was like, (falsetto voice) "ehhh, this is not so cool" (laughs). And, I think then, at like, after prom in 11th grade was maybe the next time that I drank. And, like, [I] didn't realize that I was drunk when I tried to drive home the next morning. Like, I woke up drunk, and I was like, (groggy voice) "Woaaah, this is terrible." And [I] got into a minor accident [on the way home], ya know, like, no one was hurt, just a little bit of car damage, you know. And, luckily, my very good friend's father who is like a ssssssslick lawyer was driving by at the time and he kind of came and interceded on my behalf. ...
>
> Oren: What's that voice you give yourself when you, uh, use your high school persona?
>
> Interviewee: Uhh, yeah, my hapless, young, dumb, full of cum—I guess that's the one.[109]
>
> Oren: (Both laugh) So, so a lawyer friend interceded—in what way? Were there police?
>
> Interviewee: Yeah, yeah, the police came, because I hit somebody. I just rear-ended somebody 'cause I kind of like, didn't stop properly, ya know. And, it wasn't like I was swerving or anything like that. And I was, um, you know, the police were there, and they were just taking my insurance info, and then, um, this car just pulled up, ya know, and [my friend's dad] was like, "Hey there, I know this, I know this young man." Like, "What seems to be the problem, officer?" That classic line. Um, and he just sort of, um, ya know, he knew the law, so he wasn't gonna try to get me off, or whatever, but *he kind of vouched for my character*, you know. Was just like, "Oh, you know, he must have just been [unsure of how to handle the traffic pattern]"—like, there was no, alcohol didn't come into it, right? Like, I wasn't breathalyzed or anything like that. Because I wasn't swerving or anything, and they saw that I was a new driver also. And so I think they just chalked it up to that, you know. So… (Emphasis added).

The lack of a breathalyzer test was attributed more to the lack of swerving—though, theoretically, the police arrived after he was no longer moving—and being a new driver than having the slick lawyer vouch for his character, let alone having friends whose parents were

lawyers who happened to be driving through the community and willing to help. It was unclear if the friend attended the same high school, and therefore his father perhaps likelier to know of the prior evening's festivities. Interested in nascent perceptions of the breathalyzer and what that might have meant, I asked, "Do you remember being worried that they might breathalyze you—at the time were you afraid [of that], or…?"

> No, it didn't really strike me. Because it had been hours since I had had a drink and I didn't really think that that was what was going on. I guess only in retrospect did I realize that, when I kind of went back and went home and went to sleep and slept for many many hours. And then I woke up smelling kind of sour, and I was like, (naïve Mickey Mouse-like falsetto voice) "What *is* this?" "I smell like what I drank last night."

As it turned out, he might have been intoxicated to the extent that being subjected to a breathalyzer would have resulted in sanction, but he did not have enough experience using substances that he could leverage to realize he was still inebriated. Instead, he was successfully chaperoned all the way home, where he did not report getting in any trouble with his parents. In hindsight, even in cases where students were "caught" by parents during high school, punishments were portrayed as lenient or at least not overly severe. A JD student could "remember getting grounded when I was a sophomore in high school for alcohol and pot use," and again when his mom found an ounce of weed in his room hours after he brought it home in anticipation of selling some for a profit so he could smoke for free; she proceeded to flush it down the toilet. On another occasion, he and his friend got high before being driven by his friend's father to their high school to participate in a play; to him it should have been clear to the father that they were high, and he felt the father knew they were high, but he still dropped them off at school, and it did not get back to his parents. Perhaps the father assumed that it would not be such a big deal at their private school.

Once in college, privileged academic settings continued to teach students that, as collectively defined, the substance using behavior they and others they interacted with were

---

[109] As defined on UrbanDictionary.com, "Young guys who act [like] idiots doing stupid things[;] often still virgins. A young guy often describing himself as being stupid n horny" (YDFC, 2006).

engaged in was unobjectionable (Blumer, 1986/1969). They had reached an educational plateau they always knew they would attain, and now had time to figure out what was next while meeting new people. Alcohol use was clearly tolerated: one student recalled how his mom had asked about the alcohol policy during the campus tour, and was informed that the school provided kegs for some events. Marijuana was similarly plentiful for most, either from numerous on-campus dealers or by way of domestic shipments particularly useful during "dry" summer months. Sometimes, other drugs were part of the regular scene, including cocaine. The following series of passages describe how a medical student, while in college, was part of a social circle that was able to engage in large-scale cocaine use while being protected by the privileged spaces and social processes of an Ivy League college fraternity house in the heart of campus. A story that ends with her describing a large-scale cocaine deal she witnessed involving one of her friends and classmates began with a seemingly innocuous question:

> Oren: You also spoke about how then you were an inexperienced user, now you are an experienced user. Can you talk about what's involved in the transition and—(speaking over each other)
>
> Interviewee: Sure, I guess I remember… The first time my ex-boyfriend asked me to do cocaine, he said "Mr. White is in town," and I had no idea what that meant. And I was like, "Ok." He was like, "do you want to party?" And I was like, "no, don't ever ask me that again. That's offensive. I don't do that kind of thing." And I was very offended. And he was like, obviously he was like, "ok, ok," dropped it, and didn't even do any that night. Um, and as we kept on going, obviously, ya know, I knew that this person I lived with more and more [as I slept over at my boyfriend's house], I began to learn, was very into the drugs, and a *very* big dealer. One of the biggest dealers on campus, for sure. I saw him do a $15,000 transaction once, we're talking big time (clears throat).

Initially, she was firmly opposed to trying cocaine, but less than a year elapsed between first trying and the deal. She proceeded to describe her first time trying it,[110] but what distinguishes her narrative is the process of developing a relationship with the dealer who lived in a fraternity house on campus, and her depiction of the settings in which cocaine use took place. The

---

[110] Her first time trying cocaine involved fast-forwarding through 80 percent of *Legally Blond* (Platt, Kidney, Lutz, Smith, Luketic, Witherspoon, Wilson, ... MGM Home Entertainment Inc., 2004): "I was like, 'you don't need to watch this, it's unimportant, you don't need to watch this.'" On future occasions they would go out to bars or clubs.

cocaine use and dealing apparently blended in with the general debauchery associated with such fraternizing:

> It was a large large fraternity house, made predominately of [varsity Greco-Roman] wrestlers. Which in itself has a very interesting culture, ya know, they're very much about weight loss, and very much about maintaining a certain weight. And in a way, ya know, I feel these drugs [cocaine], a lot of the people use them, there were a lot of bulimics in the house. There were a lot of very strange kind of, type A, obsessive personalities… it was just bedlam in there. I mean, it was trash, it always smelled like stale beer. It was just like, crazy. People running around at all hours, four in the morning, five in the morning, ya know? I could sleep through just about anything about that.

The privilege becomes more salient if the preceding were imagined to have taken place in a setting more regularly patrolled by local police instead of abutting a college green: coke-fueled and drunk, muscular and grappling, disorderly late at night, and in this case stressed about school and issues many college students deal with (e.g., relationships, deadlines, grades), while also maintaining weight and competing athletically. By contrast to the MBA student who was an Ivy League varsity athlete and did not smoke marijuana until her career was over, in part because she was afraid of drug testing, here behavior that might otherwise be seen as cocaine-fueled could be explained by the need for wrestlers to, for example, exercise late at night in order to make weight for an upcoming meet. Furthermore, people coming and going to buy cocaine would not seem out of place under the guise of fraternity activity, wrestlers being wrestlers, or a late-night session "cramming" for an exam. Her ability to sleep soundly may represent her immersion and comfort in these surroundings, and would perhaps come in handy during her medical training when sleeping in the hospital.

Continuing with her immersion, she learned that the dealer had an "open door" policy for friends, which in practice apparently meant they could help themselves to cocaine that was "out on the table for anyone to do." He operated as follows:

> He had two phones. One phone was, he gave out to his friends, one phone he gave out to other people. And so you'd have to call, ya know, this phone, the "friend" phone, versus the "other" phone, we called it. And, ya know, he'd usually pick up. Or you could just go over to the [fraternity] house. Like, I feel like a lot of the people he always used and abused with were his close friends. So, ya know, if he was hanging out with his close friends, there'd alllwways be drugs out. There's *rarely* a time, and that's usually

> when he couldn't find a supply for that day or that week. … So after we called him, or whatever, got up to his room, umm… he called it "sweets," he didn't call it any—we were never allowed to say cocaine. I guess 'cause he was very very paranoid, um, probably because he used so much (chuckles). Not actually real paranoia: he thought there were cameras and the police were watching or recording him or whatever.

Here, she applied terminology learned in medical school in describing the student-dealer as a cocaine "abuser" largely enabled by his surroundings, and further flashed her fledgling medical opinion to characterize him as not being unreasonably paranoid, but having a genuine fear based not only in how much he used but the scale of his operation (see "Professional discourse and leveraged expertise"). These types of interactions played a role in her ability to feel confident identifying herself as a "high-functioning" drug user, i.e., relative to others she had observed. At the time, though, she was learning the lingo of how to covertly procure, which can be contrasted with the overt way that those in the dealer's "inner circle" consumed cocaine. Cocaine was so abundant that

> … usually I didn't even have to buy it. But when we did buy it, we'd say, "I want sweets," I'd give out whatever money I had. Like usually, I would collect it from my friends because, um, they usually, ya know, they weren't around, we were gonna meet up later, whatever, I happened to be over at the house. And, uh, he would take out this gigantic bag (chuckling) that he had that was like filled with drugs, and he had it in this little octagonal table in the middle of his room and everyone knew where it was which I thought was so interesting, but bare[ly any security]—like, he had a lock on his door, but like even if he left his door open I felt like no one really took it. So I thought that was so interesting, like, for some reason he commanded some kind of respect in that house. And this was a house of like thirty people. So he would take out this huge bag, weigh out a certain amount, and put it in a separate bag for us. And then we would usually do some right there with him. And he would put some out from his bag, and we'd put some out from our bag.

Though she continued to learn the finer points of this dealer's customs, including the argot,[111] her friends "not being around" may reflect her immersion in the scene. Meanwhile, the drugs being openly available even when the dealer was not around (e.g., while attending classes, presumably) suggest that perhaps unfettered access was provided in exchange for "security"—

---

[111] Other students developed coded ways of referring to drug use more innocuously. A PhD student and her friends would drop "Chef Boyardee" into a discussion to let others know they planned to smoke, a term that came about after a late night smoke session where many cans of his pasta were consumed.

or because he realized they could knock down his door if they truly wanted. Regardless, the thirty brothers, some of whom wrestled, knew who belonged, so an outsider's presence in their fraternal space or near their respected brother's room would be noticed. Perhaps being one of the biggest cocaine dealers on campus required such security from other students as, based on her retelling, the MD felt it would have been relatively easy to purloin.[112] It seems one outsider they were less afraid of were police, as the University's law enforcement would similarly have had no trouble seeing the coke poured out on the octagonal table had they entered the house for an unrelated reason (e.g., smoke alarm, noise complaint, fight). As it turned out, the dealer did not get caught.

It was after she had developed such a relationship with the dealer, where she was using the "friend" phone, that she observed—or pretended not to see—the large transaction. The following excerpt shows they also hung out when not using cocaine, and even after the dealer had moved from the fraternity house to a slightly off-campus location, perhaps largely because of the fraternal bond between her boyfriend and the dealer. Even though it generally seemed free for housemates and friends, at this point it became apparent that others were paying:

> And we were there just, uh, actually hanging out this time, we weren't, we weren't doing any drugs or whatever. (Clears throat) I think it was some time on a weekend, like noon or something, we had gone out [the night before], we were tired, we were just relaxing over there, eating a little takeout, or whatever. And some guy called him on the friend phone, and pulled up around the back. And I remember the, this dealer being, ya know, kind of cautious, and like a little bit antsy and nervous. And uh, so the guy came on through the back door, and closed the door really fast, and locked it. And still under this octagonal table he had all these drugs, it was ridiculous. And I dunno, I guess everyone else that was there tried to not really pay attention to what was going on. We all kind of knew that this happened, but it was very rarely that we saw the actual transactions unless we were part of it ourselves. And those were always, ya know, $20 bucks here,

---

[112] Those in less athletic fraternities described similar open-door policies when it came to smoking and sharing marijuana, for example:

> … it would kind of happen where I'd, you'd go door to door, basically, and hang out with someone in one room, and hang out with someone else in another room, and smoke a doobie. Well, it was like I was living in this house that had all these little characters in it and, yeah, that was part of it. And then also I'd buy my own stuff. Sometimes people would have stuff in their room, yeah, I could just grab a little—a stem. But I would sit down sometimes and just smoke like an eighth.

> $40 bucks here. If we wanted to really go crazy it was like $150 dollars, never more than that. And this was… I guess, I don't even know who the other person [who came to meet my friend] was, he didn't really introduce himself or anything. It was a very hush hush thing like in the corner, and the rest of us were just kind of sitting around, watching TV, playing whatever. But everyone kind of knew what going on, so... It was interesting. … we knew it happened, but that was pretty much the only time I'd ever seen that.

While this was "pretty much" the only such transaction she observed, she had purchased different quantities of drugs over the course of her involvement; amassing the money needed for such a deal would entail roughly 100 $150 transactions or 750 $20 transactions, or some combination thereof, though he gave friends a discounted rate. Though she used the phrase "ya know" throughout the interview to give herself a beat to express herself, its frequent inclusion in the story about such a unique experience may convey her attempt to, on the one hand, try to recall memorable features of the event, and on the other hand, normalize the experience as one many people might have happened to be privy to on a lazy weekend afternoon in college. While the dealer's position "in a [drug] ring or whatever you call it … was never made clear," she continued

> I know that this dealer, the one that was our friend or whatever, was getting his drugs from his hometown, which was very far away, I think an hour or two.

An hour or two seemed far, yet little more than a suplex throw away others were much more likely to be arrested for possessing small quantities of crack cocaine. On campus, however, privileged use meant many could be involved without being caught, perhaps in part because they watched each other's backs, though this appeared to be done to guard against the type of student who was invited into their house to party but might steal a keg tap, not campus or municipal police who did not cross the threshold.

The response to an MBA student who had a manic break the summer after graduating from college provides the final example of how students in the sample received privileged treatment even when their substance use had to be addressed. This event was "a huge part of the story" that he attributed to a number of factors, including ending a relationship with his girlfriend, the transition from college to the next phase of life, "and doing lots of drugs," mostly

cocaine and Ritalin:

> The real precipitator was I took too much of an anti-depressant I was on, and that has a known side effect of, ya know, being—but I'm sure doing tons of coke and mixing that shit didn't help lay the [kind of] foundation [that would be conducive to avoiding a manic break]. …. Um, at that point, I kind of like, as part of that manic process, I divulged information I wouldn't normally? So I divulged to my parents that I had been doing some drugs. … I mean, my mom knew I smoked pot. My dad didn't. But they didn't know, like, everyday. … Um, so, well that was good, kind of got some shit out there.

Just as a combination of factors likely precipitated the episode—and foreshadowing the tools students would learn to wield themselves, as discussed in the next section—more than one approach was used to leverage a response. His family was mainly concerned with "want[ing] to make me mentally healthy," including his brother, who "Was like, 'you're a fucking idiot if you keep doing coke.'" He "saw a psychiatrist, downed some meds," and disclosed the full extent of his substance use history to his mental health professional.[113] At this point in the interview, he was not as happy or jovial as he was at other times, refrained from making jokes, and was more serious, talking quietly in a raspy voice that was almost a whisper. He received help at the time from his family, doctor, and medicine, and was able to continue on his path towards professional school:

> I had like an internship during that period, [which] I continued to [have]. And I went back to school in the fall to get, like, some continuing graduate classes. But that definitely turned things where, at least for a couple of months I didn't smoke pot. And then I did go back to smoking pot, but I don't think I did coke ever after that.

While he referred to this as a critical event that "definitely affected my brain chemistry," because of his privileged access to mental health treatment and a supportive family, he was able to maintain his forward momentum following a period where he was abusing cocaine and needed a break from drugs. His story shows how use might theoretically continue until the full extent of it becomes known to particular social circles, or exacerbates pre-existing conditions—"before that [I had] not *really* been diagnosed as Bipolar II"—reinforcing the importance of segmented identities and the ability of privilege to provide further insulation until students learn how to

leverage on their own. For him, that meant not using cocaine and seldomly smoking marijuana.

While privilege was here shown to be a process that starts in the home, for many in the sample it also extended to their communities, and from there was transported onto college campuses like a mini-refrigerator or shower caddy. Perhaps as a result, many students claimed to be more nervous about how legal trouble would affect relationships with their parents than the actual sanction, suggesting such bonds are themselves a kind of privilege. These buffers did not suddenly evaporate in the time following college, during which many began to forge their careers, and thus create privilege not just through their ability to use without recourse but also because of their professional pursuits and accomplishments. Privilege continued to amass after returning to school as graduate or professional students, though it might have taken some new forms, including those described in the next section.

6.2 Professional discourse and leveraged expertise

Educated substance users leverage recently acquired knowledge and language in the interview setting and during other social interactions where drug use is of interest. Most had very rarely if ever been asked to portray aspects of their drug using and professional careers in the same conversation (though perhaps this occasionally occurred with other GAPSS they used with), and the resultant integration blended language and issues relevant to both pursuits (e.g., stress, time management, creative thinking). In many ways, absorbing dialects native to a profession is similar to learning languages that have evolved in particular regions or drug-using subcultures; for example, the more time spent in a “foreign” place, the easier it is to become immersed, and the less unusual the local customs seem. It might therefore be expected that students enrolled in programs spanning more years would be likelier to become more well-versed, as would those who had begun to identify with a particular profession rather than

---

[113] When asked, “So they wouldn’t be surprised by anything you told me today, for example?,” he replied, “No, I can’t imagine: I’m open as shit.”

considering themselves to be students. Here, the manners in which new knowledge from immersion into specific academic disciplines is folded into talk about substance-using practices are considered: when, where, why, and what is leveraged? How is discourse germane to a profession and related insight used as a tool when talking about drugs? How does budding expertise emerge in how they use and talk about use? These issues are intertwined, as the examples of successful interactions with police are also forms of potential expertise (e.g., knowing how not to look shady), and how they use may impact who knows, just as who knows—and their response—may impact how they talk about use. More recently acquired academic knowledge can be contrasted with insights developed over the course of their drug use. The argument is that immersion in socially acceptable pursuits can be leveraged to bolster decision-making or explanations of explicitly illegal behavior, and that the ability to do so is associated with the status of high-functioning user.

Unlike MBA students, for which the "folklore" of use in their profession was more of an abstraction (see "Professional socialization"), PhD students were likelier to have leverageable knowledge about earlier use among forerunners in the profession and society. While JD and MBA students displayed more casual awareness, PhD students—particularly those who used a range of substances in graduate school and studied issue pertaining to the brain and central nervous system—were most likely to provide specific examples indicating that they were not the first in their fields to experiment with drugs. Based in part on knowledge of others before him who had pursued similar lines of inquiry, a Neuroscience student "brought a couple of doses [of LSD] home… for further experimentation" after attending a music festival where he had tried it for the first time. He referenced the work of a famous self-experimenter in explaining his decision to use this particular drug in the manner that he did:

> … 'cause again, I'm a neuroscientist. And while it's not perfect science to use yourself as a test subject, this is how, you know—sort of inspired by, um, there's this guy: do you know Alexander Shulgin? (Oren: No). So he's a chemist; S-H-U-L-G-I-N. He was [a] biochemistry professor or something. He was working in a lab. And he would synthesize new compounds that he would predict had hallucinogenic properties, and test them on

> himself. And write very detailed—documented, sort of, you know, not just synthesis notes and lab notes, but also experiential notes and how this one compound was more of a head trip, and this other compound was more of a body high. Uh, one would give you closed-eyed spiral visuals, one would give you sort of open-eyed spider-web visuals. You know, and sort of classifying, "change one bond, what happens?" To, to your effect. Um, and he published two books: one is called *Tryptamines I Have Known And Loved* [Shulgin & Shulgin,1997], and one is called *Phenethylamines I Have Known And Loved* [Shulgin & Shulgin, 1991]. LSD is a Phenethylamines, it is in that class of hallucinogen. And so, there is this sort of a strong history of self-experimentation in science, and especially neuroscience.

By asking the interviewer a question in such a way, he set himself up for a "teaching moment," where he could essentially talk about what he knew about this researcher, whose work was more important than his title: the fruits of his research could be leveraged in using practices, whereas his title was a formality, insofar as the student could evaluate the quality of the work for himself without judging it as more or less credible due to Shulgin's academic rank. When he said "To, to your effect," he was essentially including a parenthetical statement for the benefit of the listener, as it was clear to him that this would be what Shulgin would have been interested in, but also that this might not be clear to most. Over an hour later, in discussing whether he or any colleagues had successfully applied any ideas they came up with while high on marijuana to their research, he again posed a question in reference to famous researchers whose drug-induced insights had been revolutionary:

> There's a guy named Kary Mullis. I don't know if you're familiar with Kary Mullis? Uh, he discovered a, uh, he won the Nobel Prize, actually, for discovering [the polymerase chain reaction,] "PCR," which is a method to amplify DNA. Uh, so you can start with like a little bit of DNA and make a lot of DNA from that. And he came up with the concept for that while tripping on LSD. And Francis Crick, uh—who is, you know, famous for discovering the structure of DNA [and also a Nobel Prize laureate]—uh, wrote in an autobiography that he came up with the concept of the double helix structure while on LSD. So there's this strong history of drug use and its application to scientific discovery.

The extent to which these are well-articulated neutralizations notwithstanding, his tip-of-the-tongue knowledge helped him to explain his own interest in drug use. While he did not spell out what "PCR" meant, he may have assumed that Crick's Nobel Prize was a widely known fact not worth mentioning, unlike Mullis', who was perhaps less widely known. References to historical substance use made by students in the sample included: Sigmund Freud's treatise to cocaine,

Über Coca; Timothy Leary, who several students had written papers on in college (though a Neuroscience PhD student noted Leary was "proselytizing the use of LSD" while Albert Hoffman of Harvard conducted associated research); a 20th century Japanese novel "inspired by European naturalism where they are studying the seedy underbelly of society" that the Literature PhD cited as portraying characters as "dissolute, drinking all the time;" "this group of British psychologists that all got together and did a bunch of Special K and, just, recorded themselves to see what it did to them," which a Clinical Psychology student "was made aware of;" Queen Victoria's use of marijuana for cramps; *The Count of Monte Cristo*'s use of hashish; and the CIA's experimentation with LSD in project MKUltra to "extract truth" from enemy combatants held in "anechoic chamber[s]." More than one participant also mentioned the role played by Harry Anslinger, and the historically discriminatory intent and application of drug laws was discussed by those studying criminal justice, but was also cited by those pursuing JDs, MBAs, and PhDs in other fields. Medical doctors did not mention historical cases of use in their profession. For those who did, references to substance use historically made their own involvement more insipid.

The historical knowledge was also transferrable between students, as alluded to by the Clinical Psychologist who "was made aware of" British psychologists' use of Special K. The Neuroscience student who spoke about Shulgin reported on how he learned about this information:

> Let's see. Alexander Shulgin I learned about from a friend of mine, also a neuroscientist in the program who had gone to another sort of top name institution. And she was in some kind of fraternity or sorority or some sort of co-ed party organization similar to the one I was describing earlier on this campus. And one of the things they did was, you know—these are all really nerdy kids—they went to a Chinese chemical supplier where you could actually order some of the compounds that Shulgin had synthesized. And so she had this book on her coffee table in her house. I was like "what is that?" And she was like, "oh, yeah, when we were in college we used this as our guide book and we would order these things and have a different drug every weekend. And they'd just ship it to us from China and it was fine, and eventually, you know, the DEA caught onto it and we can't do it anymore."

The passage conveys how one story about transferred knowledge could lead to another, as students readily shared and absorbed information pertaining to drugs that they came across purposefully or by chance (e.g., reading a book vs. seeing one). The informant questioned the appearance of a book his colleague had out, perhaps one of the two titles referenced earlier about Tryptamines and Phenethylamines, and quickly learned about the storied past of the artifact as a guide to drug use he had not previously imagined, and the ability to leverage it to procure drugs through previously unchartered channels. Even though he did not engage in the use that he described, portraying it as a scientific pursuit of "nerdy kids" could neutralize qualms about the nature of their involvement, such that it might be activity that was on the DEA's radar (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

Using drugs with more knowledgeable users was also reported to help allay fears that doing so would be overly harmful, and in understanding drug effects—or lack thereof. In one case, a Master's student spoke about how using cocaine with a medical student reduced some of her anxiety about the drug:

> … it's funny to say because I worry about the health risks and things like that, but one of the [women I have used cocaine with] is actually in medical school, so knowing her background, I kind of felt better about it. It's not really something that you would expect a lot of med students to be doing. But, knowing that she's aware of effects that certain drugs have on you, and she was doing it, kind of made me feel kind of better about doing it. I don't know if that's rationalizing it, I think that is rationalizing it.

Therefore, for students with specialized knowledge, their status or expertise might influence those around them, even when acknowledged as a form of rationalization. In another story and social context, the same student who felt more comfortable using cocaine with a medical school student realized she could not feel the effects of Ecstasy ("oxytocin") due to her use of anti-depressants, but still took a tablet with friends. She then leveraged her own expertise by giving her friends some of her prescription medication to take the morning after to help prevent the reuptake of serotonin from their synaptic clefts and minimize the day-after doldrums. She wanted to be involved in the group activity, and it was perhaps easier to do so than to make her

depression a topic of conversation. By sharing her pills it was perhaps acknowledged, though it was unclear whether her friends who did not have such expertise realized the significance of her providing these pills or the underlying science. Thus, students may feel safer using drugs with fellow professionals, and pass on their knowledge to friends from non-academic settings.

The Clinical Psychology PhD typified the extent to which thinking and discourse relevant to a profession were integrated into discussions of past drug use, and also in self-assessments. He was very adept at switching from his “toga” to his “lab coat” (these are descriptive labels, i.e., he did not refer to himself this way). He discussed, on the one hand, his various experiences with drugs, and, on the other hand, how his professional interests pertained to substance use. These statements, which were interspersed throughout the interview, represent a pre-grad school way of talking about drugs, and then a post-baccalaureate way. When donning his toga, he spoke about “smokin’ the toast,” “scrapin’ the resin,” “hot-boxing” or having a “clambake,” “Robotrippin’ on Robitussin,” and “Diet Coke” (i.e., Adderall). He had flown in the European Union with mushrooms in his pocket, and blacked out on numerous occasions, including from combining Xanax and alcohol, on his 21st birthday (“there is video”), and a few weeks before the interview (“tequila”). As reported earlier (see “Professional socialization”), he became very open with his substance use after drinking, and had used drugs with all but two in his cohort: a recovering user, and one who was “always pregnant.”

Donning his lab coat, he recounted how friends sought out his guidance regarding whether they would pass drug tests, and referred to his use as “more academic than recreational per se”—“I have that kind of brain.” Regarding how his professional knowledge informed his own substance use, “I have a scientific interest, so I try to remember [my substance-using experiences].” Like some Neuroscientists, he saw himself as “an N of 1” when it came to his own experimentation with drugs. Beyond that, as he studied memory for a living, he was more focused on cognition, and “less worried about [my] lungs.” He worked with patients who used marijuana to treat a medical condition, and was interested in opening a line of

research into “the science of hangovers” to study “what happens when [people] blackout? Do memories make it to the hippocampus?” Regarding negative aspects of his own use, he noted that his “main concern is time,” and that the “perfectionist part of me” questioned whether he was “living up to [his full] potential” by spending time smoking marijuana instead of working. He referred to his struggle as “The tyranny of the shoulds,” without noting that the phrase was coined by Karen Horney, a psychoanalyst and “a shaping founder of modern humanist” (MANAS, 1970) and feminist psychology (Boeree, 2006). His statements reveal a depth of knowledge of both substance use slang and professional jargon, and his dyadic identities were somewhat in conflict “while vacillating between these two impossible selves,” alienating the neurotic “from their true core” and thus “prevent[ing them] from actualizing their potentials” (Boeree, 2006). He sometimes wondered: “What would my life be like if I went to the gym more?” At the time of the interview, he was going through the matching process (Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers, n.d.), and during the interview itself he was paged several times to provide consultations on patients being observed in a clinic. He constructed the research interview as a form of practice for interviews he would have in the future, commenting after being asked to describe himself:

> This is good, these are questions I’ll get on internship interviews, it’s good practice. I think of myself as a student through and through, always trying to learn … I consider myself a scientist—it’s lame to say, this is a buzzword—practitioner.

Use of an admitted buzzword highlights that some answers, or parts of them, were adapted from previous narratives. Though not afraid to portray unflattering moments that he tended to laugh off, leveraging the interview as a useful experience was a form of expertise that both allowed him to practice the presentation of self and mitigate potential concerns he might have about anything he had disclosed. As someone accustomed to asking questions of patients, the interview was practice for a known or unknown future event where he might be asked similar questions. While he clearly knew how to get around in a lab coat, therefore, he was also able to blend the toga in quite effortlessly and it could sometimes be seen underneath.

MD and PhD or Master's students who studied neurological or biological processes were likely to speak about drug use physiologically, in terms of the interaction with the body. Statements could be more general, or specific, and, in contrast to references to more historical events, indicate familiarity with more recent developments. The first excerpt shows how an MD student quickly pivoted from talking about his first experience smoking with people in his program to a larger debate about the use of marijuana for medical purposes:

> Oren: Yeah, so, you've smoked with a few people in your program?
>
> Interviewee: A few, yeah.
>
> Oren: And how far into the [first] semester did it first happen?
>
> Interviewee: Um, maybe three weeks. Two, three weeks. (5 second pause) It may have been approached to me, first, but then, ya know, you hang out with a few people enough, it's, I think people do it in every professional school around the country, or anywhere, and I guess it's a personal choice. I don't think, I don't think we live in an age where there are a ton of people who are so against it, especially when *it's been proven to have some medical benefits*. There are some states now, even the state where I'm from is currently contemplating, might be one of the next states to sort of *ratify the use of medical marijuana*. Certainly, *its therapeutic affects are undeniable*. Recreationally, I think the government would like to cut down on that, but it's something that happens everywhere… at least, everywhere that I've been and seen it done (Emphasis added).

As a first-semester medical school student, he was more reliant on general social changes that might influence his profession, with the caveat that people in every professional school that he knew of were using drugs too. By comparing recreational and medical or therapeutic uses, and highlighting the "certainly" "proven" benefits, he balanced marijuana's medical potential with its illegal status, noting that the law may soon support a less punitive approach. Therefore, his recreational use was less of an issue given these other trends, and only briefly touched on, though he discovered relatively early in his program that others smoked, a process that took others months to broach, if ever. Asked, "Have you talked about illicit substances [in medical school], marijuana and cocaine and stuff?," he indicated it had not really been covered, but would be the following year:

> the first year of medical school is more about the normal, less about the abnormal. Not to say that taking drugs is abnormal, but the effects that drugs can have are abnormal, can cause abnormal processes. Right? So, next year we talk a lot about immunology, so

> when drugs have an effect on your body, and cause liver failure or renal failure, or some-something of that sor[t]-nature. Then we sort of learn about I guess those mechanisms, and how drugs affect certain pathways.

While showing a degree of familiarity with some courses he would be taking in the future, and providing a few examples of what he might learn about substance use the following year, his language was not as confident as it would be after taking those courses (e.g., "Right?," "something of that sor[t]-nature," "sort of learn about I guess"). Meanwhile, substance use went from having "therapeutic affects [that] are undeniable" and "a personal choice" to causing "abnormal processes," as defined by the profession.

By contrast to the first-year medical school student, an MD-to-be in her third year spoke about the effects of substance use on the body in greater detail. While the more novice medical school student shifted from talking about his own experience to substance use in society, the student with more training provided specific details on internal processes related to marijuana, cigarettes, alcohol, and then cocaine use:

> Oren: Being that you're going to be a doctor, can you talk about what, say, marijuana does to your body, or (speaking over each other)—
>
> Interviewee: Sure, I've been researching actually… because I've been worried [because of my own use]. Apparently, what I looked into so far, marijuana has a similar, or slightly lower tar content than cigarettes, but does not have any of the carcinogens, or cadmium, or arsenic, or nicotine, or any of the addictive or carcinogenic substances that cigarettes have. And I also looked up whether marijuana predisposes [users] to any type of cancer. Specifically, I was looking at throat cancer (laughing) because I have this one area in my throat that I keep thinking, "it always hurts after I smoke," so I keep thinking I'm going to get like a cancerous transformation there. But apparently there's only a slightly increased, very slightly increased risk of cervical as well as prostate cancer. I know in males marijuana does, (clears throat) lower your sperm count. And I do know that marijuana acts on your opioid receptors—or cannabinoid receptors, I'm sorry, not opioid receptors. Which a few other drugs do. And there's also a treatment for anorexia that involves stimulating the cannabinoid receptors, and stimulating eating. But obviously once you take this person off the medication, they're gonna revert back to their old ways.

Starting with her own personal reasons for researching marijuana in an attempt to diagnose what she was experiencing, her discourse then shifted to a number of medical implications of use, and also potential treatments stemming from the brain receptors involved in the interaction

with cannabis. Marijuana went from potentially causing cancer to being used in treatment.

Without pause or prompting, she continued to describe alcohol:

> As for alcohol, it is a CNS depressant, central nervous system depressant. You basically eliminate the exact same rate of alcohol from your body every single hour, like a certain amount; let's say like 10 grams per hour. Even if you drink 1000 grams, you're still only going to be eliminating 10 [grams] per hour, so that's why people run into this trouble with intoxication. All you have to do is drink five or six beers, and then once more an hour and that will keep you at a very intoxicated level. And so, the more you drink is not the more you're going to be eliminating. Like, your liver can only process so much. Obviously, that's why people can die from alcohol overdoses, because you basically drink yourself into a stupor and that suppresses your brain stem respiratory center. And you literally like do not get the urge to breathe anymore. What else did you want to know?

Eager to provide more information, her description of alcohol incorporated exaggerated but helpful examples (livers process, e.g., "10 grams per hour… even if you drink 1000 grams"), assessments ("so that's why people have trouble with intoxication"), and potential outcomes ("people can die from alcohol overdoses" because it "suppresses your brain stem respiratory center"). These would all be helpful in talking about substance use with a patient or layperson. Demonstrating her ability to get more technical, she responded as follows when asked about cocaine:

> Ok… Cocaine is similar to the amphetamines, such as methamphetamine. What it does is it keeps the levels of… basically, so you have two neurons, right, so there's going to be dopamine coming out of your pre-synaptic neuron, and then it usually hits your post-synaptic neuron and goes on in signals and does a lot of stuff in your brain. And then dopamine can also go back up and get sucked into this pre-synaptic receptor, and basically, reused or broken down or recycled. So what cocaine does is it keeps the amount of dopamine that you have in your body basically, out in between these two neurons. And it keeps it active, and in your system. So it's making these feelings that dopamine gives you, like euphoria, restlessness, agitation, um, it dilates your pupils, it increases your heartbeat, it almost is like mimicking that flight or fight response. You become very mobile, you talk a lot, you're very agitated, you're sweating. Your eyes dilate. Like that's a very sympathetic response, so you'll be able to see very far. That's about it.

Her reference to "dopamine" and the "pre-synaptic" neuron and receptor convey a sense of expertise of what is going on inside the body when cocaine is ingested, though oversimplified to may it easier to conceptualize, and she also talks about physical manifestations a medical doctor might need to be aware of when interacting with a patient. Applying what she had

observed and learned about substance use across multiple settings (e.g., social scenes and classrooms), she recognized, on the one hand, that she "tend[ed] to self medicate a little bit with marijuana, and if I'm having a rough day, that's the first thing I wanna do. And that's never a good thing." On the other hand, she considered herself as much of a high-functioning user as any of her peers likelier to drink alcohol or abuse prescription stimulants. Overall, she did not think her personal drug use made her a better physician, but that her experiences with a range of drugs would perhaps make her a more empathetic one, particularly with young people.

Whereas the MD described the effects of marijuana, alcohol, and cocaine in succession, other students demonstrated an ability to leverage their knowledge in explaining differences and similarities between licit and illicit drugs. The following statement by a Master's student in Psychology has words grouped by whether they refer to neurotransmitters in the brain that allow it to communicate (**bolded**), examples of licit and illicit drugs and the feelings they elicit (*italicized*), and technical terms by which these processes are related (underlined):

> Oren: You mentioned **serotonin** and **dopamine**. Can you talk about either one of those and how they relate to *illicit vs. licit drugs*?
>
> Interviewee: **Dopamine** is kind of the drug that's released when you do *cocaine*, it's like *our feel good happy* drug. So let's say your favorite, your *high school team wins a game*… I guess it's also released during *orgasm*, so it's just like our really *feel good happy drug*, that's what happens. It can happen naturally, but when you take *cocaine* it kind of floods your system with this *feel good* drug, it's also a drug that kind of *speeds you up*, *motivates* you. It's also the drug that's used in *Wellbutrin*, that's the neuropathway that's used, which is an antidepressant. So um, there's theories that people who are attracted to *cocaine* may have lower levels of **dopamine** in their brain. **Serotonin** would be your, **serotonin** is kind of a drug that regulates your *appetite*, your *sleep*, and also your *mood*, so people who are depressed are thought to have like a deficit or lack of **serotonin**, so all those—*Paxil*, *Prozac*, *Zoloft*—what they do is keep your brain from re-uptaking **serotonin**, so they kind of stay in your synaptic cleft longer, so the effects of the drugs, just you feel them longer, they stay there. One of the things is it [i.e., **serotonin**] controls your appetite, so having that in there [i.e., the synaptic cleft], people may feel hungrier, but they'll feel less depressed, *whatever that feeling is for people*. In terms of what the relation between what those drugs are and drug use? Is that [good]? Or between those neurotransmitters and drug use?

Her narrative clearly demonstrated that talking about drug use was a domain of expertise and, similar to the MD ("What else do you want to know?"), ended in a question that would allow her

to continue talking about neurotransmitters in relation to drugs. While she did go on to continue talking about technical aspects of drug effects, she summarized the distinction between licit and illicit drugs by stating "I think it's just the extremities": illicit drugs flooded the system with dopamine, whereas prescription medications had more attenuated effects and, rather than making more dopamine, could make it so that the dopamine already being made stayed in the synaptic cleft longer. Thus, prescription drugs helped avoid the effect sometimes associated with the come-down from cocaine, where the high spike in dopamine was followed by relative depletion: "So to get back to normal you need to keep doing it." In spite of having snorted cocaine within the past month, she mentioned numerous negative aspects of the drug, including the use of "mules" to smuggle it into the U.S., suggesting that interview statements might also provide opportunities for informants to influence their future use by helping them to develop multifaceted narratives about drugs.

Complementing their historical knowledge, PhD students and medical doctors were likelier to reference the latest literature available in order to make informed decisions regarding substance use, particularly when preparing to take a drug for the first time. Before taking a hallucinogen for the first time, a Biology PhD student commented that he "planned in advance" and "researched as much as I could about it" and its "pharmacological effects," including in peer-reviewed journals. When asked for a specific example of what he had learned, he explained:

> What I learned most about was research studies on psilocybin, in Baltimore. Psilocybin administered to cloistered nuns, and it was found—I hope I'm getting this right—no, I'm sorry, I messed it up. They did brain scans, I think functional [magnetic resonance imaging] MRI, on nuns in the midst of some religious ritual. And then they did similar scan on people administered psilocybin, and found it mirrored what nuns were experiencing at the height of religious ecstasy…. And that really enticed me.[114]

[114] It is possible he was referring to research done in Baltimore, or by researchers at an institution there (e.g., John's Hopkins University). MacLean, Leoutsakos, Johnson, & Griffiths (2012) have worked to develop a scale that can be used to measure mystical experiences associated with psilocybin, but did not reference fMRI directly. Others have used fMRI to study psilocybin (e.g., Carhart-Harris, Erritzoe, Williams, Stone, Reed, Colasanti, Tyacke, Leech,

It was very important for this informant to accurately relay information, just as it had been when he TAed classes for undergraduates and led a summer enrichment program, and most others were open about whether they remembered precise details about research and experiences, tweaking themselves mid-sentence or later—one MD student contacted me the following day to correct the definition of drug abuse provided during the interview. As the Neuroscience PhD had grown up religious, it was interesting that the scientific study he keyed on also pertained to religious experiences, as he either related to or recalled it more easily. Another student mentioned that "God made these drugs for a reason," and also felt that she had been meant to try all of these drugs after meeting her husband, who guided her on the journeys. One student was more incredulous when I asked, "Do you ever smoke [marijuana] before you go to church?" Her eyes opened wide, she replied "No" in a low voice, indicating that it had never occurred to her or possibly offended that I thought to ask. For her, Sundays were a day without drugs, and a time for family meals.

Returning to science, the Neuroscience PhD student went on to explain that hallucinogenic mushrooms were "metabolized well by the liver, did not linger in the blood stream for a relatively long time," and that "overdose was relatively impossible, so [I was] not worried about having too much," nor was it "chemically synthesized, obviously, so…" Continuing to detail what his research had uncovered, he noted: "In controlled settings, people reported life-changing experiences. There was a very common report—I read this in multiple studies—that people reported improved quality of life *a year* later." This was very exciting to him, as it indicated both the long-term nature of the research paradigm, which suggested a degree of rigor, and a unique effect whereby one dose could have such a lasting impact. With this information, he felt comfortable taking the drugs (see "Hallucinogens with colleagues and alone"). After this single experience, he had "Never done it again, I don't feel a desire to do it again, that that was

---

Malizia, Murphy, Hobden, Evans, Feilding, Wise, & Nutt, 2012), and reviewed research on how neuroimaging has been and might be used to study religious experiences more generally

probably two years ago. If the right situation presented itself, I would [try it again].” Perhaps having seen research inspired by Zinberg (1984), he noted that “Set and setting are crucially important to me,” i.e., when deciding whether to use a drug. Others similarly reported reading scientific studies about drugs they were interested in using and “judging them using the same criterion I use in reviewing publications related to my work.”

Students in other disciplines might reference the brain, but they were less likely to use scientific terminology when doing so. One Neuroscience PhD student who worked in a lab researching “why monkeys aren’t talking” spoke about the different language neuroscientists have in the context of reflecting on drug use in her profession:

> Well I feel that people in neuroscience in general are very, uh, are very curious about drugs. And, initially I thought about it, I’m like, “Oh, we study the brain, we’re interested blah blah blah.” But that’s not it, everybody is interested in the brain and how they function, it’s just maybe that we have a little bit more technical terms to apply to it. But I don’t know what it is about the neuroscience departments—everywhere I’ve been, the neuroscience department for some *particular* reason is *very* drug-friendly.

For her, people wanted to explore their brains, but might not be able to explain what they were experiencing in relation to internal processes. For example, the Master’s in Communication student who saw what she realized were probably imaginary dolphins while on mushrooms at the beach described taking hallucinogens as “dipping into a piece of the brain that doesn’t get accessed a lot.” Another PhD student not researching the brain per se applied a Freudian perspective in noting his interest in Asian culture might have been influenced in part by a picture of a naked Geisha his grandparents had hanging over their toilet that he used to admire while going to the bathroom. They were aware of these ways of thinking, and could apply the logic to their own lives, but did not use such precise lingo. A Neuroscience student thought, “many [in my profession] probably experiment because they have access and curiosity.” In fact, a Neuroscience PhD student who had special access to a strong hallucinogen through the lab she worked in was deterred from leveraging it, as the drug’s use and weight were closely monitored

---

(Newberg & Yee, 2005).

and regulated, and thus she had made no attempts to take any—though she had heard stories of a lab assistant who was caught selling research drugs before the stricter protocols. Therefore, terminology was often leveraged, but the immersion in social and physical settings where scientific considerations and conversations regarding drugs were likelier to occur also played a role, as such processes provided additional material that could be leveraged, or not.

A few students were less informed about substance use, and their lack of knowledge provides helpful contrast to the preceding excerpts, before transitioning to legal discourse. The Management Consultant MBA student, in describing why he had not tried cocaine, concluded by stating that he thought it was "much more dangerous than alcohol and marijuana." Asked, "Dangerous in what ways?," he replied:

> In two ways it could do more damage to your body, I think—*I couldn't tell you that I know that as a scientific fact*—but it's more addictive to your body, and then in comparison to alcohol and marijuana you're more prone to do destructive things (Emphasis added).

Earlier he had noted that it was important to provide at least three points on each PowerPoint slide he prepared as a management consultant: "Occasionally, there's four; two always seems suspicious"—yet now he provided "two ways" cocaine might be dangerous. His aside that he was not relying on "scientific fact" qualified his statement while acknowledging limited substantive knowledge. As his substance of choice was alcohol, he was then asked about a recent time where he "lost control with alcohol," but instead returned to the issue of what he actually knew about illicit drugs and how this informed his decision to use or not to use:

> Interviewee: One more thing about substances. I think I was too aggressive in saying I was completely uninterested in those substances [cocaine and hallucinogens]. I think I have some curiosity about what the experience would be like using the substance [cocaine]. I think there is a little curiosity about what the experience would be like trying to use it, but I think I have a strong fear of the destructive… I think I have a strong fear of addiction because I feel in some ways I have an addictive personality, and so I worry that could be translated to what I consider to be harmful substances. And then, just, I think it's obviously more of a concern with abuse or addiction than one time use, but I just think the physical effects of using it are as concerning for me. *Even though I preface that by saying I'm not well informed*.
>
> Oren: What would serious consideration entail to inform your curiosity?

> Interviewee: I would need to feel like addiction is not a real risk, and connected to that, one-time use would be safe.

As the individual who perhaps had used the least amount of drugs relative to others in the sample, his decision to return to the topic of "substances" showcases how foreign it is for some, but that he was perhaps interested in exploring his views on it further given the context. While he was able to leverage professional expertise in work settings, and was relatively expert in navigating discussions after going on rigorous job interviews, his professional training did not require him to have superior insight into processes associated with substance use. Neither his substance use nor professional history provided him with the background necessary to be a high-functioning user, as he rarely used, and had only returned to school because his employer had provided financial incentivizes to do so—rather than talking the professional talk, he walked the professional walk.

Overall, MBAs, perhaps due to their lack of experience with substance use socially and exposure to it professionally relative to representatives from the other degrees, had greater difficulty leveraging their curricular-based knowledge into how they talked about drugs, yet were more capable at leveraging their anticipated social status in portraying their relationship to drug users more generally. Three mechanisms for leveraging distance or status are interspersed throughout the following statement by the Social Entrepreneurship MBA student, who was speaking reflectively about not only her experience, but more generally about the business school environment and the types of people she encountered there on a day-to-day basis. The themes developed in her statement pertain to how MBA students are socially distant most people and issues (*italics*), will have—and be surrounded by people with—jobs and money (**bold**), and are not overly concerned with issues pertaining to social control (<u>underline</u>):

> Business schools … people can very readily d*istance themselves from like the rest of the population*. They are people who are **anticipating earning a certain income** out of school, and being **leaders of larger corporations or their own businesses**, right? So they kind of *self-segment* as I think really *distant from a lot of social problems*, and probably to the extent that that informs their own substance abuse, use, I think there is a sense that like "<u>well I am untouchable</u> once I am in a certain … **earning bracket**," and

> things like this; "I am … not subject to police in the same way," and "the negative impact won't affect me necessarily to the same extent." There's also, just because *you're around it less*, or *not regularly grappling with the same issues that the rest of the population does*, that you… I just think, when *you kind of lose specific basis in certain issues* it's much easier to demonize the behavior. So I think *business school accelerates that process* for a lot of people 'cause you're really narrowly narrowly looking at like **a certain type of job**, you're **surrounded by people who are going to also be in that tier**, so it's just very—*isolating*.

Her statement shows how, for MBA students, leveraging can have more to do with prospective social status than academic knowledge, perhaps in part because their respite in business school was not perceived to be as influential in shaping their professional career. Yes, it might get them to the next rung in the ladder, and for one student helped in transitioning from a career as a management consultant to a job in corporate finance, but it seemed MBA students were not just far away from personal trouble associated with substance use, but found it easier not to worry about other people and instead accept basic value judgments, i.e., "demonize the[ir] behavior." This was also true for fellow professionals:

> I know a guy who is a—a friend of my husband—who is like a neurosurgeon now, who will use marijuana when we're with him. And something about that is so disturbing to me, because I'm just like what if he gets called in?

She further distinguished between doctors and lawyer, as "doctors are dealing with people in a very life-or-death way, so I think there's a heightened onus on them to pick and choose their moments"—"like you wouldn't want a doctor showing up drunk and then performing a surgical procedure." Though she didn't "have a major issue with people's usage of different things to the extent that they're able to control it," she proceeded to create more space between drug use by MBAs and problematic use:

> Interviewee: … where it impacts how they can perform in their job, and their job has an impact directly on another person, as opposed to indirectly for like an economic system, then I have an issue with it.
>
> Oren: What about investors who use coke, or trade while on coke—is that something that you're aware of?
>
> Interviewee: Yeah, nol'm sure that's going on (laughs). Yeah, that's an interesting one, because you're saying that if investors are also investing on your behalf, or on behalf of a fund in which—

> Oren: (interrupting) —all the not-for-profits are investing in—
>
> Interviewee: —yeah, exactly, exactly, or a convent for that matter.
>
> Oren: Yeah!
>
> Interviewee: Um (4 sec pause). Yeah, um (4 sec pause). Yeah, I guess I have an issue with that, I mean, that's, that's an interesting one… I don't… uh, more broadly than what I just know socially the immediate impact of like being on coke, but I do know, like it typically makes you more risk-seeking than risk-averse, right? So, uh… yeah, that's a tough one, um.

The active back-and-forth demonstrated her ability to riff and think on the fly, even when challenged as much as she was throughout the interview. Acknowledging that her colleagues might be using cocaine that would make them prone to riskier financial decisions, the example of "investors" precluded consideration of people working in business who might have more regular face-to-face interactions with a range of clientele, instead spending the bulk of their time tracking numbers and conferring with fellow investors. Even her classmates who would not be mere investors but "leaders of corporations and their own businesses" would be likelier to interact with people of similar stature, and less of a cross-section of society, as some lawyers and doctors might. While the business profession could require long hours and international travel, it was less likely to necessitate rushing from a social setting to their place of work to handle issues pertaining to life-or-death.[115]

---

[115] A PhD student, by contrast, highlighted his status as high-functioning user while acknowledging that others who were not in school might also use in ways he thought were acceptable:

> I believe myself to be a high-functioning drug user, and I don't necessarily think there's anything wrong with that. … everyone has their vices, and as long as people aren't doing this on the job, and people aren't doing it in a way where it effects how they work. I would expect the same of a truck driver, I would expect the same of a pizza man, or I would expect the same out of a UPS guy, anyone, I would expect the same. And just being able to do your job as well from day to day, I feel like if you can do that, then… you're fine.

Whereas the MBA student mentioned problematic use by other professionals as a way of indicating why use by MBAs seemed less harmful, the PhD student provided examples of users with less status who were "fine" to further deproblematize his identity as a high-functioning user.

Others, particularly PhDs, felt that substance use occasionally provided new insights into their work. The Biology PhD commented that "[I] smoke to stimulate my brain," as it "helps me think in a different way, creatively, academically." He reported that, not only had his friends "made intellectual and academic strides in relation to their work while smoking or high," but "I consider myself one of them," i.e., who has also benefitted from getting high and channeling his thoughts towards his work. He came up with one "highdea" that formed the basis for the metaphor he used in the conclusion of a manuscript that he submitted for publication, which was then accepted. He attributed this to his ability to make connections while high on marijuana; whereas he would "usually only make small jumps, but when under the influence, I am able to make connections several degrees away." He had a question and answer to a potential problem he imagined might arise: "am I going to get to the point where I think I am only creative when high? No, I won't get to that point." Reinforcing his belief in the intellectual benefits of cannabis, which were different from what he had heard growing up, he noted, "For the record: marijuana is not a gateway drug, [as] there are lots of drugs I haven't tried because of their addictive potential or legal risk."

JD students who participated in the study were, as a group, more circumspect regarding what they said and how they dealt with "being on the record." Like neuroscientists, while lawyers might also discuss substance use in professional settings, it was likely to be the use of their client or the opposing party, not their own. Some practiced strategies that allowed them to avoid providing accounts (Lyman & Scott, 1968: 57), or allowed them to do so on their own terms. For example, one JD student whose sister participated in the study decided not to; another cancelled as I waited in the lobby of her law school to meet her; three others did participate, but "off the record," meaning no audio recording was produced. Another participant who agreed to be recorded stated, in the middle of the interview, that what he was about to say was "off the

---

His description of delivery drivers was also unique, as most referenced other professionals who used drugs in relation to their own use.

record," proceeding to speak without waiting for the device to be paused or turned off—the only interviewee to make such a request. The same informant took several breaks during the interview to venture into the next room, where his flatmate was entertaining some lady friends. During one of these breaks, his friend was overheard asking the interviewee if a particular event had been discussed; this story was then probed somewhat awkwardly:

> Oren: I was thinking to bring up what you said before about having, uh, an incident where there was an alcohol-related crash or an accident or something?
>
> Interviewee: (Said with confidence) Nope, I don't think so.
>
> Oren: Did you ever get in trouble with the law pertaining to alcohol?
>
> Interviewee: No.
>
> Oren: Never?
>
> Interviewee: Never.

After trying to ask a question in a way that suggested he had mentioned it earlier and I had not been eavesdropping, the line of questioning quickly became more directed, in part because he indicated he wanted to watch the end of the baseball game. His initial denial might have meant I had misheard, or that he was not prepared to broach that topic. Perhaps he was answering truthfully based on my questioning, which indicated *he* had said something earlier (when it had been his friend who mentioned it), and then asked if he ("you*")* had gotten in trouble with the law (when, like a few students described in "Segmented identities," it was also possible to be a passenger). Such an interpretation supported his earlier assertion that he felt he had been open and honest throughout the interview, though "I don't know my subconscious." However, earlier in the interview he had noted how his approach to substance use might change after passing the Bar exam:

> Interviewee: Going to law school, I know what can happen [if I get caught with drugs], I know about sentencing guidelines. Like, I know what can't happen now [in terms of my drug use], and, um, as I said I don't smoke weed [anymore]. I never really had coke [around] or blew coke [regularly], but I'll never have coke in my house.
>
> Oren: Is it because you know the law more?

> Interviewee: No, I would get disbarred. At that point I would have a lot more to lose. That will definitely be a deterrent for me at that point.

He was willing to discuss the nexus between women and alcohol, which I asked about next, commenting that "I think those are the two things in my life where I live in excess all the time," so he was otherwise open about legal affairs. Earlier he had also indicated that he had smoked weed recently, just had not sought it out. As "Lawyer and client sometimes negotiate agreed interpretations of behavior" (Sarat & Felstiner, 1988: 742), law students in an active interview do the same.

Other JD students who participated leveraged expertise that reflected their transition from having social to more professional relationships with their classmates, akin to changing perceptions of how to maintain "Segmented identities." A female JD student who as a first semester student thought she could recruit some colleagues to participate, did not feel comfortable doing so by the time she was interviewed in her third year. A male JD student who did disclose many aspects of his substance use history during the interview, including his arrest for DUI, still did not want too many of his classmates to know about his use, fearing they might keep such information "in their back pocket" to use against him at a later date (e.g., when they happened to square off in a courtroom). He expressed a desire to "control what aspects of my personality that they knew [about]," which he accomplished by "not accepting Facebook friend requests" and "putting all of my law school friends on limited view, like on a limited list I can tailor to control what sorts of things they can see and do on there." For law school students, then, their expertise was knowing that, regardless of purported IRB protections, they did not want to be tape recorded; if they did speak on the record, they understood what not to say and leveraged their knowledge of the legal system to minimize exposure to potential legal liability that might stem from disclosing their substance use history. Furthermore, some were already used to information *not* pertaining to drug use being wielded as a weapon by colleagues, such

as pages being ripped out of textbooks in the libraries of more competitive law schools in the hopes of making it harder for classmates to perform well on upcoming exams.

For some, it was not clear whether expertise was derived in the classroom, or through other experiences. A Criminology student who frequently mailed drugs developed methods to help diminish the likelihood that her shipments would be identified and, if so, traced back to her.

> I try to be really careful with it. And with sending it, if I'm taping up a package, I'll put gloves on. I know they're not going to take my fingerprints and probably not take the time to do all that but I just never want to be connected. I'll put a different return address and… lately I've been taking little bags of M&Ms and I'll be taking a razor blade and slitting open the M&Ms and then putting the pills in the little bag. Putting it in there, and then sealing that up again. And then putting it in the package. Anytime I go to the post office I'll be sure to *always* pay cash and wear a hat so they can't see my face. And, ya know, and I send it off. And it always gets there, and I haven't gotten anything [negative] from [doing] that.

A frequent mailer of drugs domestically and occasionally internationally, the specific learning process that resulted in this detailed approach, and had perhaps emerged over time. She might have observed such practices on a TV show, discovered them in a textbook, inferred such precautions might be beneficial based on what she had seen or read, or learned them from a friend; regardless, they resembled a more professional risk-management strategy, or *Crime as Work* (Letkemann, 1973). She engaged in similar efforts that allowed her to be surreptitiously high in class, which she felt was "ok," i.e., to do, but it was "just disrespectful to smell like pot or look high, because it is not professional." To show how she would mask her smell and appearance, she dumped out the contents of her purse, which contained a number of leveragable tools a professional woman might have: lip balm, spray perfume, lotions of various fragrances and strengths, gum, mints, eye-drops, eyeliner, a compact, glasses, and more. For a woman to use a compact was not suspicious, and she would often do so to assess whether she looked "high" before returning to class after a break during which she was sure to smoke a cigarette as well as marijuana from a one-hitter that looked like a cigarette to further comingle the licit and illicit sights and smells. She had been caught smoking a cigarette by someone in her department one time, and felt they were surprised to discover that she smoked tobacco.

Therefore, in addition to sheltering drugs in the presence of police, the purses of some women in the present sample—specifically, two who were white and middle-to-upper-class—also provided other forms of protection.[116]

Another Criminology student more clearly relied on personal experience, as she had a mother who was a felon, a sister who had been abused by an older male figure, and other personal contacts with the criminal justice system, noting that there were "No credentials or certificate to show you have experience with that." Rather than leverage academic knowledge to facilitate experiences with drugs, she was doing the opposite, relying on insights from the school of life to inform her professional work:

> I'm in CJ [criminal justice] to hopefully somehow some way make a change in something, I have no clue what it will be, but I feel like I'm supposed to change something within the system in regards to women, and children, and just families in general, because I've been through that and I know stuff isn't there for us to pull through, so, that's it.

Still early in the PhD process at the time of the interview, she had not settled on a dissertation topic that would leverage her experience into professional credentials. However, she clearly felt that her ability to get out of that situation was in spite of, not because of, resources made available to her and her family as children or siblings of those involved in the system or victimized, such that these were issues that still needed to be addressed. For one, she noted that experiences such as her own were not portrayed in the literature, which she noticed when researching the topic for work she was doing in public schools:

> Oren: [So] Do you use personal experiences [to relate to the students], or professional things you learn in the program?
>
> Interviewee: A big argument I had [in one class], [there is] not a lot of literature on resilience and thriving in difficult settings. Not too much about resilience of [the] same kids they say are going to be chronic offenders.

Instead, she used herself as an example: "just the idea that I moved from one state to another and knowing [I was going to go to college], absolutely knowing, they were like 'how did you do

---

[116] This is not to say that police never search the purses of white middle-to-upper-class women, but rather that the only women in the sample to report such an incident were white and middle-

that?'" She mentioned her fiancé, her friends with difficult backgrounds that pulled themselves out and made some major strides in life, and were on the right path, including "Mr. Ivy League JD" and his bougy wife. Yet she was unable to "pull things" or articles about people like them from the books, because "it wasn't written." Her expertise did not pertain directly to methods for ingesting drugs, other than her decision to never try cocaine, but coming from a particular background where drug use and criminality were ingrained and making it to graduate school in spite of obstacles might in turn provide others with the leverage to follow a similar course. Unlike many in the sample who were born into families that conferred privilege through parental occupation, academically-accomplished siblings, or wealth, she had greater awareness of how, even in "academic courses and institutions which gave attention" to people of her race (McIntosh, 1988: 9), stories about resilient people with backgrounds similar to her own were not part of the curriculum (cf. Platt, 2012). Therefore, unlike how "race ambassadors" must (Anderson, 2011: 214), without choosing to do so, represent others that look like them when they enter white spaces (Anderson, 2015), the Criminology PhD student served as a willing "academic privilege ambassador" and exemplar to young inner-city children who would very likely have to navigate white spaces to gain similar status. As she suggested, the notion that physical mobility was possible seemed like a prerequisite for social progress through education.

Types of discourse specific to each discipline were identified and represent the ability of participants in the sample to differentiate themselves as high-functioning users. Due to their discipline-specific training and prior discussions of academic interests and accomplishments, students were likelier to demonstrate ideas relevant to their profession, practice strategies informed by their conception of the interview, and portray themselves as drug users in certain ways. Generally, law school students spoke about legal considerations, such as not wanting classmates to know about their use because they may keep such information "in their back pocket," and were likelier to participate "off the record," go "off the record" during the interview,

---

to-upper-class. None of the other participants reported having their purses searched.

or avoid answering questions altogether. PhD students were likelier to have knowledge regarding historical substance use. Among medical, psychology, and neuroscience students, understanding brain chemistry helped them explain the effects of drugs, or lack thereof, individually or in specific combinations. Knowledge shared about drugs cited specific rationale, decisions rendered precise, informed, and purposeful. Meanwhile, MBA students assumed a position where they were somewhat removed from most issues associated with drug use, such as law enforcement efforts or the societal response, though drinking did play a role in business deals, and drug testing in the workplace was mentioned as an issue companies might consider. In some cases, students blended forms of discourse generally associated with other professions, though perhaps also germane to theirs. For example, a Master's student in Psychology spoke of performing a "cost-benefit analysis" when deciding whether to use cocaine, terminology perhaps more readily associated with business but also useful when discussing treatment plans with their own clients (i.e., therapeutic). Overall, PhDs tended to think and talk about drug use more (including during the interviews, which tended to last longer for PhDs), pursue it more as a hobby, and were likelier to use alone; MBAs used to relax or escape, on special occasions, and socially; JDs were somewhere in between. Future lawyers and doctors were likelier to have to pass additional hurdles (e.g., drug testing), whereas MBAs did not mention such issues, save for one who knew an MBA student who had to be drug tested in order to work on a government contract. Therefore, multiple leveraging strategies were detailed in this section, and expertise was used to reduce risks (how, how much, when, where), inform understandings of drug effects and potential harms, talk about experiences, avoid detection, and to contextualize use (e.g., historically).

6.3 Conclusion

Akin to gambling, running, biking, hiking, pilates, yoga, scubaing, skiing, basketball, intramural sports, cooking, going to concerts or museums, attending weddings or cultural events,

eating out, seeing movies, vacationing, and an assortment of other leisure activities GAPSS in the sample pursued, substance use can be a more or less regular part of their social lives. Having the time, desire, and resources to enjoy these activities, like education, is a form of privilege. The excerpts in this chapter depicted how educated GAPSS who spend some amount of their leisure time drinking and using drugs (see Shinew & Parry, 2005) can be privileged or buffered before beginning graduate school, at which point they acquire new ways of understanding and explaining their own involvement with drugs. Many of these pre-graduate school experiences and stories might otherwise have played out differently if not for aspects of privilege that inflected social dynamics. Privilege is a process that helps leverage GAPSS into social spaces where they are exposed to large quantities of information (and some of drugs), much of which they may add to their dossiers because it is particularly memorable, aligns with their worldview, or might potentially help them in their profession (the same can be said of decisions to alter one's state of consciousness). Myriad lessons students had learned that were relayed during the interview are not reported here, as they did not directly relate to substance use, but encouraging GAPSS to discuss issues they had just discovered or knew and cared a great deal about[117] reinforced that their eventual portrayal would encapsulate more than their use of drugs—it was an opportunity to portray oneself as a certain kind of user.

After putting their best foot forward, the topic shifted to substance use, which they knew would inevitably happen, but implicitly challenged them to keep it there while describing drug experiences far and near. To help maintain their emergent professional identity during the interview and after, students leveraged different aspects of their knowledge not customarily engaged in criminological literature and continued practicing strategies for the presentation of self that would allow their overarching narrative and journey to make sense, both to themselves

[117] For example, one JD student spoke about *Loving v. Virginia* and a time he had strongly objected to *Bowers v. Hardwick* without knowing it had since been overturned, and said he was a "Footnote four kind of guy," referencing *U.S. v. Carolene Products Co.*; another had recently learned about the case of *Leonard v. Pepsico, Inc*. and recalled many of the facts.

and audiences real and imaged. The reality that their experiences might reappear in writing further challenged them to represent themselves in a particular way (e.g., knowledgeable), and also to pass muster as genuine and recognizable to others who were “there,” while remaining unidentifiable to many others. Participating in research anonymously and having a chance to talk about their professional passions and substance use histories, for many, seemed itself a “sneaky thrill” (Katz, 1988) perhaps not on par, but similarly worthwhile, to using drugs. Willingness to disclose their use benefitted the research greatly, as knowledge regarding internal and social processes can be relevant to academic coursework and discussions of substance use (i.e., both for GAPSS and in general), and students can also learn how to consume substances in ways that are socially acceptable for those they interact with in subgroups affiliated with these same institutions. This chapter demonstrated how events occurring both before and after becoming GAPSS can amalgamate in the subcultural DNA of students who occupy privileged places and employ sophisticated discourse, further defining the particular behaviors, beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge regarding drugs that are possible for GAPSS substance users to possess and voice.

CHAPTER VII. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Disparities associated with the War on Drugs in the U.S. tend to be studied among those disproportionately affected by the criminal justice system or addiction. The freedom to use illicit drugs in a controlled way or without social sanction is a privilege that, like education, is not equally afforded to all. The educated and affluent procure, use, and discuss drugs, often in privileged social spaces. Research methods, policy and theory should also be informed by the experiences of such users who are able to consume substances without intervention by criminal justice, public health, or social service systems, as the consequences of such interactions are the focus of much of the literature. Consolidating the examination of privilege in the preceding chapters, salient examples were provided that demonstrate how GAPSS have routinely been able to avoid inspection altogether, or easily pass muster when subjected to cursory scrutiny (e.g., are not given breathalyzer tests, do not have purses searched, do not get arrested for urinating in public). That some of these events predated their status as GAPSS suggests that privileges are granted episodically and entail multi-dimensional social processes, of which working towards an advanced education is but one form. Given that privilege is often described as invisible (McIntosh, 1988), at least to those who possess it, the major contribution of the present effort has been to make visible social processes that a sample of GAPSS observed and benefitted from in the course of engaging in substance use. Particularly for those without other forms of social advantage, their education can become their “master privilege” that allows them to achieve success or overcome disadvantages, such as those related to social class or race (cf. Hughes, 1945). Access to the white spaces (Alexander, 2015) associated with institutions of higher learning may provide knowledge, opportunities, and benefits that permeate other social spheres and processes.

Drug use occurs across the life course, including during adolescence, high school, college, after joining the workforce, among those involved in the criminal justice system, and in the general population. Yet there is a knowledge gap whereby, though GAPSS may know a lot

about substance use, little is known about substance use by GAPSS, a high-status hard-to-reach subgroup. GAPSS become socialized into a profession or field of interest, hear and share ideas and terminology germane to their discipline, and transition into new roles that will help them establish a career during which they will be expected to deliver answers, innovations, and treatments. Insight into the impact of these formative years on substance use strategies and patterns of discourse helps to understand the implications of individual experiences, social influences, and the criminal justice system in controlling or allowing for the creation of pockets of users more or less able to remain under the influence, but above the law. Not all leverage expertise in these ways, but there appears to be potential for knowledge to be used for these purposes. Academic information acquired in school is a form of privilege that can serve to neutralize (e.g., internal *a priori* thoughts, accounts verbalized *a posteriori*, or the thoughts, statements, and actions of others), perhaps more easily by those who are knowledgeable, of high social status, or with more to lose; whether excuses or justifications are accepted depends on a number of factors (e.g., speaker, audience, context). While there are questions regarding the relevance of these findings for criminal justice populations, as GAPSS users in the sample were not subjected to formal control at the time of the interview and had collectively spent hardly any time under such supervision, it becomes apparent that drug consumption does not involve the same problems for all, and the differences may be meaningful.

The original data presented herein further inform why the official criminal justice statistics (Kitsuse & Cicourel, 1963) that indicate who gets arrested for substance use differ from self-reported rates of substance use in the general population, as the likelihood of arrest is influenced by social status. The narratives of the status-seeking student users lend support to this assertion, complementing research on less privileged groups most impacted by punitive drug policies and police practices. Drug use by graduate and professional students attending prestigious educational institutions occurred in environments associated with status, power, and potential (see Chambliss, 1973), allowing them to engage in illegal behavior with minimal

external sanction. Substance use was rendered less problematic by the absence of punitive reproach, a process these student users' experiences helped elucidate. Stories of "those dominated" (McIntosh, 1988: 13) by drug use or accompanying legal troubles who are able to overcome are made more poignant by those of users who only had to navigate a drug effect or hangover, not a social penalty. Similar to how privileges conferred by skin-color or gender were less pronounced when these issues were under-acknowledged by mostly white men (McIntosh, 1988), the dearth of research on substance use that occurs in and is perhaps facilitated by educational institutions simultaneously minimizes and reinforces the significance of pockets of privilege that exist in "blind spots" or the shadows of Ivory Towers, obscuring and affording permanence to this particular "dark figure in crime" (Biderman & Reiss, 1967).

Acknowledging that interview encounters between researchers and populations involved in deviance can also potentially be experienced as sites of conflict, steps can be taken to ensure that the discussion of rule-breaking inherent to criminological interviews does not produce a flat representation of complex identity performance. However, exacerbating the inherent challenges of linking internal processes (e.g., decision-making, genetic predispositions) to environmental and social factors, an additional problem arises when investigating substance use criminologically: most research portrays those who have come into contact with the criminal justice system, essentially sampling unsuccessful criminals who at one point were caught, processed, or incarcerated (McCall, 1978: 21-33; cf. Polsky, 1969; Jacques & Wright, 2010a, 2010b). This includes research that makes use of official statistics collected by criminal justice agencies (Kitsuse & Cicourel, 1963), and data assembled by criminologists. Such research tends to involve persons who have engaged in illegal behavior and been punished by the criminal justice system, either formally or by being involved in the process (Feeley, 1979).[118]

[118] Such persons are to be distinguished from "offenders" who were punished for crimes they did not commit, another topic of interest in relation to its implications for due process.

Their statements, therefore, are inflected by their contact with the criminal justice system, and have likely been rehearsed with a particular audience in mind (e.g., family, lawyer, judge, jury).

To address this issue, Polsky (1969) calls for the study of both "uncaught" career criminals and "others who in the past have been caught but are *not* caught at the time you study them" "*au natural*, in the field … as they normally go about their work and play" (p. 115). Such uncaught deviants who engage in illegal behavior but have not been formally punished by the criminal justice system inform the "dark figure in crime" (Biderman & Reiss, 1967) that is not accounted for by official statistics (Kitsuse & Cicourel, 1963), including those pertaining to drug use (Mandel, 1969).[119] Uncaught rule-breakers may be distinguished from the "secret deviant" (Becker, 1963: 20) who receives no official labels—a conceptualization with an implied "objectivity to deviance that transcended the deviant label" (Ibarra, 2008: 11/34)—as external sanction is not always required to anticipate the societal reaction associated with secondary deviance, or to realize that behavior would be interpreted as non-conformist (Lemert, 1972/1967). For example, in cases where involvement with drug use is not overtly displayed across contexts, it is likely recognized as potentially objectionable; on some macrostructural level (Collins, 2000), it is understood to be inappropriate for certain times and places. Hence, when informing one's conception of self, "one's conduct or intentions are questioned … by one's self" (Gerth & Mills, 1953; p. 115): people might internalize what they believe a societal reaction might entail if their behavior were to become more widely known. Just as it can be assumed that internalized neutralizations are used even without hearing them, but can only be documented when uttered, uncaught rule-breakers excuse and justify their behavior to themselves and to others.

---

[119] It is possible that persons at some distance from deviance who have not engaged in illegal behavior or been punished by the criminal justice system are asked about attitudes and opinions pertaining to crime more than uncaught deviants (e.g., Vieraitis, Piquero, Piquero, Tibbetts, & Blankenship, 2012).

Whether research participants are involved in ongoing deviance and the context in which a social interaction takes place are important for considering the implications of what is communicated, and the manner in which it is conveyed. This is particularly true of criminological research involving people who are detained at the time of the interview, as participation is somewhat less voluntary and perhaps associated with informal incentives. Compared to "active" offenders, research on those subjected to "total institutions" (Goffman, 1961: 1) might be influenced by the a) interaction with the justice system leading up to incarceration, which can inculcate legal or formulaic narratives (Brookman, Copes, & Hochstetler, 2011), b) time behind bars and resultant stigma, c) the context of the interview in the prison (or similar) setting, d) extension of any inherent power differential between the interviewer and interviewee, or e) the interviewees' motivation in sharing certain stories (e.g., to gain sympathy, lengthen or shorten the visit) (e.g., Scully & Marolla, 1984: 532[120]; cf. McCall, 1975). The relationship between ongoing illegal behavior and whether an interview participant is detained suggests that some offenders who are in relative captivity at the time of the interview may still be involved in criminality, or plan to continue violating the law upon release, whereas others are detained at the time of the interview but express a desire to desist from crime. Less frequently sampled but of equal importance are offenders engaged in ongoing illegal behavior, but not detained at the time of the interview—such as the GAPSS who participated in the present effort—and individuals who are similarly not incarcerated at the time of the interview who also happen to not be currently involved in illegal activities (though they may have been in the past) provide further contrast. Those not detained at the time of the interview stand to derive little benefit from disclosing illegal behavior. Regarding how to study rule-breakers who are not detained at the time of the interview, particularly those involved in organized crime, Chambliss (1975) suggested:

---

[120] Scully and Marolla (1984) observed that male "rapists volunteered more about their feelings and emotions to the female author and her interviews lasted longer" (532) (Gur & Ibarra, 2011).

> The data on organized crime and professional theft as well as other presumably difficult-to-study events are much more available than we usually think. All we really have to do is to get out of our offices and onto the street. The data are there; the problem is that too often [researchers] are not (quoted in Wright, Decker, Redfern, & Smith, 1992: 12).

These distinctions are often not fully appreciated for their potential implications for research, leading to the overreliance on offenders who have been caught that Chambliss laments (1975), limiting the range of disclosures offered during interviews between researchers and criminogenic populations, or theories of offending developed from such interactions. Additional research on those who have engaged in illegal behavior without being punished by the criminal justice system who continue to break the law, but are not incarcerated at the time of the interview, would seem useful.

Focusing on those not involved with the criminal justice at the time of the interview, this research calls attention to the relevance of privilege to studies of drug use. The contexts in which privileged drug use can occur, and the statements and experiences of students pursuing advanced degrees who use illicit drugs, demonstrate how academic and social knowledge are integrated into using practices, leveraged to frame involvement, or inform decisions regarding what to disclose to others during interactions that arise in the context of their lives, including the research interview. The reasons provided for using drugs were thoughtful and informed, and though participants may not include many GAPSS who had a harder time because of drug use, their stories about school and “active” social lives (Polsky, 1969) have implications for policy, criminological theory, and methods for studying the nexus between class and crime.

Policy implications of the present study most directly pertain to the criminal justice system. Perhaps akin to the fruit of a poisonous tree associated with the exclusionary rule introduced in *Mapp v. Ohio* in an attempt by the judiciary to control police discretion (1961), the modern War on Drugs has emerged from rotten roots; it was created and continues to disproportionately target and punish some groups more than others. Those targeted include people who are “poor, unemployed, unmarried, unorganized, lack formal education,” and racial

or ethnic minorities with a “history of subjection to law” (Jacques & Wright, 2010a: 392)—the same populations likelier to be involved in criminological research and incarcerated at the time of participation. Old policies must be uprooted, and new ones sewn, breathing life back into communities from which too many have been plucked. States have already begun to subvert Federal laws in regards to marijuana (e.g., Colorado, Washington), perhaps comprised of high-functioning policy makers who were able to leverage reasons into actionable statutes and profitable models. If the use of marijuana (or other drugs) continues to become more socially acceptable, and is decriminalized or legalized, some of the present findings would perhaps be less relevant due to the diminished need to, for example, segment drug-using identities from professional networks. However, the value of the study might also be enhanced due to its historical significance in demonstrating how privileged individuals were able to engage in illicit substance use with seeming impunity. Furthermore, regardless of trends in drug laws and associated enforcement efforts, the results may generalize to other activities that people with status or wealth pursue that might continue to be illegal (e.g., impaired driving, solicitation, sexual assault, shop-lifting, gambling, white-collar crimes).

Several questions remain unanswered by the present study pertaining to the intersection of privilege, drug use, and GAPSS. Regarding privilege, the narratives offered by informants suggest that, in addition to not being responded to by authorities, their substance use was generally unobjectionable to colleagues, mentors, parents, siblings, and most others they came into contact with. While some reported that individuals in their program had been called to account (e.g., for being too drunk at departmental functions or inappropriate touching), the actual rules and policies at relevant institutions pertaining to substance use were not discussed by participants or included in analysis. One criminology student noted that federal student loans might be affected by a drug arrest, but concerns regarding the implications of such a social sanction for affiliation with graduate and professional schools were not made apparent; students seemed more aware of the policies at their undergraduate institutions, perhaps suggesting they

felt such issues would not be as problematic for advanced students. In terms of drug use, aside from roughly two thirds of the sample that had used powder cocaine, and the use of alcohol, tobacco, and caffeine, the overwhelming majority of students did not report having ever tried the most addictive drugs, including heroin, crack cocaine, methamphetamines (e.g., Nutt, King, & Phillips, 2010)—with few exceptions. Therefore, the ability of GAPSS to achieve their professional goals and maintain associated relationships while using these types of drugs remains unclear. Long-term research could follow-up to assess how GAPSS users continue to evolve in their use and careers, including those who drop out or experience more serious problems with substance use. Incorporating a control group of students who do not use drugs could inform a number of important issues, such as how colleagues perceive GAPSS who do use (see 3.5.2 Limitations). A more retrospective effort might involve interviewing those who have already completed their course of study and moved on to academic careers while continuing to use drugs, such as the professors mentioned in some of the narratives. They could similarly be asked about their pathways into substance use and experiences as GAPSS, and may have some unique issues (e.g., locating drug suppliers, as referenced by interviewees in the present sample) or distinct practices associated with being assistant, associate, full, or emeritus professors, or those who leave academia. The results of the present effort could also lay the foundation for more structured interviews and be used to inform quantitative surveys, providing insight into what kinds of questions to ask in order to collect information relevant and meaningful for GAPSS users. Finally, in contrast to the theme of privilege in relation to GAPSS users, a study of GAPSS who do not come from privileged backgrounds—including those of criminological interest (e.g., involved in substance use, with criminal records, exposed to violence)—could perhaps better distill the role of educational privilege in relation to its other forms. For example, while McIntosh (1998) suggests “unearned over-advantage” is associated more with race than “class, region, religion, ethnicity, or sexual orientation” (p. 1), how the other privileges might be ordered in terms of the advantages they provide is unclear.

Although the data set pertained to an elite population, there are policy implications for disadvantaged groups (e.g., stigma reduction for those who do not get into trouble, and those who do). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2014), 31.9 percent of adults in the U.S. have earned a bachelor's degree, of which 17.2 percent are either current or former GAPSS, and of these 3.3 percent have already obtained professional or doctorate degrees. As between 2.5 to 8.5 percent of booked arrestees had a four-year degree or more (ADAM, 2010), extrapolation from these figures suggests that, depending on the jurisdiction, people who have not graduated college are roughly 3.75 to 12.8 times more likely to be arrested than those with diplomas. These figures are similar to others that indicate, for example, that in 2010, "a Black person was 3.73 times more likely to be arrested for marijuana possession than a white person" (ACLU, 2013: 9). As the data presented here—the majority of which was generated during interviews with white students—suggest, substance use by GAPSS frequently occurs without coming to the attention of the criminal justice system. The sample represents a small slice of GAPSS, and GAPSS encompass a fraction of the total population, but the findings nonetheless have implications for non-GAPSS and society more generally as they imply that some have unearned advantages associated with a particular status that allow them to successfully navigate social processes. For example, whereas Jim Crow laws are generally considered for those they negatively affected, and privileges in regards to those that do not have many, it is also possible to better understand these topics by considering, respectively, those who benefitted from Jim Crow, and those who have abundant privileges; both sides of the coin merit scrutiny.

While the adverse effects of substance use may have been minimized by informants or analytically, that those in the sample presented themselves as being able to use drugs while maintaining an upward professional trajectory suggests that, at least for some (i.e., those portrayed in the literature, not this specific sample), the punitive response to substance use may amplify associated harms, rather than reducing them. Many informants acknowledged this possibility, which, based on the review of the literature pertaining to drug law enforcement,

might suggest that the trend toward decriminalization may be grounded in a realistic assessment of the negative impact of punitive approaches to low level drug use, particularly where possessing marijuana is the most serious charge, as laws restricting marijuana use are disparately enforced. For example, Federal funding to police departments incentivizing drug arrests should be reconsidered, as this invariably leads to the disproportionate arrest of marijuana users for possession, as it is the most widely used drug. Other policy changes were suggested by participants: As noted by medical school students and others in the sample, marijuana should not be a Schedule I drug, as its therapeutic benefits for treating epilepsy, Crohn's disease, eating disorders, nausea (e.g., associated with cancer), insomnia, post-traumatic stress disorder, and pain management continue to advance. Informants studying criminology and in other fields expressed similar antipathy for other inequities inherent in drug laws, such as the sentencing disparities between crack and powder cocaine, which they felt should be ameliorated. For GAPSS in the sample, alcohol was consistently the most harmful drug consumed, aside from the student who had a manic break in part due to cocaine and prescription drug use and the student who took a mystery pill on the night of his arrest. The drinking age seems arbitrary, as several GAPSS noted, particularly for those socialized into binge drinking as a normative behavior during college. While social class influences substance use and car ownership, it seems telling that racial disparities do not consistently appear in arrest rates for driving under the influence (BJS, 2014; Romano, Voas, & Lacey, 2010: 28).[121]

Criminological theory, in addition to studying those who continue to engage in the rule-breaking behavior of interest before they are caught doing so, might also focus attention on the process of returning to school as it pertains to involvement in substance use and other illegal behavior, perhaps as a parallel to research on workplace deviance. As shown here, for some GAPSS who use drugs, the classroom and their social interactions more generally serve as a

[121] In 2012, the arrest rates for driving under the influence (DUI) was 357.9 per 100,000 for black people, compared to 436.0 per 100,000 white; historically, from the early 1980s to present,

training ground where they can learn about drug effects and drug use is normal. What they are learning about and in the process of becoming can create a feedback loop that reinforces how they make sense of their own use and the use of others around them. Graduate and professional schools can be studied as social spaces distinct from college and the workplace in which students have time to transition while rehearsing ways of thinking that reflect possible future trajectories for themselves, some of which pertain to substance use. Their stories can inform how we think through issues of drug use and other kinds of so-called deviant behavior, particularly in relation to privilege, as some continue traditions of substance use associated with their fields, and others create new ones. In these contexts, students are trained in how to recognize opportunities, risks, and do so more effectively. Realms of respectability provide areas where students may become more civilized, but also more delinquent; they do not become delinquent, just better at engaging in some behaviors associated with delinquents. Just as prisons are known to expose relatively novice inmates to those with more extensive criminal histories, beliefs, and skills, attending graduate school can facilitate criminal behavior in the form of substance use, particularly for those who do not want or need to enter the workforce and instead forged an identity through their college experience that they want to maintain, elaborate, or cultivate in new ways they may not have realized were possible. There is a distorted view of substance use as being associated with the lower classes, yet it is also possible to understand the privileged spaces of professional schools that exist as gateways to the middle-to-upper class and subsequent privileged spaces that mask transgressions.

White-collar crime tends to be associated with crimes *typically* committed by white-collar criminals, but legally the term defines a type of crime, not the social class of those involved. The present study suggests that, at least with respect to substance use, interviewees behaved as if the definition applied to the class, rather than the crime; therefore, as reflected in the narratives of GAPSS, white-collar crime may be less about the type of crime, and more about who

---

whites have been arrested at higher rates than blacks for DUI (BJS, 2014).

commits it and where. That is, even when people in positions generally associated with white-collar crime instead engage in criminal deviance, the social penalty is nonetheless more in line with an infraction of civil law. While this study allows for specification by elaborating on a particular group (i.e., GAPSS), there are examples that suggest the principle extends to more serious offenses (e.g., Edward Moore “Ted” Kennedy, O.J. Simpson, Robert Durst, Bill Cosby).

The stories relayed in the data chapters, like the participants who told them, have traversed many different scenes and countless interactions and experiences with substance use. Some walked in the footsteps of Shulgin, others with Snuffleupagus. Drugs were used by all, close calls had by more than a few, but only two had experienced significant social control stemming from substance use; one received treatment, and used drugs infrequently at the time of the interview, and the other had his record expunged, and still drank regularly and smoked marijuana daily. At this point, had the students in the sample proceeded as planned, most all would have already earned their degrees. What separates their current selves from the depictions in the stories on these pages are only a few letters, but the words they spoke as GAPSS users differentiate them from other renderings in the literature.

CITED LITERATURE

21 U.S. Code § 812 (2011). Schedules of controlled substances. Retrieved from www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2010-title21/pdf/USCODE-2010-title21-chap13-subchapI-partB-sec812.pdf. Accessed June 10, 2015.

Abel, E.L. (1980). *Marihuana: The first twelve thousand years*. Retrieved April 25, 2015 from http://www.ukcia.org/research/abel/index.php

Adlaf, E.M. (2005). Collecting drug use data from different populations. In Z. Sloboda (Ed.), *Epidemiology of Drug Abuse* (pp. 99-111). New York: Springer.

Adler, P.A. (1990). Ethnographic research on hidden populations: Penetrating the Drug World. In: E. Lambert (Ed.), *The Collection and Interpretation of Data from Hidden Populations*. NIDA Monograph 98. National Institute on Drug Abuse, Rockville, MD.

Adler, P.A. (1993). *Wheeling and dealing: An ethnography of an upper-level drug dealing and smuggling community*. 2d ed. New York: Colombia University Press.

Adler, P.A., & Adler, P. (2003). The reluctant respondent. In J. Holstein and J. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 153-73). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study (2015). Request for applications (RFA). *Department of Health and Human Services.* Retrieved March 28, 2015 from grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/RFA-DA-15-015.html

Agar, M. (2003). Toward a qualitative epidemiology. *Qualitative Health Research, 13*, 974-86.

Alexander, M. (2012). *The New Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.

American Civil Liberties Union (1999). *Drug testing: A bad investment*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.aclu.org/files/FilesPDFs/drugtesting.pdf

American Civil Liberties Union (2013). The war on marijuana in black and white: Billions of dollars wasted on racially biased arrests. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from www.aclu.org/files/assets/aclu-thewaronmarijuana-rel2.pdf

American Civil Liberties Union (2015). *Stop and frisk in Chicago*. ACLU of Illinois. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from www.aclu-il.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/ACLU_StopandFrisk_6.pdf

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Anderson, E. (2011). *The cosmopolitan canopy: Race and civility in everyday life*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Anderson, E. (2015). The white space. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 1*(1), 10-21.

Anslinger, H.J., & Cooper, C.R. (2011/1937). Marijuana: Assassin of youth. In J.A. Inciardi & K. McElrath (Eds.), *The American drug scene: An anthology* (6th ed.) (pp. 143-148). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (n.d.). APPIC Internship Matching Program. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from https://www.natmatch.com/psychint/

Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (2010). ADAM II 2010 Annual Report. *Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/ondcp/policy-and-research/adam2010.pdf

Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (2013). ADAM II 2013 Annual Report. *Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/ondcp/policy-and-research/adam_ii_2013_annual_report.pdf

Association of American Medical Colleges (n.d.). Association of American Medical Colleges-Facilitated Criminal Background Checks. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.aamc.org/students/applying/amcas/how_to_apply/134176/background_check_details.html

Baicker, K. & Jacobson, M. (2007). Finders keepers: Forfeiture laws, policing incentives, and local budgets. *Journal of Public Economics*, *91*(11), 2113-2136.

Bailey, et al. v. City of Philadelphia, et al. (2015, February 24). Plaintiffs' fifth report to court and monitor on stop and frisk practices. Submitted by D. Rudovsky, P. Messing, M.C. Roper, & S. Kreimer in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, C.A. No. 10-5952.

Baldisseri, M.R. (2007). Impaired healthcare professional. *Crit Care Med, 35*(2), S106-S116.

Barlow, D.E., & Barlow, M.H. (2000). *Police in a multicultural society: An American story*. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

Bass, S. (2001). Policing space, policing race: Social control imperatives and police discretionary decisions. *Social Justice, 28*(1), 156-76.

Baum, G. (1994, June 24). The secrets of your soul. *L.A. Times*, at E1, E7.

Beatty, P., Petturiti, A., & Ziedenberg, J. (2007). The vortex: The concentrated racial impact of drug imprisonment and the characteristics of punitive counties. Washington, D.C.: Justice Policy Institute. Retrieved December 7, 2010 from www.justicepolicy.org/research/1953

Beck, C.J.A., Sales, B.D., & Benjamin, G.A.H. (1995). Lawyer distress: Alcohol-related problems and other psychological concerns among a sample of practicing lawyers. *Journal of Law and Health, 10(*1), 1-60.

Becker, H.S. (1953). Becoming a marihuana user. *American Journal of Sociology, 59*, 235-42.

Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: The Free Press.

Becker, H.S., Geer, B., Hughes, E.C., & Strauss, A.L. (2008/1961). *Boys in white: Student culture in medical school*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Beckett, K. (2012). Race, drugs, and law enforcement: Toward equitable policing. *Criminology & Public Policy, 11*(4): 641-53.

Beckett, K., Nyrop, K., & Pfingst, L. (2006). Race, drugs, and policing: Understanding disparities in drug delivery arrests. *Criminology, 44*(1), 105-37.

Beniger, J.R. (1984). *Trafficking in drug users: Professional exchange networks in the control of deviance*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Benson, B.L. & Rasmussen, D.W. (1997). Predatory public finance and the origins of the war on drugs: 1984-1989. *The Independent Review, I*(2), 163-189

Benson, B.L., Rasmussen, D.W., & Sollars, D.L. (1995). Police bureaucracies, their incentives, and the war on drugs. *Public Choice*, *83*(1), 21-45.

Benson, M. (1985). Denying the guilty mind: Accounting for involvement in a white-collar crime. *Criminology, 23*(4), 583-607.

Berard, T.J. (2003). Ethnomethodology as radical sociology: An expansive appreciation of Melvin Pollner's' constitutive and mundane versions of labeling theory'. Human Studies, 26(4), 431-448.

Berge, K.H., Seppala, M.D., & Schipper, A.M. (2009). Chemical dependency and the physician. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 84*(7), 625-31.

Berk, R.A., Campbell, A., Klap, R., & Western, B. (1992). The Deterrent Effect of Arrest in Incidents of Domestic Violence: A Bayesian Analysis of Four Field Experiments. *American Sociological Review, 57*, 698–708.

Biderman, A. D. & Reiss, A. J. (1967). On exploring the "dark figure" of crime. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 374(1), 1-15.

Biernacki, P. & Waldorf, D. (1981). Snowball sampling: Problems and techniques of chain referral sampling. Sociological Methods & Research, 10(2), 141-163.

Bittner, E. (1967a). Police discretion in emergency apprehension of mentally ill persons. *Social Problems, 14*, 278-292.

Bittner, E. (1967b). The police on skid-row: a study of peace keeping. *American Sociological Review, 32*, 699-715.

Black, D.J. (1976). *The behavior of law*. New York: Academic Press.

Black, D.J. (1980). *The manners and customs of the police*. New York: Academic Press.

Black, D.J. (1995). The epistemology of pure sociology. *Law and Social Inquiry, 20*, 829–870.

Black, D.J., & Reiss Jr., A.J. (1967). Patterns of behavior in police and citizen transactions. In *U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Studies in Crime and Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas, Field Surveys III, Volume* 2 (pp. 1-139). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Blumenson, E., & Nilsen, E.S. (1998). Policing for profit: The Drug War's hidden economic agenda. Suffolk University Law School Faculty Publications. Paper 4. lsr.nellco.org/suffolk_fp/4

Blumer, H. (1986/1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boeree, C.G. (2006). Karen Horney: 1885-1952. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from webspace.ship.edu/cgboer/horney.html

Bonnie, R. J., & Whitebread, C. H. (1970). The forbidden fruit and the tree of knowledge: An inquiry into the legal history of American marijuana prohibition. *Virginia Law Review, 56*(6), 971-1169.

Booba1234 (2009, January 30). "David After Dentist." YouTube.com. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=txqiwrbYGrs.

Bourgois, P. (2003). *In search of respect: Selling crack in El Barrio* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Bowden, M. (2001/1987). *Doctor dealer: The rise and fall of an all-American boy and his multimillion-dollar cocaine empire*. New York, NY: Grove Press.

Brave New Films (2014, November 17). Interview with Matthew F. Fogg, former U.S. Marshal and DEA Agent. Brave New Foundation Presents: SafeKeepers. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.bravenewfilms.org/they_told_this_dea_agent_not_to_enforce_drug_laws_in_white_areas_really

Brecher, E.M., & the Editors of Consumer Reports Magazine (1972). *Licit and illicit drugs: The Consumers Union report on narcotics, stimulants, depressants, inhalants, hallucinogens, and marijuana – including caffeine, nicotine, and alcohol*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. Retrieved March 24, 2015 from www.ukcia.org/research/cunion/index.php

Briggs, D., & Turner, T. (2011). Risk, transgression and substance use: An ethnography of young British tourists in Ibiza. *Studies of Transient States and Societies, 3*(2), 14-25.

Brookman, F., Copes, H., & Hochstetler, A. (2011). Street codes as formula stories: How inmates recount violence. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 40*(4), 397-434.

Bucher, R. (1965). The psychiatric residency and professional socialization. *Journal of Health and Human Behavior, 6(*4), 197-206.

Bucher, R., & Schatzman, L. (1962). The logic of the state mental hospital. *Social Problems, 9*(4), 337-349.

Bucher, R., Stelling, J., & Dommermuth, P. (1969). Differential prior socialization: A comparison of four professional training programs. *Social Forces, 48*(2): 213-23.

Bucher, R., & Strauss, A.L. (1961). Professions in process. *American Journal of Sociology, 66*(4), 325-34.

Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (2014). Arrest data analysis tool. Accessed March 23, 2015 from www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=datool&surl=/arrests/index.cfm#

Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cai, R., Crane, E., Poneleit, K., & Paulozzi, L. (2010). Emergency department visits involving nonmedical use of selected prescription drugs: Unites States, 2004-2008. *J Pain Palliat Care Pharmacother., 24*(3), 293-297.

Carhart-Harris, R.L., Erritzoe, D., Williams, T., Stone, J.M., Reed, L.J., Colasanti, A., Tyacke, R.J., Leech, R., Malizia, A.L., Murphy, K., Hobden, P., Evans, J., Feilding, A., Wise, R.G., & Nutt, D.J. (2012). Neural correlates of the psychedelic state as determined by fMRI studies with psilocybin. *PNAS, 109*(6), 2138-43.

Chambliss, W.J. (1973). The saints and the roughnecks. *Society, 11(*1), 24-31.

Chambliss, W.J. (1975). On the paucity of research on organized crime: A reply to Galliher and Cain. *American Sociology, 10*: 36-9.

Chambliss, W.J. (1995). Crime control and ethnic minorities: Legitimizing racial oppression by creating moral panics. In D.F. Hawkins (ed.), *Ethnicity, Race, and Crime: Perspectives Across Time and Place* (pp. 235-258). Albany: State University of New York.

Charmaz, K. (1983). The grounded theory method: An explication and interpretation. In R. M. Emerson (Ed.), *Contemporary field research: A collection of readings* (pp. 109-126). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 509-536). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2012/2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chase, S.E. (1995). Taking narrative seriously: Consequences for method and theory in interview studies. In R. Josselson & A. Lieblich (Eds.), *Interpreting Experience: The Narrative Study of Lives* (pp. 1-26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Christensen, T. (2010). Presumed guilty: constructing deviance and deviants through techniques of neutralization. *Deviant Behavior, 31*(6), 552-577.

Clair, R.P. (2003). The changing story of ethnography. In R.P. Clair (Ed.), *Expressions of ethnography: Novel approaches to qualitative methods*. NY: SUNY Press.

Clift, E. (2015, February 28). DC Police Chief Stands Up to Congress Over Pot. *The Daily Beast*. Retrieved March 10, 2015 from www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/02/28/dc-police-chief-stands-up-to-congress-over-pot.html

Cohen, L.E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review, 44*(4), 588-608.

Cohen, S. (2002/1972). *Folk devils and moral panics: The creation of the mods and rockers* (3rd ed). New York: Routledge.

Coleman, P. (2005). Privilege and confidentiality in 12-step self-help programs. *The Journal of Legal Medicine, 26*: 435-74.

College Atlas (n.d.). Top Party Schools in the US for 2015, 2014, 2013 and 2012. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.collegeatlas.org/top-party-schools.html

Collins, R. (1979). *The credential society: An historical sociology of education and stratification*. New York: Academic Press.

Collins, R. (2000). Situational stratification: A micro macro theory of inequality. *Sociological Theory, 18*(1), 17-43.

Costa, E., & Kiss, A. (2011). Dealing with opposition: Uncomfortable moments in research. *European Educational Research Journal, 10*(2), 242-251.

Courtwright, D.T. (2004). The controlled substances act: How a “big tent” reform became a punitive drug law. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 76*(1), 9-15.

Courtwright, D.T. (2010). The NIDA brain disease paradigm: History, resistance and spinoffs. *BioSocieties, 5*(1), 137-147.

Covington, J. (1997). The Social Construction of the Minority Drug Problem. *Social Justice, 24*(4), 117-47.

Covington, J. (1997). The Social Construction of the Minority Drug Problem. *Social Justice, 24*(4), 117-47.

Dabney, D.A., & Hollinger, R.C. (1999). Illicit prescription drug use among pharmacists: Evidence of a paradox of familiarity. *Work and Occupations, 26*, 77-106.

Dabney, D.A., & Hollinger, R.C. (2002). Drugged druggists: The convergence of two criminal career trajectories. *Justice Quarterly, 19*(1), 181-212.

Deaux, E., & Callaghan, J.W. (1985). Key informant versus self-report estimates of health behavior. *Evaluation Research, 9*: 365-368.

Denvir, D. (2014, August 14). Philly pot arrest maps: black people in black neighborhoods. *Philadelphia City* Paper. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from citypaper.net/Blogs/Philly-pot-arrest-maps-black-people-in-black-neighborhoods/

Denzin, N.K, & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

DeVault, M.J. (2007). Knowledge from the field. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Sociology in America: A*

Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) (2013). *Substance-Related and Addictive Disorders*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.dsm5.org/Documents/Substance%20Use%20Disorder%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf

DiChiara, A., & Galliher, J.F. (1994). Dissonance and contradictions in the origins of marihuana decriminalization. *Law & Society Review, 28*(1), 41-78.

Domino, K.B., Hornbein, T.F., Polissar, N.L., Renner, G., Johnson, J., Albert, S., & Hankes, L. (2005). Risk factors for relapse in health care professionals with substance use disorders. *JAMA, 293*(12), 1453-1460.

Douglas, J.D. (1970). *Deviance and respectability: The social construction of moral meanings*. New York: Basic Books.

Draus, P.J., Roddy, J., & Greenwald, M. (2010). "I always kept a job": Income generation, heroin use and economic uncertainty in 21st century Detroit. *The Journal of Drug Issues, 40*(4), 841-869.

Draus, P.J., Siegal, H.A., Carlson, R. G., Falck, R. S., & Wang, J. (2005). Cracking the cornfields: Recruiting illicit stimulant users in rural Ohio. *The Sociological Quarterly, 46*: 165-189.

Dreher, M.C. (1999). Working men and ganja: Marijuana use in rural Jamaica. In C.R. Schwenk & S.L. Rhodes (Eds.), *Marijuana and the workplace: Interpreting research on complex social issues* (pp. 145-166). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Drug Policy Alliance (2015a). The federal drug control budget: New rhetoric, same failed drug war. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from www.drugpolicy.org/sites/default/files/DPA_Fact_sheet_Drug_War_Budget_Feb2015.pdf

Drug Policy Alliance (2015b). The drug war, mass incarceration and race. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from www.drugpolicy.org/sites/default/files/DPA_Fact_Sheet_Drug_War_Mass_Incarceration_and_Race_Jan2015.pdf

Duff, C. (2007). Towards a theory of drug use contexts: Space, embodiment and practice. *Addiction Research and Theory, 15*(5), 503-19.

Dunham & G.P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings* (pp. 465-79). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Dunlap, E., & Johnson, B.D. (1999). Gaining access to hidden populations: Strategies for gaining cooperation of drug sellers/dealers and their families in ethnographic research. *Drugs and Society, 14*: 127-49.

Durkheim, E. (1947). *The division of labor in society*. Trans. G. Simpson. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Durkheim, E. (1982/1895). *The Rules of sociological method*. Trans. W.D. Halls. New York: The Free Press. Retrieve March 23, 2015 from comparsociology.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Emile-Durkheim-Rules-of-Sociological-Method-1982.pdf

Duster, T. (1970). *The legislation of morality: Laws, drugs, and moral judgment*. New York: The Free Press. Retrieved March 24, 2015 from www.drugtext.org/Table/The-Legislation-of-Morality/.

Dwyer, J. (March 21, 2013). Out of one gram of marijuana, a 'manufactured misdemeanor.' *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 24, 2015 from www.nytimes.com/2013/03/22/nyregion/out-of-one-gram-of-marijuana-a-manufactured-misdemeanor.html?_r=0

Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I., & Shaw, L.L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Encyclopedia of Social Measurement. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Erickson, B.H. (1979). Some problems of inferences from chain data. In K. F. Schuessler (Ed.), *Sociological Methodology* (pp. 276-302). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Erikson, K.T. (1963). Notes on the sociology of deviance. In H. S. Becker (Ed.), *The other side: Perspectives on deviance* (pp. 9-22). New York: The Free Press.

Erikson, K.T. (1966). *Wayward Puritans: A study in the sociology of deviance*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Fagan, J., Davies, G., & Carlis, A. (2012). Race and selective enforcement in public housing. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, 9(*4), 697-728.

Faugier, J. and Sargeant, M. (1997). Sampling hard to reach populations. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 26*, 790–797.

Feeley, M.M. (1979). *The process is the punishment: Handling cases in a lower criminal court*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Felson, R.B., & Ribner, S.A. (1981). An attributional approach to accounts and sanctions for criminal violence. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44*(2), 137-142.

Ferguson, A.G. (2011). Crime mapping and the Fourth Amendment: Redrawing "high-crime areas." *Hastings Law Journal, 63*, 179-232.

Ferrell, J. (2004). Boredom, crime and criminology. *Theoretical Criminology, 8*(3), 287-302.

Ferrell, J., & Hamm, M.S. (Eds.). (1998). *Ethnography at the edge: Crime, deviance, and field research*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Fishman, M. (1978). Crime waves as ideology. Social Problems, 25(5), 531-543.

Floyd v. City of New York, 959 F. Supp. 2d 668 (S.D.N.Y. 2013). Retrieved March 10, 2015 from www.nysd.uscourts.gov/cases/show.php?db=special&id=317

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge* (A. Sheriden Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1973). *The order of things: An archeology of the human sciences*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction*, Vol. I (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Fristche, I. (2005). Predicting deviant behavior by neutralization: Myths and findings. *Deviant Behavior, 26*, 483-511.

Frone, M.R. (2006). Prevalence and distribution of illicit drug use in the workforce and in the workplace: Findings and implications from a U.S. national survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 856-869.

Fyfe, J.J. (1989). Split-second syndrome and other determinants of police violence. In R.G.

Gallagher, C.A. (2003). Color-blind privilege: The social and political functions of erasing the color line in post race America. *Race, Gender & Class, 10*(4), 22.

Galliher, J.F. (1971). Explanations of police behavior: A critical review and analysis. *The Sociological Quarterly, 12*(3), 308-318.

Galliher, J.F. (1980). Social scientists' ethical responsibilities to superordinates: Looking upward meekly. *Social Problems, 27*(3), 298-308.

Galliher, J.F., & Walker, A. (1977). The puzzle of the social origins of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937. *Social Problems, 24*(3), 367-76.

Galliher, J.F., Keys, D.P., & Elsner, M. (1998). Lindesmith v. Anslinger: An early government victory in the failed War on Drugs. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 88(*2), 661-82.

Ganley, O.H., Pendergast, W.J., Wilkerson, M.W., & Mattingly, D.E. (2005). Contract with North Carolina Physicians Health Program for the Period 1995-2000. *Journal of Addictive Diseases, 24*(1), 1-12.

Gardner, S.K. (2007). "I heard it through the grapevine": Doctoral student socialization in chemistry and history. *High Educ, 54*, 723-40.

Garfinkel, H. (1964). Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities. *Social Problems, 11*(3), 225-250.

Geertz, C. (1983). Thick descriptions: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In R. M. Emerson (Ed.), Contemporary field research: A collection of readings (pp. 37-59). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Geller, A., & Fagan, J. (2010). Pot as Pretext: Marijuana, Race, and the New Disorder in New York City Street Policing. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies, 7*(4), 591-633.

Gerth, H.H., & Mills, C.W. (1953). Character and social structure: The psychology of social institutions. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from archive.org/details/charactersocials00gert

Glaser, B.G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA: The sociology press.

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Glaser, R.D., & Thorpe, J.S. (1986). Unethical intimacy: A survey of sexual contact and advances between psychology educators and female graduate students. *American Psychologist, 41*(1): 43-51.

Glasser, I. (2000). American drug laws: The new Jim Crow. The 1999 Edward C. Sobota Lecture. *Alb. L. Rev., 63*(3), 703-24.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates.* New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Goffman, E. (1982/1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* New York: Anchor Books.

Gold, K.B., & Teitelbaum, S.A. (2006). Physicians impaired by substance use disorders. *The Journal of Global Drug Policy and Practice. 1*(2). Retrieved November 11, 2013 from www.globaldrugpolicy.org/Issues/Vol%202%20Issue%202/Physicians%20Impaired%20by%20Substance%20Abuse%20Disorders.pdf.

Goldstein, C. (2014, August 7). Philly420: Racial disparities continue in Philly marijuana arrests. *Philadelphia Media Network*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.philly.com/philly/columnists/philly420/Philly420_Racial_disparities_continue_in_Philly_marijuana_arrests.html

Goldstein, J. (1960). Police discretion not to invoke the criminal process: Low-visibility decisions in the administration of justice. *Yale Law Journal*, 69, 543-594.

Goldstein, P.J. (1979). *Prostitution and drugs*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

Goldstein, P.J. (1985). The drugs/violence nexus: A tripartite conceptual framework. *Journal of Drug Issues, 39*, 143-174.

Golub, A., Johnson, B. D., & Dunlap, E. (2006). Smoking marijuana in public:The spatial and policy shift in New York City's arrests, 1992-2003. Harm Reduction Journal, 3(22). Available online at www.harmreductionjournal.com/content/3/1/22

Gonnerman, J. (2004). *Life on the outside: The prison odyssey of Elaine Bartlett*. New York: Picador.

Goode, E. (2007). *Drugs in American society*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goode, E., & Ben-Yehuda, N. (1994). The American drug panic of the 1980s. In E. Goode & N. Ben-Yehuda (Eds.), *Moral panics: The social construction of deviance* (pp. 205-223). Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers Inc. Retrieved December 10, 2012 from www.drugtext.org/Various-general/the-american-drug-panic-of-the-1980s.html.

Gordon, R.L. (1992). *Basic interviewing skills*. USA: F.E. Peacock Publishers Inc

Gottfredson, M.R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gould, J.B., & Mastrofski, S.D. (2004). Suspect searches: Assessing police behavior under the U.S. Constitution. *Criminology, 3*(3), 315-62.

Granfield, R., & Cloud, W. (2011). The elephant that no one sees: Natural recovery among middle-class addicts. In J.A. Inciardi & K. McElrath (Eds.), *The American drug scene: An anthology* (6th ed.) (pp. 451-63). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gray, J.P. (1991). *Why our drug laws have failed and what we can do about it: A judicial indictment of the war on drugs*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gur, O.M. (2013). Leveraged expertise: Risk management strategies of graduate student substance users. *Critical dialogue presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems*, New York, NY, August 11.

Gur, O.M., & Ibarra, P.R. (2010). 'High functioning' users: Interviewing women in professional school. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology*, San Francisco, CA, November 19.

Gur, O.M., & Ibarra, P.R. (2011). Making sense of high status drug users: Constructionist and objectivist readings of neutralization theory. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology*, Washington, D.C., November 18.

Gur, O.M., & Ibarra, P.R. (2013). "Reconsidering the study of accounts in interview-based drug and alcohol research: Lessons from active and ethnographic interviewing." *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems*, New York, NY, August 10.

Gur, O.M., & Ibarra, P.R. (2014). Professional socialization and drug use: Notes on leveraged expertise. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Society of Criminology*, San Francisco, CA, November 20.

Gusfield, J.R. (1986/1963). *Symbolic crusade: Status politics and the American temperance movement* (2 ed.). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Hagan, J. (1991). Destiny and drift: Subcultural preferences, status attainments and the risks and rewards of youth. *American Sociological Review, 56*, 567–582.

Hagan, J. & Foster, H. (2006). Profiles of punishment and privilege: Secret and disputed deviance during the racialized transition to American adulthood. *Crime, Law and Social Change, 46*(1-2), 65-85.

Halnon, K.B. (2011). The power of 420. In J.A. Inciardi & K. McElrath (Eds.), *The American drug scene: An anthology* (6th ed.) (pp. 161-167). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Halper, E. (2015, March 12). Pot-smoking stockbroker has a steady supplier: The Feds. *The Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved March 27, 2015 from www.latimes.com/la-na-c1-government-pot-smoker-20150312-story.html#page=1

Hampton, T. (2005). Experts address risk of physician suicide. *JAMA, 294*(10), 1189-91.

Harris, E.A. (September 23, 2011). Police memo on marijuana warns against some arrests. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from www.nytimes.com/2011/09/24/nyregion/minor-marijuana-possession-charges-require-public-view.html?_r=1&ref=nyregion

Hart, C.L., & Ksir, C. (2013). *Drugs, society, & human behavior* (15th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hathaway, A.D. Comeau, N.C., & Erickson, P. G. (2011). Cannabis normalization and stigma: Contemporary practices of moral regulation. *Criminology & Criminal Justice, 11*(5), 451-469.

Hathaway, A.D., Hyshka, E., Erickson, P. G., Asbridge, M., Brochu, S., Cousineau, M. M., Duff, C., & Marsh, D. (2010). Wither RDS? An investigation of respondent driven sampling as a method of recruiting mainstream marijuana users. *Harm Reduction Journal, 7*, 15-25.

Hawthorne, N. (1999/1850). *The scarlett letter*. New York: Bartleby.com/83/A125

Heckathorn, D.D. (1997). Respondent-driven sampling: A new approach to the study of hidden populations. *Social Problems, 44*, pp. 174–199.

Herbert, S.K. (1996a). The geopolitics of the police: Foucault, disciplinary power and the tactics of the Los Angeles police department. *Political Geography*, *15*(1), 47-59.

Herbert, S.K. (1996b). The normative ordering of police territoriality: Making and marking space with the Los Angeles police department. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *86*(3), 567-582.

Herbert, S.K. (1997a). *Policing space: territoriality and the Los Angeles Police Department*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press.

Herbert, S.K. (1997b). Territoriality and the police. *The Professional Geographer*, *49*(1), 86-94.

Hicks, P.J., Cox, S.M., Epsey, E.L., Goepfert, A.R., Bienstock, J.L., Erickson, S.S., Hammoud, M.H., Katz, N.T., Krueger, P.M., Neutens, J.J., Peskin, E., & Puscheck, E.E. (2005). Medical education reviews—Dealing with student difficulties in the clinical setting. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 193*, 1915-22.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hokemeyer, P.L. (2013, June 7). Privilege and adolescent addictions. *Addiction Professional*. Retrieved March 28, 2015 from www.addictionpro.com/article/privilege-and-adolescent-addictions

Holley, K.A. (2011). A cultural repertoire of practices in Doctoral education. *International Journal of Doctoral Students, 6*, 79-94.

Holstein, J.A. (2009). Defining deviance: John Kitsuse's modest agenda. *American Sociologist, 40*, 51-60.

Holstein, J.A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview: Qualitative research methods*, v. 37. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Holstein, J.A., & Gubrium, J.F. (1997). Active Interviewing. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* (pp. 113-29). London: Sage.

Holstein, J.A., & Gubrium, J.F. (2000). *Constructing the life course* (2nd ed.). Dix Hills, New York: General Hall.

Holstein, J.A., & Gubrium, J.F. (2003). Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns. In J.A. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Inside interviewing: New lenses, new concerns* (pp. 3-30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Holstein, J.A., & Gubrium, J.F. (2004). *The active interview*. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method, and Practice* (2nd edition) (pp. 140-161). London: Sage.

Holstein, J.A., & Gubrium, J.F. (2011). Don't argue with the members. *The American Sociologist, 43*(1), 85-98.

Hser, Y., Longshore, D., & Anglin, M.D. (2007). The life course perspective on drug use: A conceptual framework for understanding drug use trajectories. *Eval Rev., 31*, 515-47.

Hser, Y.I., Anglin, M.D., Grella, C., Longshore, D., & Prendergast, M.L. (1997). Drug use careers: A conceptual framework and existing research findings. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 14*(6), 543-58.

Hughes, E.C. (1945). Dilemmas and contradictions of status. *The American Journal of Sociology, 50*(5), 353-359.

Humensky, J.L. (2010). Are adolescents with high socioeconomic status more likely to engage in alcohol and illicit drug use in early adulthood? *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy, 5*, 19.

Ibarra, P.R. (2008). Contextual and strict constructionism in the sociology of deviance and social problems. In J. Holstein and J. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of constructionist research* (pp. 355-69), New York: Guilford Publications.

Ibarra, P.R., & Gur, O.M. (2014). Drug use and professional socialization: Notes on substance use in graduate and professional school. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences*, Philadelphia, PA, February 20.

Ibarra, P.R., & Kitsuse, J.I. (2003). Claims-making discourse and vernacular resources. In J. Holstein and G. Miller (Eds.), *Challenges and choices: Constructionist perspectives on social problems* (pp. 17-50), New York: Aldine.

Illinois v. Wardlow, 528 U.S. 119 (2000).

Inciardi, J.A., Surrat, H.L., & Kurtz, S.P. (2011). African Americans, crack, and the federal sentencing guidelines. In J.A. Inciardi & K. McElrath (Eds.), *The American drug scene: An anthology* (6th ed.) (pp. 252-263). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Jackson-Jacobs, C. (2001). Refining rock: Practical and social features of self-control among a group of college-student crack users. *Contemporary Drug Problems, 28*, 597-624.

Jackson-Jacobs, C. (2004). Hard drugs in a soft context: Managing trouble and crack use on a college campus. *The Sociological Quarterly, 45*(4), 835-856.

Jacobs, J.A. (2005). ASR's greatest hits: Editor's comment. *American Sociological Review, 70(*1), 1-3.

Jacques, S. (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, S. & Wright, R. (2008a). Intimacy with outlaws: The role of relational distance in recruiting, paying, and interviewing underworld research participants. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 45*(1), 22-38.

Jacques, S. & Wright, R. (2008b). The relevance of peace to studies of drug market violence. *Criminology, 46*(1), 221-254.

Jacques, S., & Wright, R. (2010a). Criminology as social control: Discriminatory research & its role in the reproduction of social inequalities and crime. *Crime, Law and Social Change, 53*(4), 383-96.

Jacques, S., & Wright, R. (2010b). Right or wrong? Toward a theory of IRBs' (dis)approval of research. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 21*(1), 42-59.

Jacques, S., & Wright, R. (2015). *Code of the suburb: Inside the world of middle-class drug dealers*. The University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, B.D., Golub, A., Dunlap, E., Sifaneck, S.J., & McCabe, J.E. (2006). Policing and social control of public marijuana use and selling in New York City. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum, 6*(5), 59-89.

Johnson, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., Bachman, J.G., & Schulenberg, J.E. (2011). *Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975-2011: Volume II, College students and adults ages 19-50*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan. Retrieved December 11, 2012 from www.monitoringthefuture.org/pubs/monographs/mtf-vol2_2011.pdf.

Katz, J. (1988). *Seductions of crime: Moral and sensual attractions in doing evil*. New York: Basic Books.

Kelling, G.L., & Moore, M.H. (1988). The evolving strategy of policing. *Perspectives on Policing,* No. 4. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Justice and Harvard University.

Kelly, B. C. (2010). Sampling and recruitment issues in qualitative drugs research: reflections on the study of club drug users in metro New York. *Subst Use Misuse, 45*(5): 671-83.

Kenna, G.A. & Lewis, D.C. (2008). Risk factors for alcohol and other drug use by healthcare professionals. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy, 3*(3), 1-8.

Kenna, G.A., & Wood, M. D. (2004). Alcohol use by healthcare professionals. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 75*, 107-116.

Kenna, G.A., Baldwin, J.N., Trinkoff, A.M., & Lewis, D.C. (2011). Substance use disorders in healthcare professionals. In B.A. Johnson (Ed.), *Addiction Medicine* (pp. 1375-1398). New York: Springer.

Kennedy, L.W,. Caplan, J.M., & Piza, E. (2011). Risk clusters, hotspots, and spatial intelligence: Risk Terrain Modeling as an algorithm for police resource allocation strategies. *J Quant Criminology, 27*(3), 339-362.

Kennedy, R. (1997). *Race, crime, and the law*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Kezar, A. (2003). Transformational elite interviews: Principles and problems. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9*(3), 395-415.

King, R.S. (2008). *Disparity by geography: The War on Drugs in America's cities*. Washington, D.C.: The Sentencing Project.

Kitsuse, J.I. (1962). Societal reaction to deviant behavior: Problems of theory and method. *Social Problems, 9*(3), 247-256.

Kitsuse, J.I., & Cicourel, A.V. (1963). A note on the use of official statistics. *Social Problems, 11*(2), 131-9.

Klein, J. (2003). *The natural: The misunderstood Presidency of Bill Clinton*. USA: Broadway Books.

Lambert, E.Y. (1990). The collection and interpretation of data from hidden populations. NIDA Research Monograph 98. Washington, D.C.: US Government Print Office.

Lankenau, S.E., Teti, M., Silva, K., Jackson, J.J., Harocopos, A., & Treese, M. (2012). Initiation into prescription opioid misuse amongst young injection users. *International Journal of Drug Policy, 23*: 37-44.

Laub, J.H. (1983). Interview with Edwin M. Lemert. In J.H. Laub (Ed.), Criminology in the Making: An Oral History. Boston: Northeastern University Press. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.sonoma.edu/ccjs/info/emljl.html

Law Enforcement Against Prohibition (2015, March 10). Matthew Fogg Was Told Not To Enforce Drug Laws In White Neighborhoods. Retrieved March 23, 2015 www.leap.cc/22417/

Legha, R.K. (2012). A History of Physician Suicide in America. *J Med Humanit, 33*, 219–244.

Lemert, E.M. (1951). *Social pathology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lemert, E.M. (1972/1967). *Human deviance, social problems, and social control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

LeRoy, M. (Producer), & Fleming, V. (Director). (1939). *The wizard of Oz* [Motion picture]. USA: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM).

Letkemann, P. (1973). *Crime as work*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Lex, B. A. (1990). Narcotics addicts' hustling strategies: Creation and manipulation of ambiguity. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 18*, 388-415.

Librett, M. & Perrone, D. (2010). Apples and oranges: Ethnography and the IRB. *Qualitative Research*, *10*(6), 729-747.

Liebow, E. (2003/1967). *Tally's corner: A study of negro streetcorner men.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lindesmith, A.R. (1940). 'Dope fiend' mythology. J*ournal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 31*, 199-208.

Lindesmith, A.R. (1947). *Opiate addiction*. Bloomington: Principia Press.

Lindesmith, A.R. (1948). Handling the opiate problem. *Federal Probation, 12*, 23-5.

Lindesmith, A.R. (1965). The addict and the law. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.drugtext.org/Table/The-Addict-and-the-Law/

Lindesmith, A.R. (1968). *Addiction and Opiates.* Retrieved March 23, 2015 from http://druglibrary.eu/library/books/adopiates/lindesmith01.pdf

Lopez, G., & Posner, J. (2015, March 16). *Cory Booker on how America's criminal justice system destroys the American dream*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.vox.com/2015/3/16/8205027/cory-booker-drug-war

Loseke, D.R. (2003). *Thinking about social problems: An introduction to constructionist perspectives* (2nd ed.). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Lum, C. (2010a). The influence of places on police decision pathways: From call for service to arrest. *Justice Quarterly, 28*(4), 632-665.

Lum, C. (2010b). *Does the race of place influence police officer decision making*? Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Report.

Luthar, S.S. (2013, November 5). The problem with rich kids. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved March 28, 2015 from www.psychologytoday.com/articles/201310/the-problem-rich-kids

Luthar, S.S., & Becker, B.E. (2002). Privileged but pressured? A study of affluent youth. *Child Development, 73*(5), 1593–1610.

Luthar, S.S., & Latendresse, S.J. (2005). Children of the affluent: Challenges to well-being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*(1), 49–53.

Luthar, S.S., Barkin, S.H., & Crossman, E.J. (2013). “I can, therefore I must”: Fragility in the upper-middle classes. *Development and Psychopathology, 25*, 1529-49.

Luthar, S.S., D’Avanzo, K. (1999). Contextual factors in substance use: A study of suburban and inner-city adolescents. *Development and Psychopathology, 11*, 845–867.

Lyman, S.M., & Scott, M.B. (1970). *A sociology of the absurd*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company.

Lyng, S. (1990). Edgework: A social psychological analysis of voluntary risk taking. *The American Journal of Sociology, 95*(4), 851-886.

Lyons, C.J., & Pettit, B. (2011). Compounded disadvantage: Race, incarceration, and wage growth. *Social Problems, 58*(2), 257-280.

McAuliffe, W. E., Rohman, M., Fishman, P., Friedman, R. Wechsler, H., Soboroff, S. H., & Toth, D. (1984). Psychoactive drug use by young and future physicians. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 25*(1), 34-54.

McAuliffe, W.E., Santangelo, S., Gingras, J., Rohman, M., Sobol, A., & Magnuson, E. (1987a). Use and abuse of controlled substances by pharmacists and pharmacy students. *American Journal of Hospital Pharmacy, 44*, 311-317.

McAuliffe, W.E., Santangelo, S., Magnuson, E., Sobol, A., Rohman, M., & Weissman, J. (1987b). Risk factors of drug impairment in random samples of physicians and medical students. *Substance Use & Misuse, 22*(9), 825-841.

McBeth, B.D., Ankel, F.K., Ling, L.J., Asplin, B.R., Mason, E.J., Flottemesch, T.J., & McNamara, R.M. (2008). Substance use in emergency medicine training programs. *Academic Emergency Medicine, 15*(1), 45-53.

McCabe, D.L., Butterfield, K.D., & Treviño, L.K. (2006a). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 5*(3), 294–305.

McCabe, S.E., Teter, C.J., & Boyd, C.J. (2004). The use, misuse and diversion of prescription stimulants among middle and high school students. *Subst Use Misuse, 39*, 1095–1116.

McCabe, S.E., Teter, C.J., & Boyd, C.J. (2006b). Medical use, illicit use, and diversion of abusable prescription drugs. *J Am Coll Health, 54*, 269–278.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming of to see correspondences through work in women's studies. *Working Paper No. 189.* Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College.

McIntosh, P. (1998). White privilege, color, and crime: A personal account. In M.S. Zatz & C.R. Mann (Eds.), *Images of color, images of crime* (pp. 207-216). Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

MacLean, K.A., Leoutsakos, J.M.S., Johnson, M.W., & Griffiths, R.R. (2012). Factor analysis of the mystical experience questionnaire: A study of experiences occasioned by the hallucinogen psilocybin. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 51*(4): 721-37.

MANAS (1970, April 22). Health and growth. *MANAS Journal, 23*(16): 1-5.

Mandel, J. (1969). Problems with official drug statistics. *Stanford Law Review, 21*(5), 991-1040.

Mandel, J. (1988). Is marijuana law enforcement racist? *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 20*(1), 83-91.

Manning, P.K. (1980). *The Narcs' game: Organizational and informational limits on drug law enforcement*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Maruna, S. & Copes, H. (2005). What have we learned from five decades of neutralization theory research. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, 32*, 221-320.

Marx, G.T. (1984). Notes on the discovery, collection and assessment of hidden and dirty data. In J.W. Schneider and J.I. Kitsuse (Eds.), *Studies in the Sociology of Social Problems*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Co., pp. 78–113.

Massey, D.S., & Denton, N.A. (2001). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Mastrofski, S.D. (2004). Controlling street-level police discretion. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 593*(1), 100-18.

Matthews, D. (2013, June 4). The black/white marijuana arrest gap, in nine charts. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/06/04/the-blackwhite-marijuana-arrest-gap-in-nine-charts/

Matza, D. (1967/1964). *Delinquency and drift*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Matza, D. (1969). *Becoming deviant*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mead, G.H. (1918). The psychology of punitive justice. *American Journal of Sociology, 23*, 577-602.

Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mead, M. (1928). *Coming of age in Samoa: A psychological study of primitive youth for Western civilization*. New York: William Morrow & Co.

Merlo, L.J., Cummings, S.M., & Cottler, L.B. (2014). Prescription drug diversion among substance-impaired pharmacists. *The American Journal on Addictions*, *23*(2), 123-8.

Merton, R.K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review, 3*, 672-82.

Merton, R.K. (1940). Fact and factitiousness in ethnic opinionnaires. *American Sociological Review, 5*(1), 13-28.

Messner, S.F., & Rosenfeld, R. (2007). *Crime and the American Dream* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Miller, J.M. (2011). Becoming an informant. *Justice Quarterly, 28*(2), 203-220.

Miller, W.B. (1958). Lower-class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues, 3*(14), 5–19.

Mills, C.W. (1940). Situated actions and vocabularies of motive. *American Sociological Review, 5,* 904-13.

Mills, C.W. (2000/1956). *The power elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Minor, W.W. (1981). Techniques of neutralization: A reconceptualization and empirical examination. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 18*(2), 295-318.

Mishler, E.G. (1999/1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mohamed, A.R., & Fritsvold, E. (2006). Damn, it feels good to be a gansta: The social organization of the illicit drug trade servicing a private college campus. *Deviant Behavior, 27*(1): 97/125.

Mohamed, A.R., & Fritsvold, E. (2010). *Dorm room dealers: Drugs and the privileges of race and class*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Mosher, C.J., & Atkins, S.M. (2014). *Drugs and drug policy: The control of consciousness alternation* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Moss, G. (2005). Cultural capital and graduate school achievement: A preliminary quantitative investigation. *Electronic Journal of Sociology*. Retrieved June 18, 2015 from http://www.sociology.org/content/2005/tier1/moss.html

Musto, D.F. (1973). *The American Disease: Origins of Narcotic Control*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.drugtext.org/Table/The-American-Disease/

Musto, D.F. (1991). Opium, cocaine and marijuana in American history. *Scientific American, 265*(1), 40-7.

National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws (2015). State info: United States. Retrieved March 27, 2015 from norml.org/states

National Survey on Drug Use and Health (2013a). *Summary of National Findings*. Retrieved February 4, 2015 from www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUHresultsPDFWHTML2013/Web/NSDUHresults2013.pdf

National Survey on Drug Use and Health (2013b). *Results from the 2013 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Detailed tables*. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from archive.samhsa.gov/data/NSDUH/2013SummNatFindDetTables/DetTabs/NSDUH-DetTabsTOC2013.htm

Newberg, A.B., & Lee, B.Y. (2005). The neuroscientific study of religious and spiritual phenomena: or why God doesn't use biostatistics. *Zygon, 40*(20), 469-90.

Newman, O. (1972*). Defensible space: Crime prevention through urban design*. New York: Macmillan.

Nixon, R. (1971, June 17). *Remarks about an intensified program for drug abuse prevention and control*. Online by G. Peters and J.T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=3047.

Nutt, D.J., King, L.A., & Phillips, L.D. (2010). Drug harms in the UK: A multicriteria decision analysis. *Lancet, 376*, 1558-65.

O'Conner, P.G.,, & Spickard Jr., A (1997). Physician impairment by substance abuse. *Med Clin North Am, 81*(4), 1037-52.

Obama, B.H. (1995). *Dreams from My Father*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Office of National Drug Control Policy (2014). *2014 National Drug Control Strategy*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.whitehouse.gov/ondcp/national-drug-control-strategy

Office of Postsecondary Education (2014). Data for calendar years 2011-2013. Retrieved March 25, 2015 from ope.ed.gov/security/GetDownloadFile.aspx

Oreskovich, M.R., Kaups, K.L., Balch, C.M., Hanks, J.B., Satele, D., Sloan, J., Meredith, C., Buhl, A., Dyrbye, L.N., & Shanafelt, T.D. (2012). Prevalence of alcohol use disorders among American surgeons. *Archives of Surgery, 147*(2), 168-174.

Osborne, G. B., & Fogel, C. (2008). Understanding the motivations for recreational marijuana use among adult Canadians. *Substance Use & Misuse, 43*(3-4): 539-572.

Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*, 937–975.

Pager, D. (2008). Blacklisted: Hiring discrimination in an era of mass incarceration. In E. Anderson (Ed.), *Against the wall: Poor, young, black, and male: The city in the twenty-first century* (pp. 71-83). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Pager, D., & Quillian, L. (2005). Walking the Talk? What Employers Say Versus What They Do. *American Sociology Review, 70*(3), 355-380.

Palmar, J.J., Davies, S., Ompad, D.C., Cleland, C.M., & Weitzman, M. (2015). Powder cocaine and crack use in the United States: An examination of risk for arrest and socioeconomic disparities in use. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 149*(1), 108-116.

Parkinson, C.N. (1957). *Parkinson's Law*. Cutchogue, New York: Buccaneer Books.

Patrick, M.E., Wightman, P., Schoeni, R.F., & Schulenberg, J.E. (2012). Socioeconomic status and substance use among young adults: A comparison across constructs and drugs. *J. Stud. Alcohol Drugs, 73*, 772-82.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (2rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Peak, K.J., Barthe, E.P., & Garcia, A. (2008). Campus policing in America: A twenty-year perspective . *Police Quarterly, 11*(2), 239-60.

Peele, S., & Brodsky, A. (2011/1997). Gateway to nowhere: How alcohol came to eb scapegoated for drug abuse. In J.A. Inciardi & K. McElrath (Eds.), *The American drug scene: An anthology (6th ed.)* (pp. 41-50). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Perrone, D. (2009). *The high life: Club kids, harm and drug policy*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Peterson, R.D. (1985). Discriminatory decision making at the legislative level: An analysis of the comprehensive drug abuse prevention and control act of 1970. *Law and Human Behaivor, 9*(3), 243-269.

Pettit, B., & Western, B. (2004). Mass imprisonment and the life course: Race and class inequality in U.S. incarceration. *American Sociological Review, 69*, 151-169.

Pewewardy, N., & Severson, M (2003). A threat to liberty: White privilege and disproportionate minority incarceration. *Journal of Progressive Human Services, 14*(2), 53-74.

Pew Research Center (2013, April 4). Majority now supports legalizing marijuana. Retrieved March 27, 2015 www.people-press.org/files/legacy-pdf/4-4-13%20Marijuana%20Release.pdf

Pink Floyd (1973). *Dark Side of the moon* [CD]. Middlesex, England: Harvest.

Platt, C.S. (2012). *How I made it over: The socialization and experiences of black male doctoral students*. Dissertation. University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/ETD-UT-2012-08-5928/PLATT-DISSERTATION.pdf?sequence=1

Platt, J. (1981). On interviewing one's peers. *The British Journal of Sociology, 32*(1), 75-91

Platt, M., Kidney, R., Lutz, K. M. C., Smith, K., Luketic, R., Witherspoon, R., Wilson, L., ... MGM Home Entertainment Inc. (2004). *Legally blonde*. Santa Monica, CA: MGM Home Entertainment.

Pollner, M. (1978). Constitutive and mundane versions of labeling theory. *Human Studies*, *1*(1), 269-288.

Polsky, N. (1969). *Hustlers, beats, and others*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor.

Pool, I.S. (1957). A Critique of the Twentieth Anniversary Issue. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 21*(1): 190–8.

Powell, J.W., Pander, M.S., & Nielsen, R.C. (1994). *Campus security and law enforcement* (2nd ed.). Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Presser, L. (2004). Violent offenders, moral selves: Constructing identities and accounts in the research interview. *Social Problems, 51*, 82-102.

Presser, L. (2009). The narratives of offenders. *Theoretical Criminology, 13*(2), 177-200.

Priest, T.B., & McGrath, J.H. III. (1970). Techniques of neutralization: Young adult marijuana smokers. *Criminology, 8*(2), 185-194.

Project Know (2014). Drugs on campus. Retrieved March 27, 2015 from www.projectknow.com/discover/drugs-on-campus-2014/

Provine, D.M. (2007). *Unequal under law: Race in the War on Drugs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Quinney, R. (1970). *The social reality of crime*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Rainwater, L., & Pittman, D.J. (1967). Ethical problems in studying a politically sensitive and deviant community. *Social Problems, 14*, 357-366.

Rashe, R.L. (2012). *Becoming a professional: Examining professional developemnt practices of communication doctoral students*. Dissertation. Texas A&M University. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from repository.tamu.edu/bitstream/handle/1969.1/ETD-TAMU-2012-08-11574/RASHE-DISSERTATION.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y

Reinarman, C. (1994). The social construction of drug scares. In P.A. Adler & P. Adler (Eds.), *Constructions of Deviance: Social Power, Context, and Interaction* (92-105). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Reinarman, C. (2011). The social impact of drugs and the war on drugs: The social construction of drug scares. In J.A. Inciardi & K. McElrath (Eds.), *The American drug scene: An anthology* (6th ed.) (pp. 80-9). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Reinarman, C. & Levine, H.G. (1997). Crack in context: America's latest demon drug. In C. Reinarman & H.G. Levine (Eds.), *Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice* (pp. 1-17). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Riessman, C.K. (1987). When gender is not enough: Women interviewing women. *Gender & Society, 1*(2): 172-207.

Roberts, L., & Indermaur, D. (2003). Signed consent forms in criminological research: protection for researchers and ethics committees but a threat to research participants? *Psychiatry Psychol Law, 10*, 289–99.

Romano, E., Voas, R.B., & Lacey, J.C. (2010). Alcohol and highway safety: Special report on race/ethnicity and impaired driving. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/nti/pdf/811336.pdf

Rosenbaum, D.P. (1993). “Civil Liberties and Aggressive Enforcement: Balancing the Rights of Individuals and Society in the Drug War.” In R.C. Davis, A.J. Lurigio, & D.P. Rosenbaum (Eds.). *Drugs and the Community* (pp. 55-82). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Rosenbaum, D.P. (2007). Police innovation post 1980: Assessing effectiveness and equity concerns in the information technology era. *Institute for the Prevention of Crime Review, 1*, 11-44.

Rothstein, L. (2008). Law students and lawyers with mental health and substance abuse problems: Protecting the public and the individual. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 69*, 531-566.

Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Sampson, R., and Laub, J. (2005). A lifecourse view of the development of crime. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 602*: 12–45.

Sandberg, S. (2008a). Street capital: Ethnicity and violence on the streets of Oslo. *Theoretical Criminology 12*(2), 153–71.

Sandberg, S. (2008b). Black drug dealers in a white welfare state: Cannabis dealing and street capital in Norway. *British Journal of Criminology 48*(5), 604–19.

Sandberg, S. (2009a). Gangster, victim, or both? The interdiscursive construction of sameness and difference in self-presentations. *The British Journal of Sociology, 60*(3), 523-542.

Sandberg, S. (2009a). Gangster, victim, or both? The interdiscursive construction of sameness and difference in self-presentations. *The British Journal of Sociology, 60*(3): 523-542.

Sandberg, S. (2009b). A narrative search for respect. *Deviant Behavior, 30*(6), 487-510

Sandberg, S. (2010a). The sweet taste of sin—A Muslim drug dealer in a Nordic welfare state. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention, 11*(2), 103-118.

Sandberg, S. (2010b). What can ‘lies’ tell us about life? Notes towards a framework of narrative criminology. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 21*(4), 447-465.

Sandberg, S. (2012a). Is cannabis use normalized, celebrated or neutralized? Analysing talk as action. *Addiction Research and Theory*, *20*(5), 372-81.

Sandberg, S. (2012b). Cannabis culture: A stable subculture in a changing world. *Criminology and Criminal Justice, 13*, 63-79.

Sandberg, S. & Copes, H. (2013). Speaking with ethnographers the challenges of researching drug dealers and offenders. *Journal of Drug Issues, 43*(2), 176-197.

Sarat, A., & Felstiner, W.L.F. (1988). Law and social relations: Vocabularies of motive in lawyer/client interaction. *Law & Society Review, 22*(4), 737-770.

Scanner Frequencies in New York City (2014). New York City Police Department Radio Signal Codes. Retrieved March 27, 2015 from www.n2nov.net/nypdcodes.html

Schaps, E., & Sanders, C.R. (1970). Purposes, patterns, and protection in a campus drug using community. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 11*(2), 135-145.

Schleef, D. (1997). Empty ethics and reasonable responsibility: Vocabularies of motive among law and business students. *Law & Social Inquiry, 22*(3), 619-650.

Schönbach, P. (1990). *Account episodes: The management or escalation of conflict*. Cambrdige: Cambridge University Press.

Schur, E.M. (1965). *Crimes without victims: Deviant behavior and public policy: Abortion,homosexuality, drug addiction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schwandt, T.A. (1997). *Qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Scott, G. (2008a). “They got their problems, and I got mine”: A cautionary tale concerning the ethical implications of using respondent-driven sampling to study injection drug users. *International Journal of Drug Policy, 19*, 42-51.

Scott, G. (2008b). Response: Responses on a cautionary tale concerning the ethics of using respondent-driven sampling to study injection drug users. *International Journal of Drug Policy, 19,* 246-7.

Scott, M.B., & Lyman, S.M. (1968). Accounts. *American Sociological Review, 33*, 46-61.

Scott, M.B., & Lyman, S.M. (1970). Accounts, deviance, and social order. In J. Douglas (Ed.), *Deviance and respectability: The social construction of moral meanings* (pp. 86-119). New York: Basic Books.

Scully, D., & Marolla, J. (1984). Convicted rapists’ vocabulary of motive: Excuses and justifications. *Social Problems, 31*, 530-44.

Serras, A., Saules, K.K., Cranford, J.A., & Eisenberg, D. (2010). Self-injury, substance use, and associated risk factors in a multi-campus probability sample of college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 24(*1), 119-128.

Sheard, L., & Tompkins, C. (2008). Contradictions and misconceptions: An exploration of injecting practice, cleanliness, risk, and partnership in the lives of women drug users. *Qual Health Res, 18*(11), 1536-1547.

Shover, N., & Wright, J. P. (2001). Cr*imes of privilege: Readings in white-collar crime*. Oxford University Press.

Shukla, R.K. (2005). Using marijuana in adulthood: The experience of a sample of users in Oklahoma City. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse, 4*(3-4), 153-181.

Shulgin, A., & Shulgin, A. (1991). *Phenethylamines I Have Known And Loved*. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.erowid.org/library/books_online/pihkal/pihkal.shtml

Shulgin, A., & Shulgin, A. (1997). *Tryptamines I Have Known And Loved*. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.erowid.org/library/books_online/tihkal/tihkal.shtml

Siebert, D.C. (2005). Help seeking for AOD misuse among social workers: Patterns, barriers, and implications. *Social Work, 50*(1), 65-75.

Siegal, H.A., & Inciardi, J.A. (2011). A brief history of alcohol. In J.A. Inciardi & K. McElrath (Eds.), *The American drug scene: An anthology* (6th ed.) (pp. 94-99). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Silver, A. (1967). The demand for order in civil society: A review of some themes in the history of urban crime, police, and riot. In D. Bordua (Ed.), *The police: Six sociological essays*. New York: Wiley.

Simon, D.R. (2006/1982). *Elite deviance* (8th edition). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

Skogan, W. G., & Annan, S. (1993). Drug enforcement in public housing. In R. C. Davis, A. Lurigio, & D. P. Rosenbaum, *Drugs and the community: Involving community residents in combating the sale of illegal drugs.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Skolnick, J. H. (2011/1994). *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society* (4th ed.). New Orleans: Quid Pro.

Sloan, J. (1994). The correlates of campus crime: An analysis of reported crimes on college and university campuses. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 22*, 51-61.

Snuff Bullets (n.d.). Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.ebay.com/bhp/snuff-bullet.

Stelling, J., & Bucher, R. (1973). Vocabularies of realism in professional socialization. *Soc. Sci. & Med., 7*, 661-675.

Stillman, S. (2012, September 3). The throwaways. *The New Yorker*, pp. 1-9. Retrieved December 12, 2012 from www.newyorker.com/reporting/2012/09/03/120903fa_fact_stillman

Strauss, A.L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stuntz, W. J. (1998). Race, class, and drugs. *Columbia Law Review, 98*(7), 1975-1842.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2014a). Substance use and mental health estimates from the 2013 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Overview of findings. *The NSDUH report: September 4*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUH-SR200-RecoveryMonth-2014/NSDUH-SR200-RecoveryMonth-2014.pdf

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2014b). 10.8 million full-time workers have a substance use disorder. *The NSDUH report data spotlight August 7*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/NSDUH-SP132-FullTime-2014/NSDUH-SP132-FullTime-2014.pdf

Sutherland, E.H. (1939). *Principles of Criminology* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Sutherland, E.H. (1940). White-collar criminality. *American Sociological review, 5*(1), 1-12.

Swartz, J.A. (2012). *Substance Abuse in America: A Documentary and Reference Guide*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood.

Sweitzer, V.B. (2009). Towards A Theory of Doctoral Student Professional Identity and Development: A Developmental Networks Approach. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(1), 1-32.

Sykes, G.M. (1958). Argot roles. In *A society of captives*: *A study of a maximum security prison* (pp. 84-108). Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sykes, G.M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 22*, 664-70.

Terry V. Ohio. 392 U.S. 1 (1968).

Teruya, C., & Hser, Y.I. (2010). Turning points in the life course: Current findings and future directions in drug use research. *Curr Drug Abuse Rev., 3*(3), 189-95.

The Legend Floyd – Canal Oficial (2012, April 26). *The Dark Side of the Rainbow – COMPLETO*. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.youtube.com/watch?v=0gXvVUg-VAE

The Princeton Review (n.d.). Party schools. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.princetonreview.com/college-rankings?rankings=party-schools

Thompson, E.P. (1967). Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism. *Past and Present, 38*: 56–97.

Thompson, S.K. (1997). Adaptive sampling in behavioral surveys. In L. Harrison & A. Hughes (Eds.), *The validity of self-reported drug use: Improving the accuracy of survey estimates* (pp 296-319). National Institute on Drug Abuse Research Monograph, 167.

Tonry, M. (1995). *Malign neglect: Race, crime, and punishment in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tonry, M. & Melewski, M. (2008). The malign effects of drug and crime control policies on black americans. *Crime and Justice, 37*(1), 1-44.

Topalli, V. (2005). When being good is bad: An expansion of neutralization theory. *Criminology, 43*(3), 797-836.

Topalli, V. (2006). The seductive nature of autotelic crime: How neutralization theory serves as a boundary condition for understanding hardcore street offending. *Sociological Inquiry, 76*, 475-501.

Treiman, D.J. (1977). *Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.

U.S. Census Bureau (2010). *Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: 2010*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau (2013). *School enrollment: CPS October 2013—Detailed tables.* Retrieved March 23, 2015 from http://www.census.gov/hhes/school/data/cps/2013/tables.html

U.S. Census Bureau (2014). *Educational Attainment in the United States: 2014—Detailed tables*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/2014/tables.html

Uniform Crime Reports (2013). *Crime in the United States 2013*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/persons-arrested/persons-arrested

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Urbina, I. (June 3, 2013). Blacks are singled out for marijuana arrests, federal data suggests. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from www.nytimes.com/2013/06/04/us/marijuana-arrests-four-times-as-likely-for-blacks.html?_r=0

Valliant, G.E., Sobowale, N.C., & McArthur, C. (1970). Physicians use of mood altering drugs: A 20 year follow-up report. *N Eng J Med, 282*, 365-70.

Vander Ven, T. (2011). *Getting wasted: Why college students drink too much and party so hard*. New York: NYU Press.

Veblen, T. (1994/1899). *The theory of the leisure class: An economic study of institutions*. Toronto: General Publishing Company.

Vieraitis, L.M., Piquero, N.L., Piquero, A.R., Tibbetts, S.G., & Blankenship, M. (2012). Do women and men differ in their neutralizations of corporate crimes? *Criminal Justice Review, 37*, 478-493.

Vollmer, A. (1936). *The police and modern society: Plain talk based on practical experience*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Wacquant, L. (2001). Deadly symbiosis: When ghetto and prison meet and mesh. *Punishment & Society, 3*(1), 95-133.

Wagenaar, A.C., & Wolfson, M. (1995). Deterring sale and provision of alcohol to minors: A study of enforcement in 295 counties in four states. *Public Health Reports, 110*(4), 419-27.

Waldorf, D., Reinarman, C., & Murphy, S. (1991). *Cocaine changes: The experience of using and quitting*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Walford, G. (2011). Researching the powerful. *British Educational Research Association*. Retrieved March 23, 2015 observatory-elites.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/researching_the_powerful.pdf

Warriner, C.K. (1958). The nature and functions of official morality. *American Journal of Sociology, 64*(2), 165-168.

Waterston, A. (1993). *The Street Addict in the Political Economy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Watters, J.K. & Biernacki, P. (1989). Targeted sampling: Options for the study of hidden populations. *Social Problems, 36*(4), 416-430.

Weidman, J.C., & Stein, E.L. (2003). Socialization of Doctoral Students to Academic Norms. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(6), 641-656.

Weidman, J.C., Twale, D.J., & Stein, E.L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Weil, A. (2011/1972). Why people take drugs. In J.A. Inciardi & K. McElrath (Eds.), *The American drug scene: An anthology (6th ed.)* (pp. 41-50). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Weiner, J.G. (1995). "And the wisdom to know the difference": Confidentiality vs. privilege in the self-help setting. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 144*: 243-307.

Weinstein, R M. (1980). Vocabularies of motive for illicit drug use: An application of the accounts framework. *The Sociological Quarterly, 21*(4), 577-593.

Weinstein, R.M. (1978). The avowal of motives for marijuana behavior. *The International Journal of the Addictions, 13*(6), 887-910.

White, B.P., Becker-Blease, K.A., & Grace-Bishop, K. (2006). Stimulant medication use, misuse, and abuse in an undergraduate and graduate student sample. *Journal of American College Health, 54*(5), 261-268.

Whyte, W.F. (1967/1943). *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Wiebel, W. (1990). Identifying and gaining access to hidden populations. In E. Y. Lambert (Ed.), *The collection and interpretation of data from hidden populations* (pp. 4-11). NIDA Research Monograph 98. Washington, D.C.: US Government Print Office.

Wieder, D.L. (1974). *Language and social reality: The case of telling the convict code*. The Hague: Mouton.

Williams, M. R., Holcomb, J. E., Kovandzic, T. V., & Bullock, S. (2010). *Poli¢ing for profit: The abuse of civil asset forfeiture*. Arlington, VA: Institute for Justice.

Wilson, J.Q. (1968). *Varieties of police behavior: The management of law and order in eight communities*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Winick, C. (1963). Physician narcotic addicts. In H. S. Becker (Ed.), *The other side: Perspectives on deviance* (pp. 261-280). New York: The Free Press.

Worrall, J.L. (2001). Addicted to the drug war: The role of civil asset forfeiture as a budgetary necessity in contemporary law enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 29*(3), 171-187.

Wright, R., & Stein, M. (2005). "Snowball Sampling." In K. Kempf-Leonard (Ed.),

Wright, R., Decker, S., Redfern, A. and Smith, D. (1992), A Snowballs Chance in Hell: Doing Fieldwork with Active Residential Burglars. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 29*(2), 148-161.

Wright, R.T., & Decker, S.H. (1994). *Burglars on the job: Streetlife and residential break-ins*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Wright, R.T., & Decker, S.H. (1997). *Armed robbers in action: Stickups and street culture*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Ya motha (2005, July 7). Top definition for “Bougy.” UrbanDictionary.com. Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=bougy.

YDFC (2006, July 20). Top definition for “Young Dumb Full of Cum.” Retrieved May 29, 2015 from www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Young+Dumb+Full+of+Cum

Young, J. (1971). *The drugtakers: The social meaning of drug use*. London: Paladin. Retrieved November 11, 2013 from www.drugtext.org/The-Drugtakers/contents.html.

Zinberg, N.E. (1984). *Drug, set, setting: The basis for controlled intoxicant use*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Retrieved November 11, 2013 from http://www.druglibrary.eu/library/books/zinberg2.pdf

Zinberg, N.E., & Harding, W.M. (1982). *Control over intoxicant use: Pharmacological, psychological, and social considerations*. New York: Human Sciences Press. Retrieved November 11, 2013 from www.druglibrary.eu/library/books/zinberg1.pdf.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Convenience Sampling Recruitment Letter

You are being asked to assist with research taking place at the University of Illinois at Chicago that is interested in learning more about how graduate school students in professional degree programs view and experience substance use. All participants are students currently pursuing graduate degrees. I thought you might be able to help with subject recruitment by passing along recruitment information to people you know who may be eligible for the study, which provides an opportunity for reflection in a confidential and professional setting during an in-depth interview which would last one (1) to two (2) hours.

A "convenience sampling" framework is being used, which means I am writing to ask you to consider informally helping with recruitment for this research. Receiving this letter does not mean that you have or have not used substances.

You were either handed a sealed envelope containing this letter ("Convenience Sampling Recruitment Letter") in person, or it was emailed to you with the inconspicuous subject "Oren checking in." If handed to you in person, this letter will be the only communication I initiate about this opportunity. If you received this letter via email, and do not respond within fourteen (14) days, a second email will be sent. The subject will read: "Recruitment Opportunity." After the second email is sent, your contact information will be deleted, and all records of correspondence, including both emails, will be deleted.

If you know anyone interested in learning more about this research project, please have him or her email Oren Gur (ogur2@uic.edu). In this way, the researcher will never know whether or not you choose to assist in recruitment.

If you want to know more about this research project, please contact Oren Gur, at [cell phone] or by email at ogur2@uic.edu or Dr. Peter R. Ibarra, at 312-413-2475 or by email at pibarra@uic.edu. You may also contact the Office for Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) at the University of Illinois at Chicago at 312-996-1711 (local) or 1-866-789-6215 (toll-free) or email OPRS at uicirb@uic.edu. Please reference Protocol Number 2010-0193.

Appendix B

Snowball Sampling Recruitment Letter

I wanted to let you know about an opportunity to participate in research taking place at the University of Illinois at Chicago that is interested in learning more about how graduate school students in professional degree programs view and experience substance use. All participants are graduate school students currently pursuing professional degrees. I thought you might be interested in learning more about this research, which provides an opportunity to reflect on your thoughts in a confidential and professional setting during an in-depth interview. A "snowball sampling" framework is being used, which means recruitment occurs through word of mouth and sealed-envelopes. Receiving this letter does not mean that you have or have not used substances.

I am not being paid to recruit, and this printed letter ("Snowball Sampling Recruitment Letter"), which was handed to you in person and in a sealed envelope, will be the only communication I initiate about this opportunity. If you are interested, please email Oren Gur (ogur2@uic.edu) about scheduling a face-to-face interview with you in a location of your preference at your earliest convenience. Interviews usually last between one (1) to two (2) hours.

If you want to know more about this research project, please contact Oren Gur, at [cell phone] or by email at ogur2@uic.edu or Dr. Peter R. Ibarra, at 312-413-2475 or by email at pibarra@uic.edu. You may also contact the Office for Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) at the University of Illinois at Chicago at 312-996-1711 (local) or 1-866-789-6215 (toll-free) or email OPRS at uicirb@uic.edu. Please reference Protocol Number 2010-0193.

Appendix C

Debriefing Script

Thank you for participating in this research. If you are comfortable doing so, I would appreciate your help in recruiting potential participants—individuals that you know from personal experience will likely be eligible for and willing to participate in this research.

I have prepared copies of a recruitment document that has been approved by my Institutional Review Board—"Snowball Sampling Recruitment Letter"—that I can show you. If you agree, then we can place copies of the "Snowball Sampling Recruitment Letter" into envelopes, and I will ask you to seal the envelopes before handing them to potential participants in order to protect both your and their confidentiality. I will also ask that you hand them the envelope privately, so as to reduce risk, and to only ask potential participants if they are interested one time.

Your participation will in no way be affected by your willingness to recruit additional participants, and you will not be compensated for recruitment. Again, thank you for your time and efforts.

As always, if you want to know more about this research project, please contact Oren Gur, at [cell phone] or by email at ogur2@uic.edu or Dr. Peter R. Ibarra, at 312-413-2475 or by email at pibarra@uic.edu. You may also contact the Office for Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) at the University of Illinois at Chicago at 312-996-1711 (local) or 1-866-789-6215 (toll-free) or email OPRS at uicirb@uic.edu. Please reference Protocol Number 2010-0193.

Appendix D

Composite interview guide developed for analytical and teaching purposes

"We will get into substance use, but beforehand I want to try and get a more holistic view of your professional choices and life history."
I'll ask you to tell stories (not give answers), and if you have any other thoughts on a topic before changing gears
Remember: is this what you thought at the time or what you think now during the interview?
Preface questions: "Talk to me about …" /// "Walk me through...." /// "Describe the process of..." / "How does X work? /// "What's the story of how you got interested in X?" ---- "Is it what you expected?" /// "Earlier you talked about your Hx, I'd love to hear more" /// *What does it help to know to do Y? ("tricks of the trade" question)*

1. **Academic program and professional goals (Aspirations and identity)**
   Reasons for / Examples of
   a. How is school going?
   b. Tell me about the program you are in. Do you like the program? (Undergrad?)
   c. How did you get interested in this career? (Classes on interviews?)
   d. How has your thinking about your career choice changed over your time in the program?
   e. "Tell me about your work experiences." ------ "What kind of situations does your program put you in?"
   f. Idealized version of your aspirations vs. the real version
   g. "What does your family think about the program?"
      i. What sorts of questions do they ask you about it?
      ii. What kinds of things do they not understand about your career, if anything [assuming family members don't share background]?
   h. What are the things you do that balance off your academic pursuits?

2. **Social life / outlets --- bridge between school, work + substance use?**
   a. How did you become involved with using different licit substance (e.g., cigarettes, tobacco, alcohol)
      i. With ppl your age / older / younger
      ii. "What became of them? Still friends? Still use drugs?"
   b. How did you become involved with using different illicit substances (e.g., underage drinking, marijuana, cocaine, prescription drugs)
      i. "Had you thought about trying before you actually did? What did you think?"
      ii. "Had you ever sworn to keep away from it?"
   c. Contemporary usage vs. historic usage "from when you first began to present"
      i. "Talk to me about substance use you have seen occurring around you"
      ii. "What's the scene?" --- "do you usually plan to use drugs, or is it more by chance?"
      iii. "What do you remember about earlier involvement?"
      iv. "What's your first memory of drinking alcohol – not your own use, but in general?
   d. "How has your use been perceived by those around you?" /// how is it perceived now?
      i. "Have you ever been publicly intoxicated?" /// when does this tend to happen?
      ii. "Have you ever used __ around strangers?" /// "Was that same/different from w/ friends?"
   e. "Were you ever caught or made to feel like you were 'caught'?" by who?
      i. Did parents ever talk to you about it?

3. **Substance use --- obtaining, consuming, reflecting**
   a. The process of obtaining drugs --- "When did you first buy drugs/alcohol?"
   b. "How much do you pay for how much?" ---- "How long does it last."
   c. Interactions with drug dealers: how does that work?
      i. How does money figure into the experience of buying, selling, and sharing?
      ii. Talk to me about how you handled getting stuff when money is tight...
      iii. Sometimes it seems that you were given stuff, but other times you bought it. Talk to me about that.
      iv. Were there times when you've given stuff to people and they wanted to pay you back with money?
   d. The physical doing of drugs (or alcohol), including how it is ingested and the psychological effects
      i. Best experience / worst experience /// "What pleases you about ____?"
      ii. "Have you ever been sick on alcohol/other?" /// "Compared to friends, more/less often?"
      iii. Which drugs do you use by yourself? /// "When was the first time you tried ____ by yourself?"
      iv. "Do you prefer to use alone or with friends?"
   e. "Were there periods of time when you tried a variety of drugs? When? Which drugs?"
      i. "For how long? When did it end? Why did it end?"
   f. "Do you use one drug as a 'mainstay,' or switch around? Mix, or keep them separate?"
      i. "Do you think there are any fluctuations or seasonality changes in your drug use?"
   g. "How do you feel about your current pattern of use?"
   h. Was there ever a time that you were a regular user?" --- *use ever been out of control?*
      i. "Have you ever spoken to a Dr. or counselor about your use?"
         1. "When did this happen? Why? Circumstances? How did drugs come up? How did s/he react? What did they say about drugs? Helpful?"
   i. How knowledge about substance use has changed over time
   j. How knowledge is integrated into how substances are used
   k. Different approaches taken towards doing drugs over the course of involvement
      i. "Do you have any rules about using drugs?"
   l. Compare personal approach with what interviewee sees others doing
      i. Do you know anyone who has gotten into legal difficulties with his/her drug/alcohol use?
         1. What happened?
   m. The effects of substance use on school, work, career goals, professional development
      i. "Who knows about your use of x, y, z?"
   n. The effects of substance use on peer groups, social networks, family
      i. "Are there some drugs you use with some people, but not others?"
      ii. How student experiences with substance use may differ for men and women
      iii. Drug use in relation to significant others in life
   o. Do you engage in other behavior that might be classified as 'risky?'
   p. How you are different from other drug users, and in what way

4. **Life history – "Where were you living before moving to _____?"**
   a. Academic and professionally (and perhaps "recreationally…")
   b. Childhood
      i. Family background—international perspective?
      ii. Home environment, neighborhood environment—(did you get "the talk?")
      iii. Schools attended and extra-curricular activities
      iv. Peer groups and friends

5. **Full circle**
   a. "What have you learned academically & professionally that helps you explain substance use in society?"
      i. "… by others around you?" "… your own substance use?"
   b. "When someone tells you something about drugs/alcohol, what causes you to believe or dis-believe them?"
      i. "Where do you get your most reliable info? Most unreliable?"
   c. What do you think about laws pertaining to drugs/alcohol?
   d. What kind of experience do you have with friends or family who also happen to be employed in some capacity in the justice system?
   e. Have you ever witnessed or experienced violence in relation to your drug use?
   f. "What is the discourse of your profession as it relates to drug use?"
      i. Do others in your program/work place do x, y, z
      ii. What do you learn in class about these issues?
      iii. Have your studies helped you to understand these issues? What we have talked about today / use by young professionals
   g. "How do you feel about the drug culture now compared to when you first started?"
      i. "Where do you think it (culture, your feelings) are going?"
      ii. "Do you feel closer to the drug world or the non-drug world?"
   h. "I appreciate how open you have been throughout the interview. I am curious as to whether there are boundaries regarding your substance use that you put between yourself and … (interview)?"
      i. (academic pursuits / workplace / professional ambitions / family / friends / intimates)
   i. "Is there any substance use you may not have mentioned? If so, why not?"
   j. "Can you tell me about a time where you have felt ashamed of your use? Proud?"
   k. How do you think somebody who (dis)likes you would describe you?
   l. Talk to me about how you would describe yourself…
   m. <u>Low functioning vs. High functioning</u>
   n. <u>Licit vs. illicit</u> – what do you think about the distinction?
      i. "Should drugs be legalized or decriminalized?"—*"What would change?"*

6. **Last question**: "Is there anything you think we haven't covered that you expected to go over when I first asked you about this?"
   a. Are there any questions you think I should ask other people I talk to about this topic?
   b. DEBRIEFING SCRIPT ---------- (AND SNOWBALL??)

Appendix E

Verbal Consent for Participation and Permission to Tape: Script for Participants

We are conducting research to learn more about how graduate school students in professional degree programs view and experience substance use. You are being asked to participate in order to help document how newly acquired knowledge is integrated when describing past, current, or anticipated future drug use. We are interested in learning about how you obtain, consume, and become educated about substance use. As someone who may have insight into these types of experiences with drugs or alcohol, we would like you to take part in this research.

If you agree to participate, we will proceed with an in-depth interview during which you will be asked questions about your experiences with substance use. For example: “How did you become involved with substance use?” “How do you decide when to use drugs?” The researcher may ask additional questions to learn more about particular experiences, or to clarify meaning. You may experience minimal discomfort from answering questions during the interview, or the interview may touch upon areas that you would prefer not to comment on. If this occurs, remember that your participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and you may choose to not answer or stop participation at any time without consequences.

A risk of this research is a loss of privacy (revealing to others that you are taking part in this study) or confidentiality (revealing information about you to others to whom you have not given permission to see this information). We will audio-tape our discussion, but if you wish to have the tape recorder turned off at any point, we will honor your request. The tapes will be transcribed and then destroyed within seven (7) days of the interview, as will your contact information and any correspondence related to the study. Any names or street addresses that are mentioned during the interview will be stripped from the interview transcript; pseudonyms will be inserted in their place. Please use pseudonyms or refer to other people more generally as friends or acquaintances, rather than by name. Confidentiality will be maintained by altering any records that could identify you. Your name will never be identified or associated with this research, and the Principal Investigator (Oren Gur) will obtain your verbal consent so that there will be no record linking you to this research.

The research will provide no direct benefit to the subject, and indirect or future potential benefits of participation are not known. By taking part in this project you may help to increase knowledge of how graduate school students in professional degree programs discuss substance use.

Your participation in this project is voluntary. There is no penalty if you decline to participate. Should you agree to participate, you may withdraw at any time, and you may decline to answer any questions for any reason. You will not be compensated for your time, and as the research is completely voluntary, the interview may last for as long as you would like - typically between one (1) to two (2) hours.

If you want to know more about this research project, please ask now or contact Oren Gur, at [cell phone] or by email at ogur2@uic.edu or Dr. Peter R. Ibarra, at 315-443-3079 or by email at pibarra@uic.edu. You may also contact the Office for Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) at the University of Illinois at Chicago at 312-996-1711 (local) or 1-866-789-6215 (toll-free) or email OPRS at uicirb@uic.edu. Please reference Protocol Number 2010-0193.

Remember: Your participation in this project is voluntary. You are free to withdraw at any time or refuse to answer questions you are not comfortable answering.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Oren M. Gur

orengur@gmail.com

OFFICE ADDRESS

The Pennsylvania State University
Abington College
Department of Criminal Justice
Sutherland Building
1600 Woodland Rd.
Abington, PA 19001
omg105@psu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Criminology, Law, and Justice
University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
Interdepartmental Concentration in Violence Studies
Dissertation: Degrees of separation: Drug use by graduate and professional school students
Committee: Peter R. Ibarra (Chair), Lisa Frohmann, Paul J. Goldstein, Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Amy C. Watson
August 2015

M.S., Criminology
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
May 2007

B.A., Urban Studies, History (minor), Political Science (minor)
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
May 2006

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

2015–Present — Assistant Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
The Pennsylvania State University, Abington College

TEACHING POSITIONS

8/14–8/15 — Instructor
Department of Criminal Justice
Pennsylvania State University, Abington College

8/13–12/13 — Adjunct Faculty
Department of Sociology and Criminology
Villanova University
Villanova, Pennsylvania

1/10–5/12; — Instructor, Co-Instructor, or Teaching Assistant
Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice
University of Illinois at Chicago

COURSES TAUGHT

Drug Control Policy in Comparative Perspective; Policing in America; Introduction to Criminal Justice; Criminal Courts; Race, Class, Law and Gender; Criminal Justice Organizations; Comparative Criminology, Law, and Justice; Independent Studies

RESEARCH TRAINING AND APPOINTMENTS

1/15–Present	Research Associate Neuropsychiatry Section Department of Psychiatry University of Pennsylvania
6/07–Present	Criminologist, Executive Coordinator NeuroForensics Consultants Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
9/13–12/13	Visiting Research Fellowship Center on Public Security Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey Newark, New Jersey
1/09–12/11	Research Assistant GPS Monitoring Technologies and Domestic Violence: An Evaluation Study (National Institute of Justice 2007-IJ-CX-0016) Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice University of Illinois at Chicago
3/11–6/11	Data Analyst Content Analysis of Jihadist Forum Discussions Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice University of Illinois at Chicago
9/08–9/10	Research Data Analyst Center for Cognitive Medicine Department of Psychiatry University of Illinois at Chicago
9/08–9/10	Project Staff National Police Research Platform Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice University of Illinois at Chicago
1/08–4/08	Assistant to Database Specialist Brain Behavior Laboratory Department of Psychiatry University of Pennsylvania
1/07–6/07	Security and Population Analysis Intern Curran-Fromhold Correctional Facility City of Philadelphia Prison System

1/05–6/05	Urban Studies Internship Homicide Unit Defender Association of Philadelphia
5/03–6/04	Research Coordinator fMRI Deception Study Treatment Research Center University of Pennsylvania

ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

1/11–5/11	Assistant to Director of Undergraduate Studies Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice University of Illinois at Chicago
5/09–12/09	Graduate Assistant to Department Head Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice University of Illinois at Chicago

AWARDS, HONORS, AND STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

2015	Summer Faculty Research Fellow ($4,000) The Pennsylvania State University, Abington College
2014–5	Thomas C. Hood Social Action Award Committee Society for the Study of Social Problems
2014	Dean's Scholar Award, Dissertation ($25,000, declined) Graduate College, University of Illinois at Chicago
2014	Summer Graduate Research Grant ($1,000) Jewish Studies Program, University of Illinois at Chicago
2013	High Pass, Preliminary Doctoral Examination Criminology, Law, and Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago
2011	Graduate Mentoring Award Criminology, Law, and Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago
2011–present	The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi
2010–2013	Graduate Student Counsel Travel Awards, U. of Illinois at Chicago
2007–present	The Mask and Wig Graduate Club, University of Pennsylvania
2006–2007	Maimonides Leaders Fellowship, University of Pennsylvania
2005–2006	Friars Senior Honor Society, University of Pennsylvania
2003–2006	Alpha Epsilon Pi, Gamma Chapter, University of Pennsylvania
2002–2006	The Mask and Wig Undergraduate Club, U. of Pennsylvania

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences; American Society of Criminology; Midwestern Criminal Justice Association; Society for the Study of Social Problem

MANUSCRIPT REVIEWER

Behavioral Sciences & the Law; Crime, Law and Social Change; International Journal of Peace and Development Studies; International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology; Policing & Society

PUBLICATIONS
Journal articles

Forth. **Gur, O.M**., Ibarra, P.R., Erez, E. Specialization and the use of GPS for domestic violence by pretrial programs: Findings from a national survey of U.S. practitioners. *Journal of Technology in Human Services*. Accepted April 14, 2015.

2015 Erez, E., Ibarra, P.R., **Gur, O.M**. At the intersection of private and political conflict zones: Policing domestic violence in the Arab community in Israel. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 59*(9), 930-63.

2014 Ibarra, P.R., **Gur, O.M**., Erez, E. Surveillance as casework: Supervising domestic violence defendants with GPS monitoring. *Crime, Law and Social Change, 62*(4), 417-44.

2013 Erez, E., Ibarra, P.R., **Gur, O.M**. Using GPS in domestic violence cases: Lessons from a study of pretrial programs. *Journal of Offender Monitoring, 25*(1), 5-10.

2010 **Gur, O.M.** Persons with mental illness in the criminal justice system: Police interventions to prevent violence and criminalization. *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations, 10*, 220-240.

Grant reports, book chapters, and abstracts

2015 Gur, R.C., **Gur, O.M.** Linking brain and behavioral measures in the medical-legal context. In R.L. Sadoff (Ed.), *The Evolution of Forensic Psychiatry: History, Current Developments, Future Directions* (pp. 295-312). NY, NY: Oxford University Press.

2013 Erez, E., Ibarra, P. R., **Gur, O. M**. Policing domestic violence in the Arab community in Israel: Meanings and consequences. In U. Gopher and G. Ben-Porat (Eds.), *Policing a Divided Society* (Chapter 11). Haifa, Israel: Pardes Publishing House with Abraham Foundation.

2012 Erez, E., Ibarra, P.R., Bales, W., **Gur, O.M**. *GPS monitoring technologies and domestic violence: An evaluation study*. A report submitted to the National Institute of Justice, Washington D.C. Available: www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/238910.pdf

2010 Keedy S.K., Rodriguez, C., **Gur, O.M**., Kern, B., Sweeney, J.A. Attention modulation of sensory processing: An fMRI study. *Biological Psychiatry, 67*(9S), p. 85S.

2009 Keedy, S.K., Rodriguez, C., **Gur, O.M**., Kern, B., Sweeney, J.A. Attentional modulation of sensory processing: An fMRI study. *University of Illinois at Chicago College of Medicine Research Forum*, Chicago, Illinois.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

2014 Ibarra, P.R., **Gur, O.M.**, Erez, E. *Surveillance, technology, and social interaction: On the importance of casework*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, CA, November 20.

2014 **Gur, O.M.**, Ibarra, P.R. *Professional socialization and drug use: Notes on leveraged expertise*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, CA, November 20.

2014 Ibarra, P.R., **Gur, O.M.** *Drug use and professional socialization: Notes on substance use in graduate and professional school.* Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Philadelphia, PA, February 20.

2013 **Gur, O.M.** *Leveraged expertise: Risk management strategies of graduate student substance users*. Paper presented at the Society for the Study of Social Problems, New York, NY, August 11.

2013 **Gur, O.M.**, Ibarra, P.R. *Reconsidering the study of accounts in interview-based drug and alcohol research: Lessons from active and ethnographic interv*iewing. Paper presented at the Society for the Study of Social Problems, New York, NY, August 10.

2012 Erez, E., Ibarra, P.R., Gur, **O.M.**, Bales, B. *Experiencing GPS monitoring for domestic violence: Interviews with victims and defendants*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, IL, November 16.

2012 **Gur, O.M.**, Erez, E., Ibarra, P.R., Bales, B. *Programs utilizing GPS electronic monitoring technologies in cases of domestic violence during pretrial: Results from a national survey of practitioners*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, IL, November 16.

2012 Bales, B., Ibarra, P.R., Erez, E., **Gur, O.M.** *The impact of electronic monitoring placement and duration on outcomes among domestic violence defendants*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, IL, November 16.

2012 Ibarra, P.R., Erez, E., Bales, B., **Gur, O.M.** *Varieties of implementation: The case of GPS for domestic violence*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, IL, November 16.

2011 **Gur, O.M.**, Ibarra, P.R. *Making sense of high status drug users: Constructionist and objectivist readings of neutralization theory*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Washington, D.C., November 18.

2011 **Gur, O.M.**, Ibarra, P.R., Erez, E. *Results from a national survey: Agencies utilizing GPS electronic monitoring technologies in cases of domestic violence during pretrial*. Paper presented at the Midwestern Criminal Justice Association, Chicago, IL, September 30.

2010 **Gur, O.M.**, Ibarra, P.R. *"High functioning" users: Interviewing women in professional school*. With Peter R. Ibarra. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, CA, November 19.

2010 Chow, C.K., Farber, M., Farooqi, A., Gross, L., **Gur, O.M.** *Bike theft at "hot racks."* Paper presented at the Midwestern Criminal Justice Association, Chicago, IL, September 24.

2010 Erez, E., **Gur, O.M.** *Electronic monitoring technologies and domestic violence: Practices, dilemmas, and legal considerations*. Paper presented at the Midwestern Criminal Justice Association, Chicago, IL, September 24.

2010 **Gur, O.M.** *Fido and Foucault: Police K9s, territoriality, and surveillance*. Paper presented at the Midwestern Criminal Justice Association, Chicago, IL, September 23.

2010 **Gur, O.M.** *High functioning users: Practices and perspectives of two professional women.* Paper presented at the 12th Annual Chicago Ethnography Conference, Chicago, IL, March 6.

INVITED PRESENTATIONS

2011 **Gur, O.M.** *Interviewing: Hard-to-reach topics and hard-to-reach populations.* Invited presentation to undergraduate students taking Research Methods I (CLJ 261), University of Illinois at Chicago, Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice, November 14.

2011 **Gur, O.M.** *Qualitative interviewing methods: Tips and strategies*. Invited presentation to first year medical school students, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Department of Family and Community Medicine, Chicago, IL, July 7.

2007 **Gur, O.M.** *Statistical analysis of the electronic monitoring unit of the Philadelphia Adult Probation and Parole Department*. Presentation to Philadelphia Adult Probation and Parole Department, Philadelphia, PA, April 19.

2007 Chow, C.K., Farber, M., Farooqi, A., Gross, L., **Gur, O.M.** *Crimes of place: Bike theft at "hot racks."* Presentation to The University of Pennsylvania Division of Public Safety and Jerry Lee Center of Criminology, Philadelphia, PA, January 17.

POSTERS

2015 Scaringelli, A., **Gur, O.M.** *Crime mapping: Predicting shootings in Trenton, New Jersey*. Poster presented at Abington College Undergraduate Research Activities (ACURA) Poster Fair. Winner, Division of Social Sciences.

2011 Yarkhan, A., Hosi, Y., Kamischke, A., Guinansaca, N., Mirkowicz, M., **Gur, O.M.** *Lost youths: Executions of eighteen, nineteen, and twenty-year-olds in the U.S. since 2000*. Poster presented at UIC Student Research Forum, Chicago, IL, April 19.

2010 **Gur, O.M.**, Hanrahan, N.F., Rosenbaum, D.P., Schuck, A.M., Watson, A.C. *Policing emotions: Development of a computerized neurocognitive battery for use with police officers*. Poster presented at American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, CA, November 18.

2010 **Gur, O.M.**, Hanrahan, N.F., Rosenbaum, D.P., Schuck, A.M., Watson, A.C. *Policing emotions: Development of a computerized neurocognitive battery for use with police officers*. Poster presented at UIC Student Research Forum, Chicago, IL, April 20.

2009 **Gur, O.M.** *How the canine became the K9: Use and misuse of dogs in U.S. policing*. Poster presented at the American Society of Criminology, Philadelphia, PA, November 5.

2009 Rowe, H.L., Christensen, C., Coleman, B., Gauvin, R., **Gur, O.**, Mart, A., Relyea, M. *Community research: Looking back, moving forward*. Poster presented at Midwest ECO Conference, Chicago, IL, October 9-10.

2009 **Gur, O.M.** *How the canine became the K9: Use and misuse of dogs in U.S. policing*. Poster presented at UIC Student Research Forum, Chicago, IL, April 14.

2007 **Gur, O.M.** *Statistical analysis of the electronic monitoring unit of the Philadelphia Adult Probation and Parole Department.* Poster presented at the Stockholm Criminology Symposium, Sweden, June 4.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

2008, 2014	Annual Jerry Lee Symposium, Washington, D.C.
2013, Fall	Risk Terrain Modeling Workshop, Rutgers Center on Public Security.
2012	Psychedemia, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, September 27-30.
2011	Evidence-Based Interventions to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harm on College Campuses, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, October 25-26.
2007, 2008, 2010	Criminology Day, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
2010	Mental Health in Corrections Conference, Forest Institute, Chicago, IL, April 12-14.
2009	The NIJ Conference, Washington, D.C., June 15-17.

PROFESSIONAL REFERENCES

Peter R. Ibarra, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Director of Undergraduate Studies
Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice
University of Illinois at Chicago
1007 W. Harrison St., 4056 BSB (M/C 141)
Chicago, IL 60607
312.413.2475 | pibarra@uic.edu

Lisa Frohmann, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Chairperson
Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice
University of Illinois at Chicago
1007 W. Harrison St., 4022A BSB (M/C 141)
Chicago, IL 60607
312.413.2477 | lfrohman@uic.edu

Joel M. Caplan, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Criminal Justice
Deputy Director
Rutgers Center on Public Security
Rutgers University
123 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102
973.353.1304 | jcaplan@newark.rutgers.edu

Robert H. DeFina, Ph.D.
Professor and Chairperson
Department of Sociology and Criminology
(SAC 204)
Villanova University
800 Lancaster Avenue
Villanova, PA 19085
610.519.4482 | robert.defina@villanova.edu