

Substance Use and Abuse

Sociological Perspectives

Victor N. Shaw

Substance Use and Abuse

Sociological Perspectives

Victor N. Shaw

PRAEGER

Westport, Connecticut
London

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Shaw, Victor N.

Substance use and abuse : sociological perspectives / Victor N. Shaw.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-275-97139-2 (alk. paper)

1. Substance abuse—Social aspects—United States. I. Title.

HV4999.2.S52 2002

362.29'1'0973—dc21 2002067938

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data is available.

Copyright © 2002 by Victor N. Shaw

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced, by any process or technique, without the express written consent of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 2002067938

ISBN: 0-275-97139-2

First published in 2002

Praeger Publishers, 88 Post Road West, Westport, CT 06881

An imprint of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

www.praeger.com

Printed in the United States of America



The paper used in this book complies with the Permanent Paper Standard issued by the National Information Standards Organization (Z39.48-1984).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4

Introduction

The idea of writing this book developed during my two-year postdoctoral scholarship in substance abuse research at the University of California–Los Angeles, under the auspices of the National Institute on Drug Abuse. As I participated in research projects to witness how data are gathered and analyzed, I soon realized that the field of substance use and abuse is plagued with an outgrowth of unrelated data collection and contingent explanations conceived in response to specific data. As I attended meetings and ploughed through the literature to learn how research findings are interpreted and reported, I gradually became convinced that there is a phenomenal poverty of, and therefore a dire need for, understanding of the fundamental issues in the field.

I then went back to my training in sociology and criminology. I examined the major concepts and theories I learned and found most of them relevant and insightful to my quest for understanding on the matter of substance, substance use, and substance users. I began with the social control perspective, into which I delved deeply while working on my previous book, *Social Control in China*. I tackled about two perspectives a year. After nearly six years of serious intellectual effort, I now have a whole variety of sociological explanations for substance use and abuse, including anomie, career, conflict, functionalist, rational choice, social control, social disorganization, social learning, social reaction, and subculture perspectives.

In form, all perspectives follow a similar logical sequence and have a comparable systematic framework. Sources of inspiration review relevant conceptual and empirical contributions in the existing literature. The theoretical framework builds upon definition, theoretical image, theoretical

component, theoretical application, and empirical test. Specifically, definition explains key concepts and presents a miniature view of the perspective. Theoretical image provides a general picture of substance use and abuse, across society and through history, in the spirit of the perspective. Theoretical component addresses major issues inherent in the perspective, such as stages of use, change through stages, and roles of use under the career perspective. Theoretical application proposes challenging topics and opportunities, derivable from the perspective, for further exploration. Empirical test elaborates how conventional research methods can be adapted to carry out concrete research projects using the perspective. There is also a major section dealing with the perspective's policy implications for public health, social control, life and community, and work and organization.

In content, each perspective stands on its own as an independent, self-sufficient theoretical system. First, the anomie perspective looks at substance and substance use as resource, opportunity, or means in people's reaction to their social structural conditions, specifically moral ambiguity or confusion and social strain or depression. As a resource, substance may be used to achieve material success. Substance use may be initiated and sustained to gain social status. As opportunity, substance may be used to excuse failure in life struggle. Substance use may be attempted to escape from active social functioning. As means, substance may be touted as a coping mechanism. Substance use may also be instituted as a routine defense against disappointment, frustration, and stress in personal experience with society. According to the anomie perspective, to reduce substance use and abuse is to improve social conditions so that laws are made clear, accessible, and understandable to common citizens, laws and social norms are enforced fairly and equitably across the population, and, most important, social resources and opportunities are provided equally for all members of the society.

Next, the career perspective compares substance use and abuse to the employment career that features upward and downward mobility over the individual's life span. From a career point of view, substance use is not just use of substance. It is distributed across various stages, from initiation, experimentation, habituation, dependence, problematic experience, assistance seeking, treatment, cessation, relapse, and maturation, to abstinence, in specific career pathways. Substance users are not just users of a common identity. They are differentiated into various roles or statuses through individual careers. In their peculiar use career path, users may experience various changes in physiological, psychological, personal, and social dimensions and take on different perspectives in work and life. Social reactions are usually fashioned accordingly through stages of individual change. For instance, prevention comes typically in the initial

phases whereas treatment takes place when individuals develop serious symptoms of addiction.

The conflict perspective detailed in chapter 3 views substance, substance use, and substance users as sites, vehicles, or carriers of division, tension, conflict, or confrontation between or among individuals, groups, institutions, social classes, or other identifiable entities. On the one hand, conflict within and between individuals and groups, social division between the rich and the poor, the powerful and the powerless, or the educated and the uneducated, as well as tension between human beings and non-human existence, may singly or jointly create and maintain conditions for substance use and abuse. On the other hand, substance use divides people into contrasting or opposing groups between addiction and abstinence, between dependency and self-sufficiency, between drug users and drug czars, between those who are in need of help and those who offer professional assistance, as well as between the oppressed, the deprived, the treated, and their oppressing, possessing, intervening counterparts. For example, substance users may challenge long- or widely held beliefs and norms, making themselves natural targets for traditional, conservative, or mainstream criticism and condemnation. They may pose as a possible threat, disruption, or danger to social order, turning themselves into easy prey for criminal justice officials, medical professionals, and service personnel in their respective efforts of punishment, treatment, and rehabilitation.

Chapter 4 focuses on the functionalist perspective and investigates substance use and abuse in the context of the larger system, how substance use and abuse are necessitated by a system, and what they offer to the functional operation, maintenance, and progression of the system. At the abstract level, the functionalist perspective explores how substance may improve human adaptation to nature, how substance use and abuse may act as a substitute for more serious deviance and even crime in a society, and how substance users may serve their group, culture, and historical era as messengers of critical issues or innovators of alternative lifestyles. At the concrete level, the functionalist perspective studies substance intake, substance users, and substance use in respective relation to the human body, individual groupings, and the sociocultural system. In specifying how the former contributes to the latter in various functional aspects, it examines and evaluates not only functions or positive effects, such as pain alleviation, symptom management, stress control, socializing, exchange, trade activities, service provision, and job creation, but also dysfunctions or negative consequences, such as dependency, withdrawal syndrome, social vice, crime, black market, wasting of social resources, and drain on taxpayers' money.

The rational choice perspective centers on human rationality in its effort to understand substance, substance use, and substance users. It examines

why a substance is adopted for use, why certain substance use is regulated pertaining to age, gender, or occasion, and how individuals make their choice about use or nonuse, all under the premise of human rationality. While it primarily follows rationality in its normal functioning, the rational choice perspective logically points to irrationality for critical inquiry. For instance, can users make normally rational choices under the influence of drugs? Are there clouded reasoning, twisted rationality, or impaired judgment in the context of addiction? The rational choice perspective also investigates what range of rationality or irrationality a society may exhibit in its reaction to substance use and abuse as a social problem.

The social control perspective focuses on the unnecessary and harmful nature of substance use. It assumes that substance use is an unnatural, irrational, abnormal, and deviant behavior. People normally do not use substance. A few who use substance begin with a loosening or a lack of proper restraints in family, school, work, or other social settings. Once they use substance, they may experience a further loss of control in their life. To prevent substance use is to institute and strengthen proper social control measures. To intervene in substance abuse is to restore order and to gain control. Theoretically, the social control perspective analyzes social control in two dimensions: attachment and regulation. Attachment refers to ties and connections one forges with his or her family, groups, community, and society. Regulations include moral advice and legal guidance one receives from his or her parents, teachers, employers, and governing authorities. Social control problems arise when attachment or regulation becomes either insufficient or excessive.

The social disorganization perspective follows substance users to their living environment. On the one hand, it examines why individuals move from one environment to another, how they struggle to adjust to a new environment, and how they are lured or forced into substance use, deviance, or criminal activity in the face of difficulty from the new environment or due to their individual misadjustment. On the other hand, it studies how a particular environment changes from generation to generation, how drastic change in a specific environment causes stress, disillusion, and disorder among individuals who live in it, and why substance use, deviance, crime, and other social problems tend to increase in a time when or in a place where change occurs abruptly. In contemporary society, substance use and abuse are bound to be prevalent and high as individuals are constantly bombarded with social and market changes fueled by scientific discoveries and technological innovations.

The social learning perspective focuses on the behavioral dimension of substance use. It explores how substance use is acquired as a human behavior. Specifically, it studies what social situations are defined as favorable to, what motivations and rationalizations are required for, and what skills and techniques are involved in substance use. It also examines how

the consequence of substance use feeds back on the process of learning and whether substance use can be unlearned through messages, groupings, and sources of influence unfavorable to violations of social norms. In approaching substance users as learners, for example, the social learning perspective points out that substance users are essentially influenced by whom they are associated with, whom they become identified with, what moral messages they are exposed to, what technical complexities they are taught with, what rewards they are given, what penalties they face, and what subculture they are thrown into in the process of learning and sustaining substance use. With proper changes in internal motivation and external pressure, users may learn to exit from or unlearn substance use by modes, through stages, under contingencies, and in contexts similar to those of learning.

The social reaction perspective capitalizes on the interactive nature of the three-way relations among substance users (actor), substance use (act), and societal responses (audience). It attempts to describe and explicate how one shapes and is shaped by another in a cyclical sequence involving all three variables. Beginning with substance use, for example, the social reaction perspective explores and explains why it is initiated, pursued, and cherished or avoided, resisted, and hated by actual and prospective users; why it is prompted, sanctified, and perpetuated or prohibited, stigmatized, and eliminated by society; and most essentially, how societal reactions implicitly and explicitly influence the way users see and behave themselves, the way they view and continue their substance use, and the way they perceive and approach life, work, society, and the whole world. Drawing upon the social reaction perspective, agents in social control should not spend all their time and energy on labeling substances, chasing substance users, and blaming a morally decaying generation or society for rampant substance use and abuse. They should instead keep some time and space to reflect upon the way they set up rules, educate the young, define deviance and crimes, approach substance use, and treat substance users. In some situations, the best way to react to substance use is to take no action at all. In some situations, the less action taken, the better it is for substance use and users. But under all circumstances, users and uses themselves should first be given their full respective force in correcting, healing, or adjusting a temporarily problematic situation before any social reaction ever takes place.

Finally, the subculture perspective focuses on the inner workings of substance user groups and groupings. It examines what beliefs, values, norms, and rituals users develop and follow in preserving and sustaining their substance use. It inspects what props, tools, aids, and equipment users innovate and employ in preparing substances for use, in administering substances, or in sanctifying use itself. It explores why users come together and what keeps them in solidarity with each other in the process

of use, in the aftermath of abuse, and in reaction to pressure from the outside. Noting that the substance subculture exists in a crowd of other subcultures, the subculture perspective examines substance-relevant subcultures, such as the youth subculture, prostitute subculture, gang subculture, and deviant subculture, to see how each of them relates to substance use as cause, collateral occurrence, or consequence. Recognizing that the substance subculture is part of the general culture, the subculture perspective studies how the substance subculture draws spiritual inspiration and material supplies from the general culture, and how it contributes special symbols, meanings, artifacts, and other residues to the general culture. More subtly, the subculture perspective points out that the substance subculture itself may be a victim of the general failure or crisis in modern and postmodern culture although it is often singled out, along with criminal and deviant subcultures, for moral condemnation and legal attacks by the larger society.

This is the first book to systematically apply sociological perspectives to substance use and abuse. In drawing upon major sociological concepts and theories, I attempt to show that established sociological perspectives can be comprehensively tested in the practical field of substance use and abuse for their validity and utility. In developing theoretical explanations for substance, substance use, and substance users, I want to demonstrate that the established field of substance use and abuse can be insightfully enlightened with major theoretical perspectives from sociology.

Contents

Introduction	vii
1 The Anomie Perspective	1
2 The Career Perspective	25
3 The Conflict Perspective	51
4 The Functionalist Perspective	75
5 The Rational Choice Perspective	99
6 The Social Control Perspective	125
7 The Social Disorganization Perspective	149
8 The Social Learning Perspective	175
9 The Social Reaction Perspective	199
10 The Subculture Perspective	221
Conclusion	245
References	249
Index	263

The Anomie Perspective

Society is not a flat collection of equally resourceful and fortunate individuals. It is constructed in a complex hierarchy where people are discriminatively positioned with differential access to power, status, capital, and opportunities. In some areas, people are so deprived of legitimate resources that they take socially disapproved means as their sensible ways of survival. During some periods of time, people are so mercilessly denied opportunities by both conventional and unconventional worlds that they turn to substance use as their ultimate retreat from productive life. Among some social classes of people, mainstream norms and values seem to be so remote and irrelevant that subcultural and unconventional rules and beliefs become guiding principles in daily behavior.

The anomie perspective looks at substance use as resource, opportunity, or means in people's reaction to their specific social structural conditions. As resource, substance may be used to achieve material success. Substance use may be initiated and sustained to gain social status. As opportunity, substance may be used to excuse failure in the life struggle. Substance use may be attempted to escape from active social functioning. As means, substance may be touted as a coping mechanism. Substance use may be instituted as a routine defense against disappointment, frustration, and strain in personal experience with society.

SOURCES OF INSPIRATION

The concept of anomie was first coined by Emile Durkheim to denote a state of normlessness. According to Durkheim, human beings are born with "inextinguishable thirst" and have an insatiable and bottomless abyss

of capacity for desires and feelings. In order for people to live together in groups and society, norms and moral authorities need to be developed and established to keep individual aspirations, passions, and desires in check.

In traditional society or society characterized by what Durkheim called mechanical solidarity, people live in closely knit communities. They attend the same church, go to the same marketplace, and share strongly in the same collective conscience. Children grow up in direct contact with parents, relatives, and neighbors. People receive concrete and clear directions and guidance in their everyday thoughts and behaviors. Anomie rarely occurs. When it does, it only appears as a random, accidental, temporal, isolated, or group-specific event. For example, unrelated individuals commit anomic suicide when they are thrown into normative confusion and moral ambivalence by some highly, unexpected fortunes or misfortunes in life, such as a sudden rise or fall in personal wealth or status.

In contemporary society or society featuring organic solidarity, people live in increasing distance from one another as well as from the state. "Religion has lost most of its power. And government, instead of regulating economic life, has become its tool and servant. . . . Industry, instead of being still regarded as a means to an end transcending itself, has become the supreme end of individuals and societies alike. Thereupon the appetites thus excited have become freed of any limiting authority" (Durkheim 1952: 255). Although development of intermediate structures or secondary groupings, such as unions, occupational organizations, professional associations, and interest clubs, may provide a functional alternative to the old loyalties generated by religion, regionalism, and kinship, anomie is likely to remain a chronic social problem in the modern and postmodern world. Individuals, caught in a normative vacuum between the remote state and unscrupulous individualism, are likely to commit anomic deviance or offense, or fall victim of anomic suicide.

Anomie also takes place discretely in history when society switches from mechanical to organic solidarities. As the old value system breaks down and new moral doctrines scramble to emerge, people experience disruption, contradiction, loss of direction, and frustration in their thoughts and acts. It is also during the period of transition that instinctually based human greed is unleashed, pushing people into the shameless pursuit of their unlimited aspirations. Anomie, in this historically characteristic show-off, signifies not only confusion, helplessness, and strain, but also ambition, manipulation, and pleasure on the part of individuals.

A major turning point in the development of anomie theory appears in Robert Merton's 1938 essay "Social Structure and Anomie." Drawing upon the social experience of twentieth-century America, Merton redefined anomie as the structured disparity between promises of achievable pros-

perity and real-life opportunities to realize those promises. Like Durkheim, Merton examined unfulfilled aspirations to see how they affect people's mind and behavior. Unlike Durkheim, Merton focused on the socially structured disjuncture between culturally inspired aspirations and socially approved means for goal attainment, rather than normative confusion and chaos, to develop explanations for individual modes of adaptation.

In the United States, the majority of the population, including newcomers, seem to be identified with the mainstream middle-class values about the American dream. Through family, school, community, mass media, and other socialization agents, people are educated to believe that America is a fair and just society. Anyone who follows the rules, works hard, and is smart will be able to achieve material success and realize his or her American dream. The reality is, however, that social resources and opportunities necessary for material success are unequally and unevenly distributed across American society. Some are powerful, rich, and knowledgeable. Some are powerless, poor, and deprived of cultural capital. Some are born into the abundance of wealth and have ready access to a wide variety of opportunities. Some grow up in impoverished, gang-controlled, and violence-inflicted communities, and have to struggle hard in every step of their lives. While most people manage to live a conforming life in response to their specific social position, some individuals opt for nonconformist modes of adaptation in their reaction to blocked opportunities. There are innovators who adhere to culturally inspired goals but turn to socially illegitimate means to attain their goals. For example, inner-city gangs market drugs to achieve their economic prosperity. There are ritualists who play by the rules but do not care about success or personal advancement. For example, some corporate or governmental bureaucrats give up their hope for further upward mobility and desire only to get through their days until retirement. There are retreatists who abandon both cultural goals and legitimate means to retreat from active and productive social life. In Merton's list, they include "psychotics, artists, pariahs, outcasts, vagrants, tramps, chronic drunkards, and drug addicts" (1957: 153). Finally, there are rebels who formulate new standards and create new channels of opportunity to replace existing goals and means. For example, communist revolutionaries educate and organize proletarians in an attempt to create a society of equity and justice in place of capitalism.

Merton's general theory of deviance seems to imply that deviation is a choice for those who experience strain as they strive for success in the legitimate world. According to Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, however, opportunities for survival and success in the illegitimate world are not automatically, readily, and equally available and accessible either, to

everyone who seeks them. Depending upon their specific living environment, youths who experience blocked opportunities in conventional society will engage in different activities, form different groups, and develop different modes of adaptation to life. In an environment dominated by organized for-profit criminal groups, alienated youths may serve their apprenticeship with professional criminals. They join crime-oriented gangs. They learn skills and disciplines. They aim to make a profit, keep a reputation, and earn a living from crime and deviance for themselves as well as for their devoted group. In an environment where adult criminals are largely unskilled, unsuccessful, and disorganized, youths are left with no role model, no live example, no technical teaching, and no organizational assistance for material success through illegitimate means. "Deprived not only of conventional opportunity but also criminal routes to 'big money'" (Cloward and Ohlin 1960: 180), youths form conflict-oriented gangs and engage in fighting and violence to vent anger, to cope with frustration, or to achieve status in the eyes of peers. Finally, in an environment clouded by an overwhelming sentiment of failure, despair, and normlessness, youths may withdraw from active and productive life in both conventional and deviant worlds. They take refuge in retreatist-oriented gangs. They center their attention and activity on the consumption of substances. They are only concerned with physical and emotional "highs." The last adaptation features what Cloward and Ohlin characterize as double failures who fail in both legitimate and illegitimate approaches to material success and social status.

Emphasis on group rather than individual responses to blocked opportunities is also reflected in Albert Cohen's work on delinquent boys. According to Cohen (1955), lower-class boys want to achieve success and higher social status just as much as their middle- and upper-class counterparts. Facing an unpromising social environment, however, lower-class boys divide into three groups in their response to the dominant middle-class value system. In college-boy response, they defer gratification, go to school, take up an occupational career, and attempt to conform to all other middle-class expectations. In corner-boy response, they give up competing with middle-class society and retreat to their specific lower-class subculture for some doses of self-perceived peace and comfort. Truancy, smoking, alcohol consumption, and drug use are common activities taken by corner boys. Finally in delinquent-boy response, youth act out in open defiance to middle-class values. They intentionally or unintentionally engage in behaviors deemed delinquent, malicious, or antisocial by the mainstream society.

Building upon his research on delinquency and the culture of gangs, Cohen went on to expand the anomie theory as a whole. Through his contribution, the anomie theory no longer looks atomistic and individualistic,

as it first appears in Merton's formulation. Reference groups and social interactions are included in and related to the selection of adaptational alternatives by persons confronted with the strain of anomie. Deviant adaptation no longer seems to be discrete and discontinuous. It unfolds itself in a gradual, step-by-step process in which people shape and reshape behavior in response to their changing environment. Criminal deviance no longer appears to be practical and utilitarian only. It can become malicious, destructive, and harmful, not only by consequence, but also in terms of intentionality (Cohen 1965).

Upon the inspirations of the anomie perspective, sociologists and other disciplinary scholars pursue serious studies in drug abuse (Lindesmith and Simon 1964; Lewis 1970; Glaser, Lander, and Abbott 1971), suicide (Henry and Short 1954; Gibbs and Martin 1964; Maris 1969), and juvenile delinquency (Hirschi 1969; Freese 1973; Elliot and Voss 1974; Empey 1982; Triplett and Jarjoura 1997; Hoffmann and Su 1997). In substance use and abuse research, early studies center on the general assumption that drug users drop out into the retreatist subculture after an unsuccessful exploration of both legitimate and illegitimate avenues of goal attainment. Instead of supporting the assumption, empirical data indicate that initial choice of drugs is determined more by drug availability than by individual reaction to strain. Furthermore, as drugs are expensive and not easy to obtain, users have to work hard within the structures of both conventional and criminal worlds should they persist in their use habit.

Recently, some studies attempt to address the neglect of everyday stress by classic anomie theories. In a special issue on stress and substance use by *Substance Use and Misuse*, a number of researchers explore the fluctuations or temporal patterns of alcohol and substance use in relation to stress (Hoffmann 2000). Structural strain experienced by particular groups is beginning to gain attention. Scheier and Botvin (1996) find that minority youth engage in substance use, sensation-seeking, and unsafe behavior because they face sociopolitical and economic setbacks in addition to normal adolescent transition pressures. Hagedorn (1997) emphatically characterizes gang drug dealing as the innovative response of young minority males to blocked opportunity, rather than participation in a deviant, oppositional culture. Garcia (1999) argues that children who are subjected to racism; sexism; physical and mental abuse; inferior, dangerous schools; and abandonment to foster care from birth are doomed to lives of hopelessness, deviance, and drug use. Sharp, Terling-Watt, Atkins, Gilliam, and Sanders (2001) note that negative affective states, such as anger and depression, intervene in the relationship between strain variables and some prototypically female types of deviant behavior, including purging, bulimia, and substance use. Interest in the large environment and general social process continues. Zimny (2000) examines alcoholism and morality

in Poland and eastern Europe, with reference to Russia. He senses a clear escapist reaction through alcohol and substance abuse by people who share exacerbated feelings of tension, alienation, despair, and uncertainty amid unemployment, currency devaluation, food shortages, and general social malaise. *sense of being unwell*

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The anomie perspective focuses on the disparity between individual aspirations and social resources in its quest for understanding of substance use and abuse. It is unique in the sense that individual attitudes and behaviors are examined against social structure and environmental conditions.

Definition

Anomie refers to both normlessness, as depicted by Durkheim, and strain, as portrayed by Merton. The connection in the two dimensions of the concept is twofold. On the one hand, problems in cultural assimilation and socialization cause moral confusion and normative extremism. Moral confusion makes individuals lose their sense of reality. At one extreme, they feel they are supermen or superwomen, they are above normal social rules, and they can do whatever they dream, desire, or want. At another extreme, they lament they are dwarfs, handicapped, or slaves of reality, they are restrained by every single social regulation, and they cannot reach even the simplest goal they set for themselves. Both extremes can lead to alienation and strain, creating either individual inclinations or social conditions for substance use and abuse.

On the other hand, failure, frustration, and strain experienced from social endeavors raise questions about self-expectation, ability, control, and image as well as social fairness, justice, legitimacy, and rationality. Moral unsureness, contradictions, and confusions ensue. In polarized reactions, individuals either harshly blame themselves to the degree of self-shame or critically charge society, even in the form of reversal, rebellion, or withdrawal. For example, they give up diligence, frugality, and conformity when they see none of those virtues works to their advantage. Substance use and other deviant behavior may arise amid moral dilemma or as part of individual reaction to social reality.

The anomie perspective follows anomie in both of its dimensions to study how substance use figures in as resource, opportunity, or means in the whole social-individual dynamic. Specifically, it examines how strain and moral undecidedness or loosening in normative control feed back on each other to make substance dealing, use, and addiction an attractive or acceptable reaction to life and reality.

Theoretical Image

Society is a resource, power, and status-differential structure. People are situated in different positions in the social hierarchy. Some lead. Some follow. Some live in affluence. Some fall under poverty. Some enjoy. Some suffer. Strain, uncertainty, and confusion, like joy, sureness, and clearness, are part of life and social dynamics.

Substance enters the picture of life as seduction, temptation, aid, companion, or scapegoat. People are seduced by some substances when they experience weak or loosening moral guidance from society. People are not able to resist the temptation of a substance and its mystified effects when they feel ambivalent and undecided about their approach to the substance because of a lack of knowledge. People turn to some substances for relief and comfort when they suffer from pain and stress in their life struggle. People use drugs to kill time, to feel at ease with themselves, or to beat loneliness in their temporary or permanent escape from active social life. Finally, people may symbolically take drugs as scapegoats for their personal anger, anxiety, stress, or failure although they themselves eventually bear the harm of the drugs. For example, one drinks alcohol, dumps it on the floor, and shatters the bottle as if alcohol is the thing to blame for his or her ill feelings at the moment.

Substance use takes place amid social strain and moral decline. Under strain, substance use is a coping mechanism, excuse, escape, defense, or rescuer. As a coping mechanism, it consumes frustration, channels anxiety, alleviates pain, and hopefully brings back peace and balance. For example, one feels "use of coffee helps me through the most stressful part of the task" or "use of alcohol gives me the courage to face creditors so that I can rebuild my failed business." As an excuse, substance use provides one with a publicly perceivable reason or explanation for why he or she drops out of social competition: "I have long had this use habit. It is now getting worse and worse. For the sake of the position I hold, I'd better leave." As an escape, substance use, abuse, and addiction pave the way to exit active social life. As a defense, substance use serves to protect one's self-image: "I have talents and potentials. I would have been a sure winner had I not been victimized by the evil effect of the substance." Substance use may also appear as a rescuer. For instance, youth who experience status frustration in mainstream social endeavors drink alcohol, smoke cigarettes and cigars, or use hard drugs to gain status among their peers as well as to prove their maturity, manhood, or womanhood in the eyes of adults. A substituted achievement in status through use of substance may indeed keep one from drifting into serious deviance in the aftermath of strain. Successful drug dealing directly makes up for any disadvantage, loss, or failure one experiences in the conventional world.

During moral decline, substance use increases when general beliefs, norms, and laws regarding substance and substance use become