IEVGENIIA-GALYNA LUKASH,

2-nd year PhD-student in Sociology, National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy" (2, Hryhorii Skovoroda St., Kyiv 04655)

ie.lukash@ukma.edu.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7296-3178

KATERYNA MALTSEVA,

Candidate of Sciences in Philosophy (2003), PhD in Anthropology (2010), Associate Professor at the Sociology Department of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Social Technologies, National University of "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy" (2, Hryhorii Skovoroda St., Kyiv 04655)

maltsevaKS@ukma.edu.ua
https://orcid.org:0000-0001-6540-8734

Using ethnographic approach and cultural models framework in research on recreational drug use

Substance abuse is one of the pressing issues that loom large in socio-epidemiological and health research in many countries nowadays. According to the data provided by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), among the individuals aged 15–64 approximately 5.6% (275 million) took drugs at least once during the year 2016 [UNODC, 2018]. The same source states that 31 million individuals are currently in need of medical, social or psychological help related to their substance use related dysfunctional behavior or behavioral pattern categorized as drug use disorder.

In the UNODC report [2018] the number of deaths related to drugs and substance abuse was estimated at 450,000 in 2015, among which 167,750 deaths occurred due to overdose. The opioid drugs are named as the most harmful type of drugs due to the risks of transmission of infectious diseases (HIV, hepatitis C), as well as overdose and misuse of prescription opioids. The UNODC report further specifies several most pressing current opioid issues. Namely, in parts of Africa tramadol became a major concern; in North America the main problem is connected with misuse of substances such as fentanyl and its analogues. In USA, during 2015–2016 period, the life expectancy has dropped two years first time in a century. The "Opioid Crisis" — the term that is used to refer to the dangerous sit-

uation with opioid pharmaceutical drugs misuse threatening population health and wellbeing, — forced the scholars to start exploring new avenues in drug use research [Volkow, Collins, 2017; Dasgupta, Beletsky, Ciccarone, 2018].

However, opioids are not the sole issue at stake. The introduction of the new psychoactive substances (NPS) is one of the defining trends of the drug market [UNODC, 2018]. The study reports that 479 NPS were on the market in 2016 and they did not replace the well-known drugs (such as cocaine or heroin). These substances coexist and can be mixed by users and drug providers.

Moreover, with the great variety of substances an intricate system of sales channels exists [UNODC, 2018]. Separate sections of the internet, called the "deep web" or darknet which people could access only with the special browser, are a crucial channel for illicit substance sale and purchase. Darknet is characterized by higher level of anonymity and confidentiality. It is mentioned in the report that the attempts to confront the illegal market have been initiated and an important internet platform has been shut down; yet the full impact of the operation is still unclear and the majority of clients of the drug market did not experience any changes in supply. It is further claimed in the UNODC that the drug market has recently reached the greatest variety of narcotic substances.

Besides the description of the drug market, production and sales, the data provided in the UNODC report has brought into focus the key groups of drug users requiring special attention [UNODC, 2018]. In the whole series of documents prepared by UNODC as the World Drugs Report there are separate booklet 4 and booklet 5 that concentrate on specific populations. The booklet 4 describes the situation with the two age groups that need attention: young people (15–24 years old) and older drug users (40 and older). The booklet 5 focuses on female drug users. These groups are defined as having their own specific characteristics and special needs in services that would respond to them, as special methodological steps should be employed to better serve the purpose of exploring these contexts.

The recommendations made by the international organizations such as WHO and the UN accumulated research findings from around the world and outlined the general trends and developments in the subject of drugs, highlighting major issues that need further research and solutions (due to health risks, need for treatment services for people with behavioral substance use disorders, various population groups with specific needs etc.). These are strategically important topics. However, the focus on problematic areas tends to neglect and divert the attention from the phenomena that are also of vital importance in the context of drug use but do not need urgent resolution. Due to the lack of data, young injecting and recreational drug users (who inject rarely), as well as non-opioid users, are left out of the research focus and, as a consequence, are left uncovered by the services or the services do not meet their specific needs.

The services and detailed empirical data are needed not only to solve problems but also to prevent them. In this context it is important to understand that service provisioning could also be the source of the data (i.e., drug checking services, when individual drug users have an opportunity to bring their drugs and test the composition and the purity of the substance). According to the European Drug Report [2019], five new directions in gathering data about the use of drugs in general population were identified: hospital emergency data about the drug-

related cases; analysis of wastewater; analysis of substances' leftovers in syringes; data from the drug-checking services; and the web-based surveys. The aim of these initiatives is to allow the research tangents able to cover less well-observed forms of drug use [European Drug Report, 2019].

The lack of data can skew the researchers' picture of the reality. It is crucial to understand that the path to substance use is more complicated than immediate drug dependence, as there are people who have used drugs but did not maintain to use them frequently and did not experience the drug use disorder. As illustrated in the World Drug Report using the data from European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction [EMCDDA, 2017], the prevalence of lifetime use of cannabis, cocaine, amphetamine and ecstasy is higher that the prevalence of use during the last year and less people used these substances during the last month [UNODC, 2018].It indicates that during the last year some people tried just once, others used rarely and others more often, and that not every person who tried any of the drugs developed dependence. Having the information about the less "problematic" users is crucial. It provides information about the factors that help to control the usage, safe practices and other components of substance use in terms of culture and not only the public health issue.

There are many studies about recreational and ritual drug use in local contexts. For example, the ethnographic study of tourists' and shamans' experience of ceremony of ayahuasca (a hallucinogenic beverage traditionally used for religious and healing purposes] in Peru [Prayag, Mura, Hall, Fontaine, 2016]; or the studies about the club or party culture and drugs such as MDMA, hallucinogens, ketamine, cocaine, GBH etc. Moore and Miles [2004] explored the role of drug use in the life of young clubbers in Britain. Ravn and Duff [2015] introduced the methodology that they had used to understand the "geography" of drug use activities during the house parties in Denmark with the help of the painted by informants maps of the party. Thus the drug use remains a health issue that is often viewed as problem, but this outlook could lead to more destructive ends, such as further stigmatization and discrimination of drug users; therefore non-pathologizing, constructive approaches could be helpful for more effective service planning and integrating the individuals using the psychoactive substances into the society.

Perspectives on drug use and their methodological weaknesses

Singer and Page [2016] identified three common perspectives to describe topic of drugs in social sciences as (1) a public health issue (studies related to health risks and needs), (2) a deviant behavior, and (3) a culture-driven practice of the usage of exotic plants. In each of these perspectives there is a tendency to separate the practice of drug consumption from normal way of life, and the lack of the integrative approach to drug use as a phenomena [Singer, Page, 2016]. Philippe Bourgois has noted on the prevalence of harm reduction driven directions in drug research in public health which reflects the position of the agencies that provide funding. Such approaches are viewed as having a pathologizing nature and narrowing the view on and the scope of the phenomena [Bourgois, 2018].

Traditionally the narcotic substances consumption has been positioned as a marginalized behavior that becomes a defining characteristics of individuals engaging in it. In his classic book "Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance"

Howard Becker [1966] analyzes the life course of marihuana users and what makes people become "outsiders" or deviants. There are good reasons to exclude narcotic drugs from what is considered normative ways of behavior, for instance, as marihuana is illegal in many countries. But there is another way to study this practice without making the emphasis of on divorcing the individuals from his or her social context, and impose a conceptual separation of causes and consequences. In his article "History, Culture and Subjective Experience: An Exploration of the Social Bases of Drug-Induced Experiences" Becker [1967] investigated the individual effect of drugs (such as marihuana and LSD) and the interpretation of drug experience. He emphasized the crucial role of the "folk knowledge", "set of understanding", and "culture as a reliable source of knowledge" in the drug users' perception of negative or positive, pleasant of frightening effect of substances. One of his main ideas was that the more integrated in the culture of drug use a novice became, the fewer situations he or she interpreted as negative because he or she learned the ways to interpret them [Becker, 1967]. Knowledge that is shared by the group of drug users shaped not only the perception of the belonging to some group, but the perception of the unique individual experience of the drug effect. A person is not always able to clearly interpret the feeling he or she has without the information that is provided by the group.

At this juncture it becomes apparent that methodological support can be obtained from the ethnographic means of data collection, and especially from the cognitive approach to assessing and explaining the collectively shared beliefs, knowledge and normative ideas that are circulating within a social group. Namely, the methodological means and the research tools offered by the cultural models framework could lend a helpful hand to the empirical researchers who seek to provide an informed detailed account for the pathways to the drug use among the different categories of users.

Ethnographic innovation in applied research settings

Ethnographers have traditionally used participant observation with additional techniques of data collection, such as interviews (informal, semistructured or formal), oral histories, archival work, recording life stories and oral narratives, and collecting audio- and video-materials as well as written records. These methods together have been well-suited to an exploration of the "very intimate, mundane, and quotidian", as well as of processes and structures and their impacts that take place at varying scales and locations [Seligmann, Estes, 2019][1].

The intent of participant observation has been that as researchers became more familiar with the studied population. It enables a researcher to approximate them mentally and thus avoid the temptation to think of them as of mere research 'objects'. Since the inception of fieldwork, every fieldworker endeavors to find patterned regularities in the invisible to the outsider routine activities of the community in question [cf. Seligmann, Estes, 2019]. Fieldwork and its ethnographic participatory approach allow for a more nuanced understanding of shared collective mental landscapes and practices that structure people's lives.

---

[1] Cf. also the works of the following authors: Bernard (2011); Schensul, LeCompte (2013); Seligmann (2005).

One of the most promising means the ethnographic approach can offer is its participatory capacity. Just as digital ethnography is tailored to particular objectives, problematic or questions, the same is true of participatory ethnographic methods, multimodal ethnography and "collaborative anthropology", that both enable the ethnographer to represent the reality inhabited by the individuals one studies better and more accurately [Seligmann, Estes, 2019]. Ethnography is a good tool to collect data on how the group affects what individuals know (or believe), and to apply it to the context involving drug users.

Mapping collectively shared mental landscapes

In its survey of the social world and particularly in its studies of human culture sociological discipline has often turned to the insights offered by the cognitive theory. The cognitive focus in the theory of culture allows concentrating on such signatures of culture as similarity of mental landscapes of the individuals who are members of the same cultural group [Goodenough, 1971]. This way culture can be presented as a measurable variable which reflects the amount of sharing that exists among the individuals within a group due to their common culture. It therefore can be operationalized as the degree of measurable consensus (shared variation) in beliefs or patterned relative homogeneity in behavior [Romney, Weller, Batchelder, 1986]. Culture and cultural sharing in experiences and knowledge structures have been the focus of research attention in cognitive anthropology and sociology, as well as cross-cultural psychology, within several theoretical traditions. The intersubjective approach to cultural meaning construction is one of the theoretical avenues that have produced the helpful framework most relevant for the present discussion [Chiu et al., 2010].

Collectively shared ideas do not exist in isolation in individual minds but are interconnected and infused with motivational, cognitive and psychological meaning. Their agglomerations link them to other ideas (values, norms, attitudes, social axioms etc.) within the socially acquired cultural schemas of varying complexity [D'Andrade, Strauss, 1992]. The inter-linkages between these schemas give rise to larger "chunks" of culturally organized shared knowledge that is part and parcel of cultural meaning construction process that is automatic for the members of the group. The interconnections within these meaningful units of information guide the sense-making process typical for the particular cultural group [D'Andrade, 2002; 2008; Maltseva, D'Andrade, 2010; Quinn, 1996; 2005; 2011; 2018; Quinn; Holland, 1987; Ross, 2004; Shimizu, 2011; Strauss, 2000; Suizzo, 2002; Vaisey, 2009]. Cultural schemas and similar collective knowledge aggregates emerge and are maintained by means of the intersubjective process of collective meaning construction [Chiu et al., 2010; Gilbert, 1987; 2015; de Munck, Bennardo, 2019; Maltseva, forthcoming]. By so doing they become instrumental in interpreting individual daily experiences, endowing specific events with particular meaning and helping individuals make culturally-logical connections between the causes and the consequences of the social world they create, negotiate and jointly inhabit. Explaining the logic of these connections is one of the tasks of the ethnography and one of the challenges in the process of measuring shared collective knowledge [Maltseva, 2016; Weller, 2007; Weller, Romney, 1988; cf. Caulkin, 2004; Polavieja, 2015].

Furthermore, cultural knowledge is not perfectly homogenous but relying on a number of variants circulating within a group, thus reflecting the intra-group variation in experience, access to social learning opportunities and group composition and size. Despite the often shared assumption that cultures are more or less evenly distributed in terms of cultural information, culture consensus does not look as perfect in the data due to the differences instilled by the exposure to different experiences in the course of socialization process, namely, SES, profession, family/community type etc. [cf. Lareau, 2015]. Therefore, cultural knowledge in the way it is partitioned and distributed along the social groups can tell us a lot about the social world the individuals inhabit. It includes the groups that are marginalized, "otherized" or otherwise conceived of as outsiders. This brings us to the applied meaning invested in the notion of cultural models and the practical usefulness of this theoretical frame.

Cultural models (further CMs) are conceptualized as collectively shared (cultural) knowledge that the natives use to make sense of the world. A CM can be defined as the "presupposed, taken-for-granted knowledge shared within a society" [Quinn, Holland, 1987: p. 4]. A defining characteristic of CMs is their internal organization that, because it follows the contours of the existing social structures, allows a CM to be used by a cultural group/social category as a cognitive map of the mental landscape inhabited by the group members. CMs contain the essential information that can be used to answer principal questions regarding the attributions of causality, individual agency, rules of the game etc. the way they are intersubjectively understood in that social group. CMs embody an important instance of organization of collectively shared knowledge. Being characterized by both sharedness within a socio-cultural community where it circulates and a degree of inter-personal variability due to uneven distribution of domain-specific knowledge among different members of a society, CMs represent an integral aspect of social living [Zerubavel, 1999] (on similarities of social landscape, pp. 22, 56). Equally important, research on CMs not only seeks to better understand how members of different social groups imagine the world works, but also to expand an inquiry into the social determinants of such views of the world and their dynamic and applied aspects [cf. Lareau, 2015] and show the instances of social exclusion through their cognitive manifestations.

One of the important features of CMs is their ability to highlight the logical causal connections that explain the interlinkages between thought, decision making and behavioral choice. In the context of health and drug use, the logic behind a decision is often left unexplained and largely unknown to social epidemiologists who focus mainly on the noxious causes and negative outcomes but not the logical justifications people have to engage in behavior. However, it is an essential component in understanding real life choices individuals make. CMs allow exploring this aspect without the reductionism and simplification often found in quantitative (survey-based) methodologies. The richness of the obtained information is not compromised and the explanatory value of the resulting narrative is considerably higher. This property of CMs is invaluable in applied research that seeks to uncover the complex reasons that individuals have for engaging in self-destructive behaviors and habits, high-risk behaviors, dangerous activities or in lifestyles with suboptimal health outcomes.

Methodological benefits of the cognitive approach in research on drugs

Human knowledge is constructed from information "in the head" — the cultural models — in the course of interactions with the contingent environment [Blount, 2011].With the help of cultural models framework we can obtain the detailed ethnographic information about the place of the drug users in society, as well as their perception of themselves, drugs and people who are "others" to them. With this conceptual tool the point of departure is not reduced to the definite positioning of drug users in a context with presupposed needs, problems and risks/threats. A good example is recent public health discourse about the drug use. People who use drugs identified as groups of high risk to HIV-infection transmission. Because of that, people who do not use drugs intravenously are less interesting for researchers thus making this line of inquiry much more limiting. Also, among the injective drug users, there are more people of older age. Consequently, young people who use drugs but do not inject them are left unstudied and beyond the scope of any consistent research effort. In other words, the drug use reality presented in such studies doesn't cover less epidemiologically interesting representatives of the group and due to this became perverted. One the one hand, drug users who do not use injective drugs are not so important a public health issue, although, on the other hand, they are already drug users with the potential to develop a deviant career and become injective drug users. Such approach is not preventive enough, as it targets people already at risk only. Meanwhile the research question should be phrased as: what are the reasons other people stay at lesser risk? Samuel R. Friedman and colleagues, who are actively engaged in public health HIV-prevention research, have suggested the "Staying Safe" methodology, an idea to uncover practices that help drug users stay not infected with hepatitis C, instead of investigating strictly the reasons of becoming infected [Friedman, Mateu-Gelabert, Sandoval, Hagan, Jarlais, 2008]. This study is an example of an alternative perspective on drug use prevention and even when the research question is still about the health risk, it reveals safe behavior and practices in a broader light. Using cultural model as a research tool researcher can starts from an exploratory position and provide drug users with the opportunity to present the reality as they see it, placing the drug consumption where in their opinion it should be placed, without imposing the researchers' preconceived categories. With the use of cultural models we need to find people who use drugs (in different ways) and let them describe, organize and identify parts and types of the world of substance use as they exist in their minds.

Such approach to the research participants is also more inclusive and empowering for the studies populations. It is crucial to provide an informant with an opportunity to actively participate in studies and be heard. Ethnographically-minded researchers, in their turn, encourage their informants to construct the *emic* model of their lives and the context where the life events are unfolding.

Mapping and explaining collectively shared mental landscapes of drug users

Empirically-based research literature on drug use addresses the motives and reasons for substance use. The difference between drug abuse and drug use is of-

ten emphasized and statistical, sociocultural and clinical evidence is presented to frame drug use as a form of normal behavior [Nicholson, Duncan, White, 2002]. Nicholson et al. [2002] discuss some of the reasons why people use drugs as identified in earlier published works. Explanation of drug use can be related to various human needs reflected in the following categories:

1. Physical sensation, which includes the relief from pain, feeling relaxed or, on the contrary, to feel more alive/active;
2. Psychological and emotional, which refers to the substance's ability to change the mood, escape from boredom or negative feelings;
3. Social, which can include the need to integrate into a group and improve the connection with other people;
4. Creative, the principal purposes of which include enjoyment or producing art;
5. Cognitive, meaning to broaden one's mind and receive insights about life;
6. Religious/Mystical used to come in contact with the supernatural;
7. Political, as serving the need to show and express one's protest.

Biolcati and Passini [2019] use the Substance Use Motives Measure (SUMM) that was founded on previous studies and empirical data. Their findings concur with the results mentioned earlier. Biolcati and Passini [2019] discuss the differences between alcohol use and substance use, as well as the need to identify specific motives related to the usage of a particular narcotic substance. Study results are the most representative for the alcohol and marihuana/hashish users and abusers (as other substances were used by mere 1.7% of the sample). Based on the SUMM, the principal motives can be described as: magnification of feeling and pleasure; engaging in social interactions; willing of acceptance in a group; coping with negative feeling (anxiety, depression); coping with absence of interest (boredom); expanding the cognitive and perception frames and improving performance at work, studying and relations with people [Biolcati, Passini, 2019].

In general, the motives or reasons individuals have to use drugs cover fall on a broad spectrum. In the articles about the instrumentalization of drugs, the reasons to use novel psychoactive substances and self-generated marihuana are associated with the similar range of needs: to be accepted and to belong; exploration of self and perception; to enjoy the effect; to cope with difficulties; to be more productive and effective, etc. [Lee, Neighbors, Woods, 2007; Soussan, Andersson, Kjellgren, 2018; Müller, Schumann, 2011].

Psychoactive substances or drugs could be classified by using the criteria based on different characteristics. In the case of cultural model application it is crucial to have an understanding of the effects that drugs have on human body and behavior. The classical typology of substances includes the following: hallucinogens/psychedelics, opiates, stimulants, depressants and marijuana [Taylor, Hulsizer, 1998]. Hallucinogens/psychedelics are substances that change the perception and feeling, induce visual, sound and other kinds of hallucination. They assist people to achieve the alter state of mind. In such group are listed lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD), psilocybin (magic mushrooms), mescaline, phencyclidine (PCP), MDMA (Ecstasy) etc. Opiates or opioids are drugs the effect of which is similar to that of morphine: people feel relaxed, euphoric and feel an an-

esthetic effect. Among the opiate group there are heroine, codeine, fentanyl, morphine etc. Stimulants activate the central nervous system (CNS) which consequences in the feeling of euphoria, increased concentration, liveliness and absence of fatigue. Most prevalent stimulants are amphetamine, nicotine, cocaine etc. Depressant type of drugs are characterized by their depressing effect on CNS, which mean sleeping, sedating, and even coma or death. Such substances as barbiturates, benzodiazepines and also alcohol are determined as depressants. Marijuana includes products that include cannabis, which are marijuana (weed) and hashish. This product contains tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) the consumption of which leads to different effects in each user, but for the most part the feeling of changed perception of time is described, a feeling of relaxation, enhanced sensation and a light euphoric state.

The National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) divides the drugs into more specific categories: tobacco, alcohol, cannabinoids, opioids, stimulants, club drugs, dissociative drugs, hallucinogens, other compounds, and prescription medications [Commonly Abused Drugs, 2020]. In the NIDA's classification we can observe the emergence of such category as "club drugs" to which MDMA, GBD and Flunitrazepam belong, all of which are described to have dissimilar effects but were nonetheless united into the one group due to the circumstances under which they mostly used.

Furthermore, the NIDA separates the groups of substances into the hallucinogens and dissociative drugs. Based on the NIDA's classification, PCP is a dissociative substance, characterizes by the ensuing feeling of separation from the body and the setting, while LSD is a hallucinogenic substance, which causes changes in the perception of time, space and self. Overall those classifications share perspectives on substances, but they also diverge. Depending on the aim, the drugs could be analyzed as in groups or separately, as it was presented in the UNODC and Global Drug Survey reports.

In the UNODC and GDS publications the researchers sought to clarify which substances were more popular, with the conclusion pointing to marihuana, amphetamines and similar stimulants, ecstasy and cocaine. In the UNODC report the second place is taken by the opiates, but in the Global Drug Survey the opiates follow the psychedelic substances such as LSD and magic mushrooms, which are not mentioned in top 5 substances of the UNODC report [UNODC, 2018; Global Drug Survey, 2016]. In the European Drug Report the opioids are the fifth among the five prevalent substances [European Drug Report, 2019]. It is clear that not only the opioid drugs that are frequently used through injections should be an issue to receive attention, but that the other drugs that are rarely used injectively, should be taken into serious consideration by the researchers of drug use.

Furthermore, the psychoactive substances vary in terms of their addictive properties which add a separate dimension to the drug use research. In the published work on drug use the aspects of addiction and harm are often brought into discussion. The group of researchers measured and ranked drugs' properties that lead to the negative consequences in the article "Development of a rational scale to assess the harm of drugs of potential misuse" published in *Lancet* [Nutt, King, Saulsbury, Blakemore, 2007]. The publication distinguished three main types of harm related to the influences on the body, addictive behavior and social well-be-

ing. According to their ranking, the most harmful drugs among 20 substances were heroin, cocaine and barbiturates, while the least harmful were ecstasy, alkyl nitrates and khat.

Separate component of the drug-use related harm is the issue of dependence. The concept of dependence is complex; it comprises three subcomponents, namely, pleasure, psychological dependence and physical dependence. Pleasure is conceptualized by the speed of the effects of the drug, which is often dependent on the way of drug's introduction into the body (injection, sniffing and smoking being the fastest), and the duration of the euphoria that comes afterwards. Psychological dependence is reflected in the willingness to repeat the experience. Physiological dependence is characterized by increased tolerance (when the dosage needs to be increased to experience an effect) and withdrawal reaction. Based on these indicators, the most dependence-inducing drugs are heroin, cocaine and tobacco. It should be mentioned that only 20 drugs were investigated in the article, and according to the UNODC report [2018], 72 NPS emerged in 2016, which means that there are much more drugs that are currently in circulation, and more substances that scientists should study. It is challenging to accurately measure the level of the addictiveness of a drug as it could be measured only on the population of the people who already use drugs, so there is the bias of prevalence and access to the substance [Nutt, King, Saulsbury, Blakemore, 2007].

The perspective of using psychoactive drugs as a tool to improve specific behavior that leads to well-being and goal achievement is described by Müller and Schumann [2011], who call this process an "instrumentalization". In the nutshell, the idea of instrumentalization imparts that through the consumption of drugs and experiencing their effect individuals learn to manage the effect of drugs in the most effective way and then keep up the practice of this behavior. It reconceptualizes the substance use from inherently maladaptive behavior to an application of an available tool which requires more sophisticated toolkits to address it. The motives listed by Müller and Schumann [2011] are similar to the motives already described above, but they emphasize the improvement of the functioning. For example, researchers argue that people choose to use drugs to improve the social interaction or physical appearance (weight loss). Important component in drug instrumentalization is controlled use; the instrumentalization of drugs increases the risk of an addictive behavior development, but it is understood that at low and medium doses the drug use is safe and should not lead to addiction of physical harm [Müller, Schumann, 2011].

Ahmed [2011] points out that this perspective draws on the idea of resilience to addiction explaining why not all individuals using drugs become dependent on them. On a different note, a group of researchers working in the field of child and adolescence psychiatry and psychotherapy draws attention to the early initiation of drugs which is characterized by lower ability to consume functionally and by increased risks of destructive practices [Banaschewski et al., 2011]. Swendsen and Le Moalstated [2011] have also claimed that the instrumentalization perspective has its limitations and could even be dangerous to apply for policy planning. Foxall and Sigurdsson [2011] suggested extending the approach of instrumentalization to the broader and more complex perspective of drug use as a form of consumer behavior. They point out that in the frame suggested by Müller and Schumann the sociocultural context is left outside the brackets and rather lim-

ited attention is paid to the potential negative consequences of drug use [Goudie et al., 2011; Wu, 2011]. On the other hand, Griffiths [2011] and Van Gulick [2011] indicate that the instrumentalization approach is destigmatizing and could be applied not only to the use of substances, but also to study behaviors that are studies as addictions (gambling, sex, sport, Internet use etc.) or mental constructs. Pickard [2011] views the instrumentalization approach as not limited to non-addictive drug use, but applicable to addiction as well. Geoffrey Miller [2011] pointed out the innovativeness of the instrumentalization theory in terms of normalization of drug use "to instill useful insights, epistemic humility, and clinical empathy in young researchers" [Miller, 2011].

Conclusions

Ethnographic research on CMs offers ample opportunities for methodological innovation, involving combined use of different techniques, integration of multimodal research options and due to the richness of the produced narrative is particularly valuable for applied contexts. Using the methodological means supplied by the fieldwork-oriented research to create the ethnographically informed accounts of the reasons why individuals may start using drugs and how they themselves see this practice and their lives would enable the social researchers to address the problem of drug use more effectively. We present the methodological argument regarding the strategic use of the principles of ethnographic approach in data collection, to increase the informativeness, accuracy and validity of the results in applied research on recreational drug use.

References

Ahmed, S. (2011). Toward an evolutionary basis for resilience to drug addiction. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 310–311. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x11000677

Banaschewski, T., Blomeyer, D., Buchmann, A., Poustka, L., Rothenberger, A., Laucht, M. (2011). Drugs as instruments from a developmental child and adolescent psychiatric perspective. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 312–313. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x11000690

Becker, H. (1966). *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. London: Free Press.

Becker, H. (1967). History, Culture and Subjective Experience: An Exploration of the Social Bases of Drug-Induced Experiences. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 8 (3), 163. DOI: 10.2307/2948371

Bennardo, G., de Munck, V. (2013). *Cultural models: Genesis, methods, and experiences*. S.l.: Oxford University Press.

Blount, B. (2011). A history of cognitive anthropology. In: D.B. Kronenfeld, G. Bennardo, V.C. de Munck, M. Fischer (Eds.), *A Companion to Cognitive Anthropology* (pp. 11–29). Oxford: Blackwell.

Bourgois, P. (2018). Decolonising drug studies in an era of predatory accumulation. *Third World Quarterly*, 39 (2), 385–398. DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2017.1411187

Caulkin, D.D. (2004). Identifying culture as a threshold of shared knowledge: A Consensus analysis method. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 4 (3), 317–333.

Chiu et al. (2010). Intersubjective culture: The role of intersubjective perceptions in cross-cultural research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5 (4), 482–493.

Commonly Abused Drugs (2020). Retrieved from: https://www.drugabuse.gov/sites/default/files/cadchart_2.pdf

D'Andrade, R. (1995). *The Development of Cognitive Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

D'Andrade, R. (2002). Violence without honor in the American South. In: T. Aase (Ed.), *Tournaments of Power: Honor and Revenge in the Contemporary World* (pp. 61–75). Burlington: Ashgate.

D'Andrade, R. (2008). *Study of Personal and Cultural Values: American, Japanese and Vietnamese*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

D'Andrade, R., Strauss, C. (1992). *Human Motives and Cultural Models*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dasgupta, N., Beletsky, L., Ciccarone, D. (2018). Opioid crisis: No easy fix to its social and economic determinants. *American Journal of Public Health*, 108 (2), 182–186. DOI: 10.2105/ajph.2017.304187

de Munck, V., Bennardo, G. (2019). Disciplining culture: A sociocognitive approach. *Current Anthropology*, 60 (2), 174–193. DOI: 10.1086/702470

DiMaggio, P. (1997). Culture and cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 23, (1), 263–87.

European Drug Report (2019). Retrieved from: http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/11364/20191724_TDAT19001ENN_PDF.pdf

European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) (2017). *Health and Social Responses to Drug Problems: A European Guide*. S.l.

Foxall, G., Sigurdsson, V. (2011). Drug use as consumer behavior. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 313–314. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x11000707

Friedman, S., Mateu-Gelabert, P., Sandoval, M., Hagan, H., Jarlais, D. (2008). Positive deviance control-case life history: a method to develop grounded hypotheses about successful long-term avoidance of infection. *BMC Public Health*, 8 (1). DOI: 10.1186/1471-2458-8-94

Gilbert, M. (1987). Modeling collective belief. *Synthese*, 73, 185–204

Gilbert, M. (2015). *Joint commitment. How we make a social world*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Global Drug Survey (2016). *Key findings from the Global Drug Survey 2016*. Retrieved from: https://www.globaldrugsurvey.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/TASTER-KEY-FINDINGS-FROM-GDS2016.pdf

Goodenough, W. (1971). *Culture, Language and Society*. S.l.: Addison-Wesley.

Goudie, A., Gullo, M., Rose, A., Christiansen, P., Cole, J., Field, M., Sumnall, H. (2011). Nonaddictive instrumental drug use: Theoretical strengths and weaknesses. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 314–315. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x11000719

Griffiths, M. (2011). Non-addictive psychoactive drug use: Implications for behavioral addiction. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 315–316. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x11000720

Lareau, A. (2015). Cultural knowledge and social inequality. *American Sociological Review,* 80 (1), 1–27.

Lee, C., Neighbors, C., Woods, B. (2007). Marijuana motives: Young adults' reasons for using marijuana. *Addictive Behaviors*, 32 (7), 1384–1394. DOI: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2006.09.010

Maltseva, K. (2016). Using correspondence analysis of scales as part of mixed methods design to access cultural models in ethnographic fieldwork: Prosocial cooperation in Sweden. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 10 (1), 82–111. DOI: 10.1177/1558689814525262

Maltseva, K. (forthcoming). Bridging sociology with anthropology and cognitive science perspectives to assess shared cultural knowledge. *Sociology: Theory, Methods, Marketing.*

Maltseva, K., D'Andrade, R. (2011). Multi-item scales and cognitive ethnography. In: D.B. Kronenfeld, G. Bennardo, V.C. de Munck, M. Fischer (Eds.), *A Companion to Cognitive Anthropology* (pp. 153–170). Oxford: Blackwell.

Miller, G. (2011). Optimal drug use and rational drug policy. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 318–319. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x11000756

Moore, K., Miles, S. (2004). Young people, dance and the sub-cultural consumption of drugs. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 12 (6), 507–523. DOI: 10.1080/16066350412331323083

Müller, C., Schumann, G. (2011). Drugs as instruments: A new framework for non-addictive psychoactive drug use. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 293–310. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x11000057

Nicholson, T., Duncan, D., White, J. (2002). Is recreational drug use normal? *Journal of Substance Use*, 7 (3), 116–123. DOI: 10.3109/14659890209169340

Nutt, D., King, L., Saulsbury, W., Blakemore, C. (2007). Development of a rational scale to assess the harm of drugs of potential misuse. *The Lancet*, 369 (9566), 1047–1053. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(07)60464-4

Pickard, H. (2011). The instrumental rationality of addiction. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 320–321. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x1100077x

Polavieja, J.G. (2015). Capturing culture: A new method to estimate exogenous cultural effects using migrant populations. *American Sociological Review,* 80 (1), 166–191.

Prayag, G., Mura, P., Hall, C., Fontaine, J. (2016). Spirituality, drugs, and tourism: tourists' and shamans' experiences of ayahuasca in Iquitos, Peru. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 41(3), 314–325. DOI: 10.1080/02508281.2016.1192237

Quinn, N. (1996). Culture and contradiction: The case of Americans reasoning about marriage. *Ethos*, 24, 391–425.

Quinn, N. (2005). *Finding Culture in Talk: A Collection of Methods*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Quinn, N. (2011). The history of the cultural models school reconsidered. In: D. B. Kronenfeld, G.Bennardo, V. C. de Munck, M. Fischer (Eds.), *A Companion to Cognitive Anthropology* (pp. 30–46). Oxford: Blackwell.

Quinn, N. (2018). An anthropologist's view of American marriage: Limitations of the tool kit theory of culture. In: N. Quinn (Ed.), *Advances in Culture Theory from Psychological Anthropology* (pp. 139–184). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Quinn, N., Holland, D. (1987). Culture and cognition. In: D. Holland, N. Quinn (Eds.), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought* (pp. 3–42). London: Cambridge University Press.

Ravn, S., Duff, C. (2015). Putting the party down on paper: A novel method for mapping youth drug use in private settings. *Health & Place*, *31*, 124–132. DOI: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2014.11.010

Ross, N. (2004). *Culture and cognition: Implications for theory and method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Seligmann, L., Estes, B. (2019). Innovations in ethnographic methods. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 64 (2), 176–197. DOI: 10.1177/0002764219859640

Shimizu, H. (2011). Cognitive approaches and education: foundational models of self and cultural models of teaching and learning in Japan and the United States. In: D.B. Kronenfeld, G. Bennardo, V.C. de Munck, M. Fischer (Eds.), *A Companion to Cognitive Anthropology* (pp. 430–449). Oxford: Blackwell.

Romney, A.K., Weller, S. C., Batchelder, W.H. (1986). Culture as consensus: A theory of cultural and informant accuracy. *American Anthropologist*, 88, 313–338.

Singer, M., Page, J. (2016). *The Social Value of Drug Addicts*. London: Routledge.

Soussan, C., Andersson, M., Kjellgren, A. (2018). The diverse reasons for using Novel Psychoactive Substances - A qualitative study of the users' own perspectives. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 52, 71–78. DOI: 10.1016/j.drugpo.2017.11.003

Strauss, C. (2000). The culture concept and the individualism/collectivism debate: Dominant and alternative attributions for class in the United States. In: L. Nucci, G. Saxe, E. Turiel (Eds.), *Culture, Thought, and Development* (pp. 85–114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Suizzo, A.M. (2002). French parents' cultural models and childrearing beliefs. *International Journal of Behavioral Development,*26, 297–307.

Swendsen, J., Le Moal, M. (2011). Flaws of drug instrumentalization. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 323–324. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x11000732

Taylor, S.P., Hulsizer, M.R. (1998). Psychoactive drugs and human aggression. In: R.G. Geen, E. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Human aggression: Theories, research, and implications for social policy* (pp. 139–165). New York: Academic Press. DOI: org/10.1016/B978-012278805-5/50007-9

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (2018). World Drug Report 2018. *United Nations publication,* E.18.XI.9.

Vaisey, S. (2009). Motivation and justification: A dual-process model of culture in action. *American Journal of Sociology,* 114, 1675–1715.

Van Gulick, R. (2011). Drugs, mental instruments, and self-control. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 325–326. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x1100080x

Volkow, N., Collins, F. (2017). The role of science in addressing the opioid crisis. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 377 (4), 391–394. DOI: 10.1056/nejmsr1706626

Weller, S.C. (2007). Frequently asked questions about consensus analysis. *Field Methods,*19, 339–368.

Weller, S.C., Romney, A.K. (1990). *Metric Scaling. Correspondence Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wu, K. (2011). Governing drug use through neurobiological subject construction: The sad loss of the sociocultural. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34 (6), 327–328. DOI: 10.1017/s0140525x11000835

Zerubavel, E. (1999). *Social Mindscapes. An Invitation to Cognitive Sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

ЄВГЕНІЯ-ГАЛИНА ЛУКАШ, КАТЕРИНА МАЛЬЦЕВА

Використання етнографічного підходу та концепції культурних моделей у дослідженні рекреаційного вживання наркотичних речовин

Зловживання наркотичними речовинами є однією з найбільш нагальних проблем, що нині стоять на порядку денному соціальних епідеміологів та дослідників у сфері охорони здоров'я у багатьох країнах. Вживання наркотичних речовин широко досліджується, й емпіричні дані дають змогу сформулювати різні підходи до різних аспектів вживання наркотиків. У статті пропонується огляд як усталених, так і інноваційних підходів до вивчення засновків вживання наркотичних речовин із наголосом на методологічних засобах створення етнографічно збагачених пояснень причин того, чому індивіди можуть розпочати вживати наркотики і як вони самі концептуалізують цю практику та своє життя. Цілепокладання нинішньої публікації полягає в тому, щоб окреслити методологічні зиски використання етнографічних принципів у різних формах збирання даних, зокрема в разі розгляду концепції культурних моделей у прикладних дослідженнях рекреаційного вживання наркотичних речовин. Етнографічні дослідження культурних моделей надають широкі можливості для методологічних інновацій, включно з комбінованим використанням різних технік та інтеграцією мультимодальних дослідницьких опцій, і є особливо цінними для прикладних контекстів завдяки насиченості наративів, що вони здатні створювати. Вжиток методологічних засобів, доступних у польових дослідженнях, у галузі вивчення вживання наркотичних речовин надасть вченим та полісі-мейкерам інший рівень розуміння цих проблем. У статті подається методологічна аргументація стосовно стратегічного застосування принципів етнографічного підходу задля підвищення інформативності, точності та валідності результатів у прикладних дослідженнях рекреаційного вживання наркотичних речовин. Поряд з методологічною інноваційністю використання

методологічних засобів, що їх надає етнографічний підхід, дасть змогу соціальним науковцям вивчати проблеми вживання наркотичних речовин більш ефективно.

Ключові слова: *етнографічні методи, теорія культурних моделей, рекреаційне вживання наркотиків, дослідницький дизайн*

ЕВГЕНИЯ-ГАЛИНА ЛУКАШ, ЕКАТЕРИНА МАЛЬЦЕВА

Использование этнографического подхода и концепции культурных моделей в исследовании рекреационного употребления наркотических веществ

Злоупотребление наркотическими веществами является одной из самых насущных проблем, которые сейчас находятся на повестке дня социальных эпидемиологов и исследователей в сфере здравоохранения во многих странах. Употребление наркотических веществ широко исследуется, и эмпирические данные позволяют сформулировать различные подходы к тем или иным аспектам употребления наркотиков. В статье предлагается обзор как устоявшихся, так и инновационных подходов к изучению антецедентов употребления наркотических веществ с акцентом на методологических средствах создания этнографически обогащенных объяснений причин, по которым индивиды могут начать употреблять наркотики, и того, как они концептуализируют эту практику и свою жизнь. Целеполагание нынешней публикации состоит в том, чтобы определить методологические выгоды использования этнографических принципов в различных формах сбора данных, в частности при рассмотрении концепции культурных моделей в прикладных исследованиях рекреационного употребления наркотических веществ. Этнографические исследования культурных моделей предоставляют широкие возможности для методологических инноваций, включая комбинированное использование различных техник и интеграцию мультимодальных исследовательских опций, а также представляют особую ценность для прикладных исследований благодаря насыщенности нарративов, которые они способны создавать. Использование методологических средств, доступных в полевых исследованиях, для изучения употребления наркотических веществ откроет ученым и полиси-мейкерам новый уровень понимания этих проблем. Авторы представляют методологическую аргументацию относительно стратегического использования принципов этнографического подхода для повышения информативности, точности и валидности результатов в прикладных исследованиях рекреационного употребления наркотических веществ. Кроме методологической новизны, предоставляемой этнографическими полевыми исследованиями культурных моделей, методологические средства этнографического подхода позволят социальным исследователям изучать проблему употребления наркотических веществ более эффективно.

Ключевые слова: *этнографические методы, теория культурных моделей, рекреационное употребление наркотиков, исследовательский дизайн*

IEVGENIIA-GALYNA LUKASH, KATERYNA MALTSEVA

Using ethnographic approach and cultural models framework in research on recreational drug use

Substance abuse is one of the pressing issues that loom large in socio-epidemiological and health research in many countries nowadays. The empirical research on drug use is abundant, as are the perspectives on studying the risks associated with different aspects of drug use. In our article we

give an overview of both prevalent and novel approaches to understanding the antecedents of drug use, focusing on the methodological means to create the ethnographically informed accounts of the reasons why individuals may start using drugs and how they themselves see this practice and their lives. The goal of the present publication is to outline the methodological benefits of the strategic use of the principles of ethnographic approach to various forms of data collection, and specifically looking into the intellectual framework of cultural models in applied research on recreational drug use. Ethnographic research on cultural models offers ample opportunities for methodological innovation, involving combined use of different techniques and integration of multimodal research options, and is particularly valuable for applied contexts due to the richness of the produced narrative. Using the methodological means supplied by the fieldwork-oriented research in drug use studies would offer new insights for scholars and policy makers. We present the methodological argument regarding the strategic use of the principles of ethnographic approach to increase the informativeness, accuracy and validity of the results in applied research on recreational drug use. Besides the methodological innovations the fieldwork-oriented research offers, using the methodological means supplied by the ethnographic research on cultural models would enable the social researchers to address the problem of drug use more efficiently.

Keywords: *ethnographic methods, cultural models theory, recreational drug use, research design*