

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Hilary Pilkington

Article Title: Beyond 'peer pressure': Rethinking drug use and 'youth culture'

Year of publication: 2007

Link to published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2006.08.003>

Publisher statement: None

**Beyond 'peer pressure':  
Rethinking drug use and 'youth culture'**

Hilary Pilkington

Professor of Sociology

Department of Sociology

University of Warwick,

Coventry

CV4 7AL

Email: [h.pilkington@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:h.pilkington@warwick.ac.uk)

Tel: 0247657 5128

Fax: 0247652 3497

## **Introduction**

Over the last decade, the study of young people's drug use has been radically transformed by the development of a sociological framework for understanding young people's routine engagement with, and accommodation of, 'recreational' drugs. The 'normalisation thesis' (Measham, Newcombe & Parker, 1994) suggests that, by the 1990s, the trend towards the gradual 'desubculturalization' of drug use in society had extended such that recreational drug use had become 'normalised' within mainstream youth culture (Parker, Aldridge & Measham, 1998, pp. 153-7). Underpinning the argument is a conceptualization of young people's drug use as a series of 'rational decisions about consumption' (p.154) rather than an uninformed response to 'peer pressure'. This understanding of illicit substance use follows a tendency within youth cultural studies to view consumption as the key resource for, and site of, young people's identity formation (Bennett, 1999; Miles, 2000). The sociological study of drug use and youth cultural practice thus go hand in hand; the consumption of a range of legal and illicit substances becomes one element in the creation and re-creation of youth cultural identities (Duff, 2003, p.443).

The emphasis Parker et al lay on understanding drug use as an element of broader youth cultural practices, however, has generated growing critique, albeit, paradoxically, on grounds that it is both too cultural and that it is not cultural enough. In the first case, it is argued, the theoretical focus of the 'normalisation thesis' - on how individuals make choices about 'risks' in the context of information-rich environments - obscures more fundamental, structural determinants of drug use (MacDonald & Marsh 2002; Shildrick 2002). These determinants include the relative availability and cost of different types of

drugs (Gossop, 2000, p.38; Pearson, 1987; Parker, Bakx & Newcombe, 1988; Johnston et al, 2000; MacDonald & Marsh, 2002) as well as traditional patterns of inequality (Shildrick, 2002, p.45). The conclusion that both MacDonald & Marsh and Shildrick draw is that the notion of the ‘normalisation’ of drug use should be recast as ‘differentiated normalisation’ (Shildrick, 2002, p.36; MacDonald & Marsh, 2002, p.29) to capture the empirical observation that different types of drugs and different modes of their use may become ‘normalised’ for different groups of young people depending upon the opportunities and constraints placed upon them by their structural location.

A further set of criticisms seek to reconfigure structural and cultural understandings of drug use by envisaging the power relations that MacDonald & Marsh and Shildrick locate in social and economic relations as embedded, rather, in the realm of cultural production and representation. On the one hand this critique is concerned with exposing how commercial systems – such as advertising – define, re-circulate and ‘mainstream’ culture through youth-targeted imagery (Taylor, 2000). On the other hand, the power of the media and other discursive institutions is seen as being used to create a discourse of regulation, underpinned by the institutions of law and medicine, which disciplines those – such as drug users – who fall outside the ‘normalizing judgment’ (Blackman, 2004, p.143). Such approaches illuminate effectively how the discursive construction of drug and alcohol use is interwoven with political discourses that shift responsibility for minimizing risk to individuals, families and communities (Dean 1999), how ‘excessive’ consumption becomes pathologised (O’Malley and Valverde 2004) and how this

encourages the extension of the surveillance, discipline and regulation of young people (Kelly, 2003: 176).

Critiques of the 'normalisation thesis' on the grounds of its insufficient sensitivity to the cultural context of drug use have pointed to the dangers, in particular, of extrapolating a cultural predisposition - 'normalisation'- from behavioural data. These data, it is suggested, are themselves crudely determined from 'life-time reported use' indicators that exaggerate the prevalence of drug use since they fail to distinguish between experimentation and occasional or regular use (Shiner & Newburn, 1997, pp.515-9). There has been criticism also of the failure to recognise the slippage between 'recreational' and other drug use in certain local contexts (MacDonald & Marsh, 2002; Shildrick, 2002; Pilkington, 2006a). Finally, it has been suggested that theories of individualisation of risk foster a too limited understanding of young people's drug decisions as individual consumer choices; this, it is argued (Pilkington, 2006b), underestimates the hermeneutic dimension of reflexivity reflected in the friendship group context of young people's drug decisions and use.

In sharp contrast to this increasingly nuanced debate in the West, Russian sociological writing on drug use is characterised by a concern with charting the 'narcotisation' (Zhuraleva, 2000) or '*narkotizm*'<sup>1</sup> (Stozharova 2003) of youth as a whole whilst often failing to distinguish between different kinds of drugs being used, or between 'drug use'

---

<sup>1</sup> 'There are two sociological terms in Russian relating to drug use: 'narkomaniia' which relates to drug addiction as a medical state; and 'narkotizm', or prevalence of drug use, which signifies the level and character of drug use (Gabiani, 1990, p.214). 'Narcotisation' refers to the growth in, and extension of, the prevalence of drug use.

and 'drug addiction' (although exceptions to this rule include: Malikova 2000; Omel'chenko (ed.) 1999 and 2000). Explanations of this process tend to be structural and broad-brush; drug use is presented as the consequence of a combination of changes experienced by Russian society to which young people are particularly 'vulnerable' (Aref'ev, 2002, p.1). Even where sociologists take a consciously 'cultural' approach, drug use is understood as an 'illness' reflecting an individual's failure to 'adapt' to society (Bykov, 2000, p.48), or as 'deviant behaviour' which compensates for poverty of experiences (Zhuraleva, 2000, p.43) or reflects the 'moral dead end' of post-Soviet society (Stozharova, 2003, p.108).

Western academic discourse on drug use in Russia to date has focussed on the relationship between injecting drug use and one of the fastest growing HIV epidemics in the world (Power et al, 2004; Grassly et al; Rhodes et al, 2004; Platt et al, 2004; Kramer, 2003). The link between IDU and HIV has been captured poignantly in the photographs of John Ranard (Ranard, 2002) and is the primary focus of international agency concern. The Russian situation is presented as the product of the convergence of two events: the rapid expansion of drugs markets (due to heroin trafficking from Afghanistan and Central Asia); and the emergence of widespread poverty and social dislocation arising from post-1991 economic transition. Attempts to draw more definite causal relationships between these phenomena have suggested that the rise in substance use is driven by the social anomie arising from economic transformation (McKee, 2002). 'These societies,' McKee argues in a way not dissimilar from Zhuraleva above, 'produce people...

whose outlook is characterised by a sense of futility, lack of purpose, emotional emptiness and despair' (McKee, 2002, p.456). Thus while McKee recognises culture – specifically supportive social networks - as important, he sees such networks as conspicuous by their absence. For others 'culture' enters the picture as an exacerbating factor in the form of Soviet era ideological obstacles to informed drug use (Veeken, 1998) producing the 'myth and ignorance' that exacerbates the HIV epidemic today (Ranard, 2002).

The empirical research drawn on in this article was undertaken as a collaborative exercise by a team of British and Russian sociologists. It sought to bridge the gap between academic discourses on drug use in the West and in Russia as well as to understand why Russian discourse on drug use was so radically at odds with young Russians' own narratives of drug use encountered in previous research (Pilkington, 1994 and 1996; Omel'chenko, 1999; Omel'chenko (ed.) 2000; Pilkington et al, 2002). To this end the research was designed to allow drug use to be understood as it occurs within everyday lives but also to ensure full account was taken of the structural locations that make some young people particularly vulnerable to drug use. Thus, while the approach was consciously 'cultural', 'youth culture' was envisaged neither as the sum of individual consumer preferences nor as 'deterritorialized' (Miles, 2000, p.159). On the contrary, it was premised on the possibility that drugs markets in different localities facilitate the formation of distinctive drug cultures and routinize (if not 'normalise') different kinds of drug use. However, youth culture was not considered to be a mere reflection of structural location but to consist of a range of practices and forms that simultaneously embody,

reproduce and negotiate locally based social inequalities. In the empirical sections of the article that follow, the importance of drug markets, social dislocation and inequality in shaping young Russians' drug using practices in a particular location are outlined before the ways in which youth cultural practices themselves transmit and reproduce, but also constrain and resist, structurally rooted propensities to drug use are explored.

### Methods

The empirical data referred to in this article are drawn from original research conducted in the Russian Federation in 2002-03 in three regions - Krasnodar Territory, Samara region and Komi Republic – and in three towns or cities within each region (see Table 1). The data referred to in this article, however, are drawn primarily from Komi Republic; the experience of young people in the other regions is reported only where issues under discussion may be illuminated through comparison.

[Insert Table 1 Regional characteristics of the fieldwork sites]

The project employed three main data gathering methods: survey; semi-structured interviews; and intensive ethnographic studies. The survey was conducted among regionally representative samples of 14-19 year olds (n=2814) using a self-complete questionnaire, which was piloted in Ul'ianovsk (n=60) before being rolled out to the regions of study. Because of the integrated, mixed-method design of the research, the survey sample was quota-based and the sample unit was educational institution. Whilst recognising that this reduces the representativeness of the survey, this sampling method

was adopted in order to facilitate access points to young people for the purposes of recruiting respondents for the interview stage of the research and because the primary purpose of the survey was to generate descriptive statistics that would provide a base line for cross-regional comparison in the absence of existing comparable data on drug use prevalence. Data from the survey cited below therefore are drawn on for their descriptive value only.

Semi-structured interviews (n=95) were conducted in parallel with the survey in each of the nine towns and cities. Respondents were invited on a volunteer-basis to participate in interviews following completion of the questionnaire. No strict quota system was used to select respondents but details of interviewees were recorded and monitored on a daily basis to ensure that interviews had been conducted with young people of both sexes, from all types of educational establishment and all three age cohorts used in the survey sample (8<sup>th</sup> class, 10<sup>th</sup> class and first year Higher Education institution). Interviews took place either immediately after completion of questionnaires in a quiet place close to the school or in another (public) place at a convenient time for the respondent. All interviews were recorded, transcribed (in Russian) and analysed using ATLAS.ti. Coding was conducted by a team of five coders including the author. Initial codes were generated on the basis of approximately 20% of the interview transcripts after which a single common coding scheme was assembled and used to code the remaining transcripts.

Ethnographic studies were undertaken in three field sites - Sochi, Vorkuta and Chapaevsk - with a total of nineteen friendship groups of young people. A young researcher was

located in each of these sites for a period of six weeks. Initially contacts were taken up with respondents who had offered their help at earlier stages of fieldwork but researchers subsequently followed respondents into their friendship circles and were not bound by quota criteria in developing their respondent network. The researchers were supported by two training sessions prior to fieldwork and used mobile phones and internet cafés to maintain contact whilst in the field. Each researcher compiled a diary of observations and invited key respondents to assist the research by making their own diaries (audio or written). All textual materials were transcribed and analysed by the ethnographers independently in order to allow the cultural practices of the groups they worked with to be presented with maximum validity.

### **Structural forces: markets, locality and social inequality**

Public discourse in the Russian Federation emphasises the supply led nature of the country's drugs problems. Media, government and academic sources concur that, prior to 1991, Russia was characterised by low levels of illicit drug use supplied from domestically grown poppy straw and cannabis but that by the end of the 1990s, the country had become an important transit route for drugs from Central Asia and Afghanistan to Western Europe and Japan (Paoli, 2002, p.22; Bykov 2000, p.51). By 2001, drug seizure figures indicated that 96.5% of the heroin, 60% of the opium, and 53% of the marijuana had come from, or through, the Central Asian states (The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2003, 14). This increase in the volume of trafficked drugs is viewed as the primary cause of structural change in the domestic Russian drug market as an increasing proportion is absorbed locally. By October 2005, the Russian

Federal Service for the Control of the Drugs Trade claimed that an ‘epidemic of drug addiction’ had spread to around 4% of the total population (Itar Tass, 2005) and declared young people to be particularly at risk. This claim is supported by data from the Ministry of Health which show a seventeen-fold rise in the number of ‘teenage drug addicts’ between 1991 and 2001 (Koshkina, 2003, p.126) while the UNODC has estimated that over two-thirds of ‘drug addicts’ are under 30 years of age (The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2003, p.22).

Empirical research confirms the importance of supply in shaping young people’s drug use. The virtual invisibility of Ecstasy and cocaine revealed by the survey element of the research (see Figure 1) reflects the relative availability and affordability of different drugs in Russian provincial cities where cocaine, for example, has an average street price at least four times that of heroin (The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2003, p.19).<sup>2</sup>

[Insert Figure 1]

Young people’s access to more commonly used drugs - cannabis and heroin - is more regionally and seasonally dependent (see Table 1). Following the logic of the argument that drug use in Russia is supply-led, prevalence of cannabis and opiate use would be expected to be highest in Samara region (through which the busiest drug trafficking

---

<sup>2</sup> The average street price for 1g of cocaine in 2001 is reported as \$120-150 compared to \$30-35 per gram of heroin (The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2003, p.19; Paoli 2002, p.24). However, in the remoter cities in which research was conducted for this project the differentials are even higher; the street price of cocaine in Vorkuta was \$150-200, compared to just under \$7 for a single dose of heroin.

routes pass) and Krasnodar Territory (where cannabis and opium poppy grow wild and ports on the Black Sea are exploited for the transshipment of drugs). The empirical research drawn on in this article, however, revealed the highest regional rate of life-time reported drug use among young people (29%) to be in the region (Komi Republic) most isolated from known sources of drug supply (see Table 2).

[Insert Table 2 Life-time reported drug use by region and city]

The remoteness of Komi Republic - and in particular the fieldwork site of Vorkuta, which is located within the Arctic Circle and inaccessible by road - means that drugs are more difficult to access, and more expensive, than in other parts of Russia. Nonetheless, of the nine fieldwork sites, the cities recording the highest rates of life-time reported use of any drug were both in Komi Republic (see Table 2).

***Equally excluded: explaining drug use prevalence on Russia's periphery***

This finding provides a clear challenge to the understanding of drug use trends in Russia as wholly supply-led and any attempt to understand the situation in Komi Republic suggests the need for two important qualifications of the role of drugs markets in determining drug use prevalence among Russian youth.

The first is that young people are active shapers, rather than passive 'victims', of drugs markets. This is particularly evident in Komi Republic because, in contrast to respondents in the other regions of study who reported both cannabis and heroin to be easily

obtainable ‘on the street, in the yard, through friends or acquaintances’ (Tol’iatti, male, 18 years, ‘regular user’<sup>3</sup>), they had to develop strategies to overcome their structurally disadvantaged position in the drugs market. Thus, in the relative absence of major organised drug dealers, low-level, spontaneous drug trafficking emerges often on the basis of traditional street gangs (Vorkuta, female, 17 years, ‘experimenter’). This is illustrated by the following respondent’s description of a job he was asked to do for the gang:

Respondent: ‘Well, I was asked to carry cannabis to Vorkuta. And I did. I did it for the money really. I carried it via Moscow - a little packet of it. I needed the money, otherwise I wouldn’t have just done it.’

Interviewer: ‘So you transported it from Briansk?’

Respondent: ‘Yes, from Briansk. The most frightening thing was that I was travelling on my own. From Moscow I was on my own, without my parents or anyone. I had the cannabis in my bag. I had a sizeable [packet]...’

(Vorkuta, male, 17 years, ‘abstainer’)

Young people also shape the market by actively adapting their substance use to the conditions of relatively short supply of expensive drugs. The comparative data show, for example, that young people in Komi make later drugs debuts compensating for this via higher alcohol (especially vodka) use (Pilkington, 2004, pp.45, 50) and that drugs debuts

---

<sup>3</sup> Respondents in the research are referred to by age, gender, place of residence and drug-using status. Drug-using status is determined by responses to a question during the semi-structured interview when respondents were invited to choose one of 14 descriptions presented to them on a card to describe their own drug experience. These responses were used to classify respondents into four broad categories: ‘abstainers’ (*otkazniki*); ‘experimenters’ (*razoviki*); ‘regular users’ (*regulatory*); and ‘future users’ (*budushchie*).

are strongly correlated with young people's temporary access to more hospitable drugs markets during their summer trips to the South of Russia (see below).

The second qualification relates to the importance of deindustrialisation and social exclusion alongside drugs market as indicators of propensity to drug use. During the Soviet period the development of geographically remote parts of the country like Komi Republic was made possible by the planned economic system. The introduction of the market in post-Soviet Russia, however, led to the collapse of mono-industrial development and this, combined with the harsh climate, and remoteness from the economic 'core', has left such populations stranded. This is quite literally the case in Vorkuta where the rapid closure of the mines upon which economic activity in the city is based has turned many of the outlying mining settlements (*poselki*) into semi-ghost towns as residents leave in large numbers amidst speculation that the city has no more than another 50 years of economic sustainability.

The connection between deindustrialisation and drug use is well-established; in the UK, studies of new heroin outbreaks have pointed to high unemployment (Pearson, 1987, p.74), social deprivation, poor educational experiences (Parker, Bakx & Newcombe, 1988, p.22) and high levels of social exclusion (MacDonald & Marsh, 2002) as key factors, alongside local drugs markets, in explaining why, in some localities, young people 'cross the rubicon' from recreational to addictive drug use. In Vorkuta, the painful nature of massive deindustrialisation and depopulation is tangible and vividly reflected in

young people's cultural practices. As people leave the city, their abandoned flats, cellars and garages are turned by young people into spaces for their own leisure. These spaces compensate for the complete lack of cultural infrastructure especially in the outlying mining settlements and provide warm, secluded spaces for cultural practices including the use of illicit substances. While in and of itself poor cultural infrastructure is not unique to Vorkuta – respondents in all the fieldwork sites complained about constraints on leisure activities – its residents articulate a real sense of isolation and abandonment:

Interviewer: 'Okay. But what about restaurants or cafes – are there any round here?'

Respondent: 'No [embarrassed] – our settlement is small. There used to be one, but not any more.'

Interviewer: 'When was that?'

Respondent: 'About five years ago probably it closed. There was a bar there.'

(Vorkuta, female, 16 years, 'experimenter')

However, the exceptionally deep pocket of social exclusion in Vorkuta cannot account for the higher drug use reported in Komi Republic as a whole; a similarly high rate of use is reported in a second fieldwork site in the region – Ukhta. The city of Ukhta, although on the same railway route north of the Republic's capital (Syktyvkaar) as Vorkuta, has prospered in post-Soviet times due to the development of oil and gas extraction and refinement industries in and around the city. The very different economic fortunes of Ukhta and Vorkuta, alongside their shared high levels of drug use, thus

suggest that definitions of ‘social exclusion’ need to be sensitive not only to economic opportunities but also to cultural factors.

### **Drug use in context: Youth cultural identities in Russia’s ‘badlands’**

In this final section of the article, interview and ethnographic data from Komi Republic are examined in an attempt to take some first steps towards explaining how the experience of marginality is reflected in, and reproduced, by young people’s cultural practices including drug use. In order to give a sense of how drug practices sit within ‘real lives’, particular attention is given to the story of one respondent ‘Nadia’ (pseudonym) who participated in all three (survey, interview and ethnographic) stages of the research. This is primarily for illustrative purposes; the arguments advanced are based on the analysis of interview and ethnographic data for Komi Republic as a whole and will be tested in the course of fieldwork planned in the region in 2006-07.

### ***Going South: Confronting youth cultural isolation***

A long-established parental response to the geographic isolation and hostile climate of Komi Republic has been to send children to holiday camps in the South of Russia in the school summer vacation period. Even though previously subsidised youth camp places have largely disappeared, many young people continue to travel in the summer to stay with friends and relatives in more climatically hospitable areas of the country. While these practices provide important respite from Arctic living conditions, travelling to the ‘outside’ world can expose young people’s isolation in a way that makes them feel deeply uncomfortable. Indicative here is the story of ‘Nadia’, a 17 year-old school student from

Vorkuta. When she was interviewed initially she was an ‘absolute abstainer’ who had no illicit substance experience, declared a dislike for alcohol and had never tried anything stronger than wine. A year later, her life had been transformed. She had ended all contact with her old group of friends, started hanging out with a completely new crowd and progressed through experimentation with alcohol, cannabis and *vint*<sup>4</sup> in quick succession. The key moment in this transition was the intervening summer holidays, which she had spent in Briansk (approx. 350km South-west of Moscow). During that long summer vacation she had made friends with a group of young people who used alcohol heavily but had felt isolated and inadequate in their company. This is how Nadia explains that experience:

‘There [in Briansk] I met some young people who didn’t particularly care about avoiding them [drugs]. At first I was very much the odd one out. Because, for example when they went round to visit someone or something, they had beer, and wine and vodka. Once they even went as far as *samogon*.<sup>5</sup> But I wasn’t drinking any of it. I just sat there. They were all drunk, all having fun. They all felt great. And I was sitting there on my own, scared and intimidated.’

(‘Nadia’, Vorkuta, female, 17 years, ‘regular user’)

---

<sup>4</sup> *Vint* is a methamphetamine solution that became popular on the Russian youth cultural scene in the 1980s. Its active precursor, ephedrine is extracted from the ephedra shrub and is part of many over-the-counter and prescription medications such as cough syrups. This is either ‘brewed’ at home or sold in ampules or ‘ready to go’ syringes for intravenous use.

<sup>5</sup> *Samogon* is the generic Russian term for all forms of illicitly (home) distilled alcohol.

Nadia articulates her youth cultural isolation through her association of a physical, spatial separation with a position of inferiority - 'I was sitting there on my own... intimidated' – and in order to re-connect herself, to feel part of things, she began to drink. Furnished with her newly acquired youth cultural skills when Nadia returned to Vorkuta she did not go back into her former friendship group - in which drug abstention was the norm - but actively sought to meet 'new people' by going to discos on her own. The new friends she found in this way were users of both alcohol and illicit drugs and with them Nadia made her drugs debut, first with cannabis and then with *vint*.

Nadia's narrative illustrates the way in which structural and cultural factors are entwined in shaping alcohol and drug use trajectories. The territorial isolation of Vorkuta means drugs are expensive and delays young people's drug debuts. Thus, when young people are sent away for the summer vacation – itself a cultural response by Vorkuta parents to compensate for their children's difficult living environment - they are relatively ill-equipped to manage the youth cultural environments they encounter. As in Nadia's case, this can mean those trips are experienced as a painful exposure of their marginalisation resulting in a 'catch up' youth cultural strategy when they return. This strategy works for Nadia to the extent that by redefining her 'risk reputation' (Green, Mitchell & Bunton, 2000, p.113) she is able to reposition herself within the youth scene in Vorkuta in a way that makes her feel more 'connected' to the wider youth cultural body. At the same time, however, this strategy – a late drugs debut followed by rapid progression to intravenous drug use - potentially reproduces the social marginalisation it originally sought to overcome.

*‘Walking the walk’: symbolic displays of marginality*

A striking characteristic of Nadia’s story is the way in which she narrates it without any recourse to neutralisation techniques. While she might easily have explained her changed situation as a result of having been ‘influenced’ by a ‘bad crowd’ while on holiday, in fact she recounted her alcohol and drugs debuts as a conscious desire to experiment and showed no compulsion to explain or justify her drugs choices. This reflects a feature of the youth cultural scene in Vorkuta, and Komi Republic more widely, which, relative to the other regions of study, is distinguished by heightened tolerance towards drug use and other ‘deviant practices’ (see Table 3) and a high level of exposure to drug offers (see Figure 2 below). Research in the region is ongoing and it is too early to make firm conclusions about whether these findings reflect a greater propensity to, and tolerance of, alcohol and drug use among young people or simply a lesser degree of inhibition about talking about such practices. For the purposes of the argument here, however, it suffices to note that, either way, both quantitative and qualitative data indicate that young people in Komi Republic show a strong desensitization to practices usually censured.

[Insert Table 3 How would you react if one of your friends began to...?]

Current interview and ethnographic data do suggest, however, that young people’s uninhibited talk about drug use should be understood within a wider set of individual and collective cultural practices that negotiate their structural location -

quite literally - on the margins of 'acceptable' society. Such practices include the symbolic deployment of the region's 'deviant heritage':

Interviewer 1: Are people from Vorkuta distinguishable in any way?

Respondent: Yes, of course. You can always tell someone from Vorkuta wherever you are.

Interviewer 1: Seriously?

Respondent: By their jacket, by the way they look at you, by their clothes.

Interviewer 2: What is it about their clothes that distinguish them?

Respondent: Almost the whole of Vorkuta wears 'gangster jackets' (*banditki*) in the winter.

Interviewer 1: What are *banditki*?

Respondent: those kinds of leather jackets, like 'Vova's' [pseudonym]. And they walk with their shoulders swinging...

(Vorkuta, male, 16 years, 'regular user')

The 'gangster' image being celebrated in this description of local youth culture cannot be seen outside of the cultural context of the historical development of the urban centres of Komi Republic. All three fieldwork sites in Komi owe their existence to the geological expeditions beginning in 1929 that sought to locate and exploit oil and coal deposits in Komi. The very first expedition used prisoners from the Solovetsky camp system (specialists imprisoned as 'wreckers') but once a base camp had been established at Ukhta, it was used to set up new camps across the region, among them one at Vorkuta

established (in 1932) to exploit a major coal deposit. By 1951, 70,000 prisoners resided in the Vorkuta camp whose social infrastructure by this time included specialist educational institutes, theatres, swimming pools and nurseries (Applebaum 2004, p.94-5). Of course, it is difficult to make substantiated statements about how, or if, this heritage impacts directly on young people's cultural practices and dispositions today. Not only were the original camp populations diverse – including professional criminals, political prisoners, dispossessed kulaks, those deemed to be Nazi-collaborators and ordinary people convicted of petty theft or poor labour discipline – but over time the city's population was supplemented by friends and relatives who followed prisoners to their place of exile and, later, by young specialists attracted to the region by the high salaries offered in the extraction industries. Like many of the prisoners released from the camps following the death of Stalin, these young workers and professionals subsequently found it difficult to leave a city that had somehow become 'home'. What is suggested here then is simply that as young people in the region live out the real life stories of post-Soviet deindustrialisation in splendid isolation, the marginal, deviant heritage of the region may be one of the few cultural resources that can be drawn upon to form workable, local youth cultural identities. Just as 'the look in their eyes' (Applebaum 2004, p.4) marked out Gulag inhabitants for each other years after release, so today the 'gangster jacket' and swaggering walk of the region's youth are symbolic displays of a shared understanding of what it means to live on the margins.

***Reproducing social relations: beyond 'peer pressure'***

Young people's 'deviant' inheritance is not only symbolically displayed, it is also reproduced through specific social formations. The most striking of these are gang structures (*gruppировки*) whose practices range from traditional ('yard against yard') fighting between gangs of lads often at, or after, local discos (Pechora, female, 16-17 years, 'abstainer') to minor extortion:

Respondent: '...A lot of people do it, it's simple, you go up to some little one and say "Do you want a hassle-free life? Then give us 500 roubles and everything will be fine.

Interviewer: Protection?

Respondent: Yes. He's little – of course he wants it. A day is fixed and the little one brings the money. Then you tell him, if he wants to be rid of you, he has to bring the same amount again. This is the most widespread method.'

(Vorkuta, male, 17 years, 'abstainer')

This kind of gang structure is not unique to Komi Republic, but in the other regions of this study respondents' narratives suggested it was disintegrating as cultural infrastructure and consumer lifestyles developed. The continued significance of gangs in the field sites in Komi, it is suggested here therefore, is indicative of the continued scarcity of resources and the need for collective strategies for maximizing those resources and controlling their distribution.

However, even in Komi, the usual site of such collective negotiation of structural location is the less hierarchical, although often still territorially based, friendship group ('*kompaniia*'). Young people's access to drugs, for example, comes first and foremost via their *kompaniia* and results in high levels of offers of drugs 'for free' rather than 'to buy' (see Figure 2).

[Insert Figure 2 Drugs offers by region and gender]

Contrary to dominant discourses of supply led drug use, however, what underpins these 'free offers' is not a commercially-driven desire to 'get people hooked' but a cultural practice known as 'treating' (*ugoshchenie*).<sup>6</sup> Whilst this practice was reported also in the other regions of study, it is particularly widely practiced in Komi. This, it is suggested here, is because of the constrained access to drugs combined with the relatively stronger presence of gang structures in the region. In such a context the practice of *ugoshchenie* makes drugs (particularly cannabis) a shared commodity (Vorkuta, female, 14 years, 'experimenter') thereby allowing those young people without the necessary financial means to participate nonetheless in collective drug using practices. At the same time it asserts youth cultural – collective - control over drug use. A particularly striking example of this relates to the restriction of girls' access to drugs to occasions when they are 'treated' by preventing their inclusion in drug-purchasing practices (see Figure 2).<sup>7</sup> At the

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ugoshchenie* is a norm of hospitality in Russian culture and is particularly established in relation to paying for drinks, ice-creams and other 'treats' for women by men.

<sup>7</sup> Of course this does not prevent young women carving out spaces for their own drug use either within a 'safe space' created by the presence of a boyfriend within the friendship group or in a separate - 'close girlfriend' – space.

same time being 'drugs-wise' is an important marker of secure masculinity as illustrated by the following respondent:

'Generally people don't start doing drugs of their own volition... Imagine a group of friends get together, right? Five to seven people, of my age, maybe more. Maybe somebody who is 21 turns up. He goes – come on lads let's shoot up, it won't cost anything, or you're a 'div' (*lokh*), something like that, something insulting. For many this undermines their sense of self. They go like – hey, I'm no 'div' ...'

(Vorkuta, male, 17 years, 'abstainer')

'Treating' with drugs thus provides a resolution to the general condition of scarcity whilst reproducing within the youth cultural group the dominant power relations of wider society.

Studying drug use in its natural cultural context reveals that young people are far from despairing individuals negotiating post-socialism unsupported by emotional bonds and social networks. Their friendship groups mediate between the macro youth cultural environment - saturated both materially and symbolically with drugs - and individual drugs choices. In so doing that friendship group often acts as the point of encounter with, and offers of, drugs. In this sense it embodies and reproduces the inequalities of young people's structural locations and transmits the pressures and constraints of the drugs market. At the same time, it is important not to make any prior assumption that strong collective practices in relation to drug use necessarily constitute 'peer pressure' to engage

in drug use. Interview and ethnographic data in Komi Republic and elsewhere reveal numerous instances of the peer group acting as a constraining influence in drug use decisions. The friendship group is thus better understood as providing a set of reference points underpinned by bonds of emotionality and mutual accountability about acceptable and unacceptable drug use and a secure and supportive environment in which to enact the ensuing drug decisions.<sup>8</sup>

### **Conclusion**

How can research into drug use among young people in provincial Russia inform the cross-disciplinary study of young people's drug use more generally? It has been suggested here that a sociological approach can inform epidemiological studies by providing a fuller picture of an increasingly diverse range of drug using attitudes and practices. It is particularly important to bring such a perspective to the study of drug-use in Russia where debate has been dominated by public discourse, which emphasises the supply-led nature of the country's drug problems, and international research that has focused on the relationship between intravenous drug use and the transmission of HIV.

Given this academic context, the primary thrust of the empirical research upon which this article draws was to reveal, and understand the meanings of, the increasingly wide range of drug using practices among young Russians. In seeking to understand and explain these cultural practices, however, it is essential to recognise the continued importance of structural factors in young people's drug use. The 'softening' of borders following the

---

<sup>8</sup> The role of the friendship group in drug decisions among young people across all three regions of study is discussed in greater length in Pilkington 2006b.

collapse of the USSR in 1991 allowed widespread access to drugs for the first time, including the extensive distribution of cheap heroin from the Central Asian region, and these new drugs markets are a crucial explanatory factor in regionally differentiated drug use trends in Russia. Economic transition, moreover, has created serious pockets of deindustrialisation and impoverishment and the experience of Russian cities where levels of such social marginality are ‘the norm’ among young people – such as the case of Vorkuta described in this article - confirms evidence from the UK that young people’s drug careers can move quickly from occasional recreational drug use to addictive, ‘problem’ drug use (MacDonald & Marsh 2002).

Thus, it is less the capacity for ‘thick description’ of qualitative sociology and more the discipline’s central concern with understanding human behaviour in social context that is significant. The value of a sociological approach to young people’s drug use is the theoretical terrain - moulded by the shifting plates of structural and cultural explanations – that it occupies. Indeed, following the wider trend in social theory to see structure and agency not as layered but as entwined, so too the sociological study of young people’s drug use has become increasingly conscious of the way in which individual and group responses to their environments are themselves an important facet of that social context. In similar vein, the intention of this article has been not to evaluate the relative importance of structural and cultural factors in a particular local context but to show how by understanding ‘culture’ (or rather cultural practice) in its territorially and structurally rooted form, the interwoven nature of these factors is revealed. This process has been illustrated using original empirical data that shows how young people’s drug using

practices are located in, and shaped by, the micro cultural context of the peer (friendship) group which simultaneously embodies and reproduces, but may also resist, young people's structural locations.

Thus, as sociological debate moves beyond an understanding of the relationship between 'youth culture' and drug use as the exertion of 'peer pressure', it is vital that the routinization ('normalisation') of drug choices among young people is recognized but not at the cost of obscuring the importance of the local and socio-economic context of drug use. In seeking to square this circle, however, we need to go beyond the notion of 'differentiated normalisation' which simply qualifies the concept of the 'normalisation' of recreational drug use on the basis that individual choice is subject to structural constraint. This is because it is not only the extension of the notion of 'normalisation' across the whole youth population that is problematic, but the very understanding of 'youth culture' as the sum of individual consumer preferences that it employs. Instead, it has been proposed here, we should understand 'youth culture' as a set of practices – including drug use and abstention practices - that individuals and groups enact, not only as responses to, but as strategies for negotiating and shaping, their structural contexts.

### **Acknowledgements**

This research was financially supported by the ESRC (Ref. R000239439) under the Research Grants Scheme. The project was a collaborative one between the University of Birmingham, UK and Ul'ianovsk State University, Russian Federation. It was designed and led on the UK side by Hilary Pilkington and, on the Russian side, by Elena

Omel'chenko. This article was written by Hilary Pilkington but is based on research conducted by the whole team which consisted of: Hilary Pilkington, Elena Omel'chenko, Erica Richardson, Natal'ia Goncharova, Evgeniia Luk'ianova, Ol'ga Dobroshtan, Irina Kosterina and El'vira Sharifullina. The team was assisted in the regions of fieldwork by Svetlana Iaroshenko, Oleg Oberemko, Dmitrii Nechaevskii, Aleksandr Shekhtman and Svetlana Teslia. The author would like to thank also two anonymous reviewers for their comments on the first draft of this article.

### **References**

- Applebaum, A. (2004). *GULAG: A history of the Soviet camps*. London: Penguin.
- Aref'ev, A. (2002). Pokolenie, kotoroe teriaet Rossiia. *Demoskop Weekly*, 91-92, 2-15 accessed on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2004 at <http://demoscope.ru/weekly/2002/091/tema01.php>.
- Bennett, A. (1999). Subcultures or neo-tribes? Rethinking the relationship between youth, style and musical taste. *Sociology*, 33(3), 599-617.
- Blackman, S. (2004). *Chilling Out: The cultural politics of substance consumption, youth and drug policy*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Bykov, S. (2000). Narkomaniia sredi molodezhi kak pokazatel' dezaptirovannosti. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia*, 4, 48-52.
- Dean, M. (1999). Risk, calculable and incalculable. In D. Lupton (Ed.) *Risk and Sociocultural theory: new directions and perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Duff, C. (2003). Dugs and youth cultures: Is Australia experiencing the "normalization" of adolescent drug use. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 6(4), 433-46.
- Gabiani, A.A. (1990) Na kraiu propasti: narkomaniia i narkomany, Moskva: Mysl'.

- Gossop, M. (2000). *Living with drugs* (5th Edition). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Green, E., Mitchell, W., & Bunton, R. (2000). Contextualizing risk and danger: An analysis of young people's perceptions of risk. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 3(2), 109-26.
- Grassly, N., Lowndes, C., Rhodes, T., Judd, A., Renton, A., & Garnett, G. (2003). Modelling emerging HIV epidemics: the role of injecting drug use and sexual transmission in the Russian Federation, China and India. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 14, 25-43.
- Itar Tass (2005). Viktor Cherkosov: v Rossii – epidemiia narkomanii. Accessed on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2005 at <http://www.tass.ru/prnt.html?NewsID=2572525>).
- Johnston, L., MacDonald, R., Mason, P., Ridley, L. & Webster, C. (2000). *Snakes and ladders: Young people, transitions and social exclusion*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Kelly, P. (2003). Growing up as risky business? Risks, surveillance and the institutionalized mistrust of youth. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 6(2), 165-80.
- Koshkina, E. (2003). Trends in the prevalence of psychoactive substance use in the Russian Federation. *Bulletin on narcotics*, 55(1- 2), 121-30.
- Kramer, J. (2003). Drug abuse in Russia: Emerging pandemic or overhyped diversion? *Problems of Post-Communism*, 50(6), 12-27.
- MacDonald, R., & Marsh, J. (2002). Crossing the rubicon: youth transitions, poverty, drugs and social exclusion. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 13, 27- 38.
- Malikova, N. (2000). Tipologiya otnoshenii studentov k narkomanii. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia*, 7, 50-7.
- McKee, M. (2002). Substance use and social and economic transition: the need for evidence. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 13, 453- 459.

- Measham, F., Aldridge, J., & Parker, H. (2001). *Dancing on drugs. Risk, health and hedonism in the British club scene*. London & New York: Free Association Books.
- Measham, F., Newcombe, R., & Parker, H. (1994). The normalization of recreational drug use amongst young people in North-West England. *British Journal of Sociology*, 45(2), 287-312.
- Miles, S. (2000). *Youth lifestyles in a changing world*. Buckingham & Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- O'Malley, P., & Valverde, M. (2004). Pleasure, freedom and drugs. *Sociology*, 38(1) 25-42.
- Omel'chenko, E. (Ed.) (1999). *Podrostki i narkotiki*. Ul'ianovsk: Ul'ianovsk State University Press.
- Omel'chenko, E. (Ed.) (2000). *Gero-in nashego vremeni*. Ul'ianovsk: Ul'ianovsk State University Press.
- Omel'chenko, E. (2005). Predislovie: "Put' dlinnoiii v 10 let: Osobennosti issledovatel'skogo podkhoda k ponimaniuu protsessov molodezhnoi narkotizatsii. In N. Goncharova, O.Dobroshtan, E.Luk'ianova, I. Kosterina, E.Omel'chenko, H. Pilkington & E.Sharifullina (Eds.) Normal'naia molodezh': Pivo, tusovka, narkotiki. Ul'ianovsk: Ul'ianovsk State University Press.
- Paoli, L. (2002). The development of an illegal market. Drug consumption and trade in post-Soviet Russia. *British Journal of Criminology*, 42, 21-39.
- Parker, H., Aldridge, J., & Measham, F. (1998). *Illegal leisure. The normalization of adolescent recreational drug use*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Parker, H., Bakx, K., & Newcombe, R. (1988). *Living with heroin: The impact of a drugs 'epidemic' on an English community*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Pearson, G. (1987). *The new heroin users*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Pilkington, H. (1994). *Russia's youth and its culture: A nation's constructors and constructed*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Pilkington, H. (1996). Farewell to the *tusovka*: Masculinities and femininities on the Moscow youth scene. In H. Pilkington (Ed.) *Gender, Generation and Identity in Contemporary Russia*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Pilkington, H. (2004). "Everyday" but not "normal": Drug use and youth cultural practice in Russia. Final Report, available online at:  
[www.crees.bham.ac.uk/research/everyday/FReport.pdf](http://www.crees.bham.ac.uk/research/everyday/FReport.pdf).
- Pilkington, H. (2006a). "For us it is normal": Exploring the "recreational" use of heroin in Russian youth cultural practice. *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 22(1), 24-53.
- Pilkington, H. (2006b). In good company: Risk, security and choice in young people's drug decisions, submitted to *The Sociological Review*, (under review).
- Pilkington, H., Omel'chenko, E., Flynn, M., Bliudina, U., & Starkova, E. (2002). *Looking West? Cultural Globalization and Russian Youth Cultures*. University Park Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Platt, L., Hickman, M., Rhodes, T., Mikhailova, L., Karavashkin, V., Vlasov, A., Tilling, K., Hope, V., Khutorksoy, M., & Renton, A. (2004). The prevalence of injecting drug use in a Russian city: Implications for harm reduction and coverage. *Addiction*, 99, 1430–8.

- Power, R., Khalfin, R., Nozhkina, N., & Kanarsky, I. (2004). An evaluation of harm reduction interventions targeting injecting drug users in Sverdlovsk Oblast, Russia. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 15, 305–310.
- Ranard, J. (2002). A little less shock and more therapy. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 13, 355-67.
- Rhodes, T., Sarang, A., Bobrik, A., Bobkov, E., & Platt, L. (2004). HIV transmission and HIV prevention associated with injecting drug use in the Russian Federation. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 15, 1–16.
- Shildrick, T. (2002). Young people, illicit drug use and the question of normalization. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 5(1), 35-48.
- Shiner, M., & Newburn, T. (1997). Definitely, maybe not? The normalisation of recreational drug use amongst young people, *Sociology*, 31(3), 511-29.
- Stozharova, A. (2003). *Narkomaniia i region*. Nadym: Izd-voCharoid.
- Taylor, D. (2000). The word on the street: Advertising, youth culture and legitimate speech in drug education. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 3(3), 333-352.
- The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2003). *Country Profile: The Russian Federation*. Moscow: UNODC Regional Office.
- Veeken, H. (1998). Russia: sex, drugs, and AIDS and MSF. *BMJ*, 316, 138-9.
- Zhuravleva, L. (2000). Faktory i usloviia narkotizatsii molodezhi. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia*, 6, 43-8.