Published in final edited form as:

Subst Use Misuse. 2008 ; 43(7): 895–918. doi:10.1080/10826080701801477.

Civic Norms and Etiquettes Regarding Marijuana Use in Public Settings in New York City

Bruce D. Johnson¹, Geoffrey L. Ream^{1,2}, Eloise Dunlap¹, and Stephen J. Sifaneck¹

¹National Development and Research Institutes, Inc., Garden City New York

²Adelphi University, Garden City New York

Abstract

This paper shows that active police enforcement of civic norms against marijuana smoking in public settings has influenced the locations where marijuana is smoked. It has subtly influenced the various marijuana etiquettes observed in both public and private settings. The ethnographic data reveals the importance of informal sanctions; most marijuana consumers report compliance with etiquettes mainly to avoid stigma from nonusing family, friends, and associates—they express limited concern about police and arrest.

Keywords

Marijuana; cannabis; civic norms; marijuana etiquettes; private vs. public settings; police; law enforcement; qualitative; quantitative; New York City

Introduction

This paper examines how policies and enforcement by New York City police and government leaders have help shape the social norms followed by marijuana users. The special focus of this paper is upon those policies intended to socially control marijuana use and sales in *public* locations—that is in the streets, parks and quasi-public settings such as bars, restaurants, and stores. Since the use of small amounts of marijuana and sales in private settings is not criminal in New York City/State since 1976, the primary focus of marijuana policy makers and enforcement activities has always been directed towards those using/selling in public locations.

This particular study is organized around regulations and enforcement associated with two central *civic norms*: 1) Users should not smoke marijuana in public settings (streets, parks) or in quasi-public settings such as stores, bars, restaurants, offices, etc. 2) Persons should not sell marijuana in such public or quasi-public settings. The main focus is upon how these civic norms have been defined and enforced in New York City, and then attempt to assess the responses of over 500 active marijuana users and among 97 ethnographic subjects recruited in New York City.

Policy, laws, regulations, civic norms, public (dis)order, and enforcement

The implementation of quality-of-life policing and targeting of street drug sellers in New York City since 1996 has substantially transformed the public visibility of marijuana use and sales

(Johnson et al 2006b). The New York Police Department (NYPD) has engaged in several strategies and tactics that have emphasized the civic norms of: *not using or selling marijuana in public settings*. Many other factors may partially explain the shifts in marijuana use and selling described above (e.g. decreased crack trade, improved economy, gentrification of low-income communities, etc.); these initiatives were often other government policies designed to improve the economy and quality-of-life in NYC (Johnson, Golub, Dunlap 2006; Blumstein and Wallman 2006). The direct role of enforcement appears important for changing the behaviors of marijuana users and sellers in public settings. Arresting large number of persons for marijuana smoking in public settings as well as many marijuana sellers may have substantially influenced many subculture participants to change the public visibility of their marijuana consumption practices.

In related research, Reinerman and Cohen (2004; Reinerman, Cohen, Kaal 2004) documented that experienced cannabis users followed a variety of informal rules regarding where and with whom to use cannabis in San Francisco and Amsterdam. They documented that Amsterdam consumers were less likely to use in public settings (other than the “coffeeshops” where cannabis can be purchased) than the cannabis users in San Francisco (also see Sifaneck and Kaplan 1995).

This paper also functions as a case study for understanding the role of policy making, laws, regulations, enforcement and sanctioning practices to combat perceived public disorder, the maintenance of civic order, and influencing conduct norms that define marijuana related behaviors—as defined below. In doing so, this paper also adopts a conflict perspective: anti-marijuana government regulations and enforcement practices are often effectively countered by well established marijuana subcultures that support millions of Americans to use, purchase, and sell marijuana on a regular basis; this conflict is especially intensive in public and quasi-public settings. This often means that the will of the majority who agree with and legitimize the civic norms, must be enforced upon a sizable minority of persons who disagree or believe that they should have latitude to violate that civic norm, without serious consequences or sanctions, especially from police and courts.

Implicit in the notion of good government, is an ideal notion of *civic order*, although this can never be well defined (Almond and Verba 1989; Durkheim and Hill 1999, Knack 2000). The fundamental building block of civic order may be called civic norms. *Civic norms* are those expectations of behavior primarily occurring in *public* settings (Hechter and Opp 2001). Civic norms usually consist of prohibitions against engaging in behaviors that are often legal or tolerated when conducted in private settings. The governmental assumption is that a vast majority of citizens agree with the morality and the commercial interests implicit in a given civic norm and comply with them when in public places. Civic norms are weakly held, however, in that the vast majority of citizens complying are not particularly interested in detecting, reporting, or assuring that sanctions be imposed upon violators of such civic norms. Many New Yorkers and citizens of other counties would not report to police that a group of youths is smoking marijuana at a street corner, or that someone approached them to buy loose joints. Indeed, the response of ordinary passersby who observe a violation of civic norms is to ignore the violator, and to not even verbally sanction them.

Deterrence, conduct norms, and marijuana etiquette

By arresting and sanctioning persons, police also intend to send a strong deterrent message. The police are clear, however, about the limits of deterrence. They do not expect the vast majority of marijuana arrestees to completely cease marijuana use or sales activities. Rather, the deterrent aspects of enforcement are designed to influence and shape the conduct norms and etiquette followed by marijuana subculture members in public settings. *Conduct norms* (often called informal rules) are expectations that govern every realm of behavior in specific

settings. Such conduct norms are generated and maintained within groups, learned by members, producing similarity of behaviors among members in the group. The marijuana subculture has numerous conduct norms described elsewhere: *learn to smoke and enjoy the high from marijuana* (Becker 1964; Johnson 1973); *learn to and effectively roll a joint or blunt, contribute money toward the purchase of marijuana, share it in a group setting, with each person using about the same amount (puff-puff-pass), talk in marijuana argot* (Johnson et al 2006a; Johnson, Golub, Dunlap 2006; Dunlap et al 2005, 2006a). These conduct norms primarily govern behaviors among members while in groups of marijuana smokers; these pro-use norms generally assume that nonusers or other outsiders will not be present.

A special subclass of conduct norms, however, may be labeled as *etiquette*. As used here, *etiquette* refers to expectations of behaviors that consider the possible (and projected) response of outsiders, especially those not involved in the behavior or group. Of course, the term *etiquette* is conventionally understood to apply to manners and social interactions among persons in polite society and involving behaviors that are not criminal nor illegal. The Dictionary (Merriam-Webster's 1999: 399) defines *etiquette* as "the conduct or procedures required by good breeding or prescribed by authority to be observed in social or official life." The "conduct prescribed by authority" effectively constitutes civic norms as used here, and "social or official life" refers generically to behaviors in public and private life. So the use of "etiquette" is focused primarily upon conduct norms promoted by civic norms, especially those behaviors that are either illegal or unlawful under existing law (criminal or regulatory). The vast majority tend to comply with these marijuana etiquettes when obtaining marijuana. Analysis of data from National Household Survey of Drug Abuse estimated almost 400 million retail marijuana transactions, and that 87% obtain marijuana indoors, from a friend or relative (89%), or for free (58%) (Caulkins and Pacula 2006). While the focus is upon *marijuana etiquettes* here, parallel etiquettes appear to govern other unlawful acts (or violations of civic norms) in public settings—such as nudity, urination/defecation, alcohol consumption, tobacco smoking, littering the environment, and many other perceived problems.

The etiquettes followed by marijuana users often consists of learned and internalized prohibitions described in more detail below. Such marijuana etiquette is influenced by both the general stigma in American society against marijuana use/sales, by legal statutes, and by actual enforcement practices. Moreover, this article argues that marijuana etiquette stands at several crucial crossroads in which public policy is designed to influence personal lives and behaviors. These include: unlawful and criminal behaviors, private and public use or sale of marijuana, workplace employment practices, and stigmatization or not within personal and professional networks.

This marijuana etiquette is effectively represented in an attractive flyer (with a high quality color photos of cannabis plants) issued by a strongly pro-marijuana organization, Cannabis Action Network (2005), that provides "Good Neighbor Guidelines" promoting both marijuana use and etiquettes.

Have fun with cannabis, but in your neighborhood keep a kind, discrete, polite profile. Do not consume your cannabis openly. The fewer people who know you have cannabis around, the smaller your exposure to rip-offs, overeager youths, cops, and mooches. Keep cannabis plants hidden from public view. Avoid actions that would lead to nuisance complaints like ... overly loud music or too many freaky parties.... Do not keep your stash and paraphernalia in plain view of the doors or windows. Take measures to minimize the distinct odors cannabis has when grown, smoked, or just sitting around.

Such guidelines (or etiquettes) encourages marijuana users/sellers to be aware of outsiders and avoid marijuana-related behaviors while they are around, and to imply nonuse if asked. Even

if the outsider would rarely notice, perhaps cast a disapproving glance, say anything, or only modestly sanction the smoker, the etiquette hold that the marijuana user should avoid doing something that might arouse the awareness and possible moral condemnation by an outsider whether unknown or personally known.

This study found evidence (see below) for a “*seclusion etiquette*” associated with using and purchasing marijuana—these behaviors occur almost entirely in private settings, usually indoors, and almost always with other marijuana consumers. While evading prohibitions against marijuana, those following such seclusion etiquettes are routinely complying with *civic norms*. They rarely use marijuana in public or quasi-public settings; so their marijuana use/purchases—while unlawful (see below) are effectively invisible to police, other government agents, and even to most persons in their work and personal networks.

By contrast, probably a substantial proportion of marijuana users/sellers make choices to consume and/or distribute marijuana in public settings (streets, parks, open fields) and quasi-public locations (stores, malls, schools, colleges, businesses, etc.)—where police, security officers, and other nonusers may observe and possibly sanction them. The public etiquettes are partially shaped by police enforcement practices designed to enforce the civic norms of no marijuana use in public. But marijuana etiquettes are strongly shaped within family and professional networks as well. It may be noted that conflicts about marijuana use/sale in public settings is only one among hundreds of other issues associated with the ongoing and often contested use of public space (Amster 2004).

The presence of poor and marginalized persons in American society, who are disproportionately from minority backgrounds and low income communities, are frequently labeled by commercial and governmental interests as undesirable in their settings. Regulations are often constructed so as to exclude them (“move on”) from various public settings. Yet those without property, legal jobs, and income, often have no where else to go but into public settings. Thus, marginalized persons frequently find their cultural practices, and most effective means for obtaining income in public settings defined as a violation of some regulation or law—that police enforced to support some civic norm. Although theoretically accessible to and available to all persons, users of the streets and parks of the city are expected to comply with a wide range of laws and regulations which define the *civic norms* that police and other governmental agencies enforce. This is especially the case in a large complex city like New York, where almost every physical space is owned or controlled by some individual, commercial, or governmental interest. In addition, users of public space often have diverse interests across a variety of moral issues (e.g. nudity, dog droppings, tobacco smoking, vendor locations, drug use and sales, etc.)—for which specific regulations are established and enforced by police.

But full compliance with civic norms cannot be assured. Therefore governments often pass laws and regulations, and also provide enforcement powers to designated agents to maintain compliance with civic norms. While the vast majority (Gallup 2005) of Americans agree that prohibitions against marijuana use and sale in public settings constitute appropriate civic norms and further that police powers should be used to enforce them. Yet, a substantial proportion of persons who both use or sell marijuana are likely to disagree that these civic norms should be obeyed. Many marijuana users want to smoke individually or gather together in a public park to smoke. They feel strongly that individuals should have the right to do so, regardless of general disapproval of the population of nonusers. Indeed, since the average nonuser would almost never bother those observed smoking marijuana in a park or street, the enforcement of these civic norms becomes almost the sole responsibility of designated agents, primarily the police.

Marijuana sellers in public locations are considered even more problematic. Since marijuana is illegal and commands a high price for a relatively inexpensively produced commodity. Moreover, public locations are often the only available place for poor minority sellers to conduct business (Sifaneck et al 2006).

Marijuana smoking and sales in public settings of small amounts are among the most minor of misdemeanor crimes in NY State. A companion paper (Johnson et al 2006b; also see Golub and Johnson 2007) more extensively documents the specific legislation and historical changes in police enforcement practices and trends in marijuana arrests over three decades (1975-2005) in NYC. Only with the rise in quality of life policing in the mid-1990s in New York City were large numbers of marijuana smokers being arrested and detained for a day—in order to enforce this (and many other) civic norms. Golub, Johnson, Dunlap (2006, 2007) document a sharp rise in marijuana in public view arrests from about 1000 in 1990 to over 50,000 in 2000. Such arrests have declined to about 30,000 in 2006 but still constitute 10% of all arrests in New York City.

Informal social disapproval—An analytic focus primarily upon public policies and police activities (formal social controls) often ignores the critically important role of the general stigma and societal disapproval of marijuana use/sales. So marijuana users and sellers must constantly be aware of, and take steps to manage their reputations when they would likely be stigmatized by their intimate and occupational networks. Even though use/possession and sales/transfers of marijuana can be easily hidden within private locations in New York, most marijuana users must learn appropriate marijuana etiquettes (elaborated below) to conceal their marijuana use from (most) family, friends, and associates who are nonusers. This also indicates thoughtfulness, a respect not only for legal consequences but for personal boundaries, not often attributed to drug users.

Blunts vs Joints—Cross-cutting the marijuana policies and etiquettes is the mode of marijuana consumption. The authors have elsewhere documented the rise (Johnson, Golub, Dunlap 2006) and extent (Golub 2006; Golub, Johnson, Dunlap 2005ab; Dunlap et al 2005a; Sifaneck, et al 2005) of a new marijuana-consumption mode among American marijuana users. The popularity of Blunts, which are cigar shells split and (mostly) emptied of tobacco and filled with marijuana, now rivals that of joints. The word “joint” has been applied to various different rituals for consuming cannabis products throughout the world. In the USA, *joints* are marijuana wrapped in cigarette paper (without any tobacco). Throughout much of Europe, the word *joint* is applied to marijuana mixed with loose tobacco and rolled in cigarette paper (this is increasingly called a Euro by Americans traveling in Europe). In some East African countries, joints contain marijuana often contain heroin. A major emerging finding from this project is that these use practices of blunts vs. joints constitute distinct subcultures, associated with very different demographics (Ream et al 2006a), as the diversity and division in marijuana use practices within New York City mirrors the diversity and division in the population of New York City.

Blunt users are disproportionately likely to be males, of black/African-American and Latino backgrounds, have high school or less education, and to be unemployed (neither in school nor working). Joints users are, in contrast, disproportionately female, white, educated, and working regularly (Ream et al 2006a). It is probably no coincidence that factors that distinguish joints users from blunts users also distinguish users who have not attracted police attention in the recent past from users who have, even while controlling for frequency of use and similar aspects of public use and use etiquette to those we examine in the present paper (Ream et al. 2007). Perhaps this is an artifact of racial disparities in arrest, i.e., that personal characteristics have long been known to predict likelihood of arrest for drug-related crime even holding the crime itself constant (Golub, Johnson, Dunlap 2006, 2007). However, a more subtle dynamic may

be operating. Among marijuana users in New York City, the more educated and affluent have private settings in which they can smoke with relative impunity, and can reduce their exposure to arrest risk even further by ordering marijuana through delivery services rather than buying it on the street (Sifaneck et al 2005, 2007). This paper addresses the question of whether different use practices are also associated with differential observation of etiquettes.

Research Questions

This study uses quantitative and qualitative data from a large-scale study of marijuana users in New York City. It employs quantitative data to explore the prevalence and distribution across race, gender, and user type (Blunts vs. Joints vs. Mixed) of marijuana use etiquettes, public use situations, and strategies to avoid police attention. With qualitative data, it explores the meaning of and motivations for these etiquettes and strategies. Observance of marijuana etiquette indicates that users employ cost-benefit analyses that are complex, sophisticated, and individual, minimizing the costs of their use not just to themselves but to others around them, considering not only the legal consequences to themselves but are also guided by informal social consequences and respect for others' boundaries and probable disapproval for their use.

Methods

Data for this paper come from an ongoing omnibus longitudinal ethnography, entitled *Marijuana/Blunts: Use, Subcultures and Markets* (Dunlap 2001). Several articles report ethnographic findings about marijuana and blunts in New York City (Dunlap 2001; Dunlap et al 2005a, 2006; Johnson et al 2006ab; Sifaneck et al 2005). The study focuses on a wide variety of patterns in the use, sale and purchase of blunts and other forms of marijuana (e.g., joints, bongs and pipes), as well as on the belief systems and conduct norms particular to these subcultures of users.

Recruitment: Ethnographic Data

Staff ethnographers recruited blunts and marijuana users in and around two New York City neighborhoods: Harlem and the Lower East Side (including the East Village and Chinatown). They contacted persons they knew to be marijuana consumers; many were initially approached while smoking marijuana in public locations. After gaining informed consent, they conducted in-depth, tape-recorded interviews with 97 ethnographic subjects and followed them over a five-year period by regularly re-interviewing them and observing their various places of consumption and purchase (see Dunlap et al (2005a) for more detail). Subjects benefited by sharing their experiences about marijuana use and how they managed the stigma of use. They also received modest compensation for their completion of ethnographic interviews and PGQ.

Recruitment: Peer Group Questionnaire

Project staff also developed a quantitative protocol called the peer group questionnaire (PGQ). This protocol was constructed based upon many insights developed during the ethnographic research and some items from Reinerman and Cohen (2004). The PGQ was developed for completion primarily by persons who were regular users of blunts and/or marijuana smoked as joints/pipes (Ream et al 2006a). The questionnaire was designed to measure why some persons preferred blunts or preferred joints/pipes, as well as to measure many other issues associated with marijuana policy and marijuana use practices that are central to understanding the phenomena of marijuana/blunts use in the 2000s. This project implemented a purposive sample intended to obtain subsamples of subjects that would illuminate the joints vs. blunts distinction. The PGQ was a paper and pencil questionnaire administered to small groups (2-10) of persons in which at least one person was a known current marijuana user. Project staff went into the streets of Manhattan and located young persons who were known to or observed to be

smoking marijuana—what Dunlap et al (2005a) calls cyphers or sessions—or who were self-reported users of marijuana; they were asked to complete this survey questionnaire and given \$10 upon completion. Staff also went to private parties in dorms, apartments, or homes where they recruited groups of persons who were using marijuana. A majority of persons approached in such peer groups agreed to participate and in fact completed the peer group questionnaire in 30 to 45 minutes. Staff made special efforts to recruit peer groups of that reflected the wide diversity among marijuana users, this included low income, African-American users in Harlem area, users who attended a range of high school and/or colleges in the area, those in the workforce and who reflected a wide range of occupations.

Peer Group Questionnaire Methodological Limitations

It is important to note that this questionnaire was intended to provide a better understanding of whether and how persons who primarily prefer blunts differed, if at all, from those who primarily smoked marijuana in joints or pipes (see Ream et al 2006a). One limitation of this survey is that it was not intended to be representative of the population of current marijuana users, so the distributions reported below apply only to those completing the protocol. But the general findings probably provide a good reflection of the thinking and the opinions of current marijuana users.

Measures

User Type: Peer Group Questionnaire—Questions in the beginning ascertained participant's preferred and usual methods of marijuana consumption, which were not always the same. Blunts users (37% of the sample) were those who both usually used and preferred blunts but neither regularly used nor preferred joints. Joints users (22% of the sample) were those who both usually used and preferred joints but neither regularly used nor preferred blunts. Mixed users (31% of the sample) had no clear preference between joints and blunts but they were, incidentally, more likely to say they used paraphernalia such as bongs and bubblers than either joints users or blunts users. The recruitment strategy of the peer group questionnaire inevitably turned up some non-users of marijuana (10% of the sample). These nonusers and eight participants who provided incomplete data about marijuana use preference are not included in later analyses.

User Type: Ethnographic Data—A somewhat different user typology emerged from the ethnographic data. Blunts users (30% of the sample) preferred and used blunts virtually exclusively. Blunts/Joints, or “blunts then joints” users (25%), preferred and used primarily blunts but would also use joints. Joints/Blunts users (35%) preferred and used primarily joints but would also use blunts. Joints/Pipes/Bongs users (10%) generally preferred joints but also used pipes, bongs, and other paraphernalia.

Race: PGQ—Participants were free to check as many racial identities as they liked. So that findings could be as clear as possible, participants were apportioned into race categories based on their selection of a single racial identification: Black/African American (30%), White (24%), Asian (6%), and Latino/Hispanic (19%), with the remaining 21% in the other/mixed/multiple category. Our choice of race rather than ethnicity as the construct under study reflects the fact that others' reactions toward our participants probably has more to do with the social meaning attached to superficial characteristics like skin color rather than to any identification that the participants themselves chose.

Race: Ethnographic Data—Participants self-identified as either Black (32%), White (30%), Asian (13%), Latino/Hispanic (20%), or Native American (2%).

Smoking Situations: Peer Group Questionnaire—Asked “In what situations have you smoked marijuana/blunts in the past 12 months?” participants were invited to check as many as they wished of the following: With friends; Parties; At home; Concerts, outdoor music festivals; Park, nature, outdoors; On the street, sidewalk; Bars, clubs; cafes, coffeeshops; Cinema, movie; School, studying; Creative pursuits; Together with partner; Before going to sleep; When get up in the morning; At work, during work; with family or relatives; With non-marijuana users.

Marijuana Etiquettes: Peer Group Questionnaire—Asked “What rules or customs do you follow regarding your use of marijuana/blunts?” participants were invited to check as many as they wished of the following: Not during work, study; Not during the day; Not in traffic, driving; Not in the morning; Not with parents; Not in the presence of children; Not with relatives; Not too often, in moderation; Not while concentrating; Not around people I do not know; Only if I have no other commitments; Not in public spaces; Not in a nonsmoking setting; Not in combination with alcohol; Not when police around; Only with friends and partner; Mainly with family, relatives; Follow no such rules.

Police Avoidance Strategies: Peer Group Questionnaire—Asked “How do you avoid police attention when you use/smoke marijuana or blunts in public locations?” participants were invited to check as many as they wished of the following: Never smoke marijuana/blunts in public location; Don’t worry about the police, use it where I want; use in secluded area; Smoke a cigar or cigarette to mask the marijuana smell; Keep moving while smoking marijuana/blunt.

Participants

Table 1 describes demographic characteristics of the ethnographic and peer group questionnaire participants side-by-side. The fact that such similar purposive samples of New York City marijuana users were collected by such different recruitment strategies helps support the study’s validity. Half of both samples were students, and both samples had slightly more males than females. The distribution of ethnicities was very similar. The age distributions were, however, qualitatively different. Both samples involved a substantial number of youth under 18. Almost half of the peer group participants were college age, however, as opposed to a little over a third of the ethnographic participants. The ethnographic study also had more participants older than college age.

Peer Group Questionnaire Results

Smoking Situations

Table 2 describes prevalence of smoking situations and police avoidance strategies and their prevalence within each race, gender, and user type. To our participants, whom we recruited in groups, marijuana is a social drug. Overall 72% of users report smoking at parties and 89% with friends, and these proportions did not vary based on user type or gender. Outdoor smoking is also common. Despite widespread perception and the reality of heavy policing in NYC (Johnson et al 2006b, Golub, Johnson, Dunlap 2006,2007), nearly half reported smoking in public locations (streets and parks), and this proportion was also gender- and user type-invariant. Where use is rare, however, is in locations like cafés, theaters, and workplaces where it would be a nuisance to others. Potential informal social sanctions seem to have more influence on locations of marijuana use than legal sanctions.

Some race and user type differences in public smoking occur along lines one would expect knowing the racial differences in user type. White and Asian users, Joints and Mixed Users, appear to gravitate toward either private settings (at home, in creative pursuits, before going

to sleep) or in somewhat-public situations where use is acceptable (bars and clubs, in concerts and at outdoor music festivals). In contrast, although only 14% of users overall smoked in school/studying situations, Mixed and Blunts users were more than twice as likely to report this than Joints users. This finding did not correspond to the race differences in user type - Latinos reported it more often than Blacks even though both are likely to be Blunts Users; Whites reported it more than Asians.

The prevalence of other smoking situations differs based on race but not on user type. These are situations that, intuitively, are the most likely to attract police attention - parties (ostensibly private but public, de facto, if they make enough noise), in coffee houses, in parks or outdoors, and on the street or sidewalk.

Counterintuitively - that is, to anyone tracking statistics on racial disparities in arrest - Whites and Asians report marijuana use in parks and streets (high-risk-of-police-attention settings) *more* often than Blacks and Latinos. Blacks and Latinos are also more likely to repudiate smoking in public at all than Whites and Asians. This could be because our Whites and Asians have intuited, correctly, that they have less to worry about from the police no matter how conspicuously they smoke (Ream et al., 2007).

Gender differences are easier to interpret. Males are more likely than females to report smoking when they get up in the morning, which indicates a risk for dependence. Males are more likely to smoke in theaters and during work, which puts them at risk for social consequences, and are less likely to repudiate public smoking, which puts them at risk for legal consequences.

Of the participants who did not repudiate public smoking, two-thirds report smoking in a secluded area. Black users are particularly unlikely to report that they keep moving while smoking, perhaps because this strategy is ill-adapted to social use. A particularly unpopular strategy is smoking a cigar to mask the smell. These self-report data provide no evidence that any user type or race is particularly diligent or lazy about overt attempts to stay out of trouble with police.

Marijuana Etiquette

As Table 3 describes, race and gender differences were also observed in endorsement of some marijuana etiquette items but not others. Only 62% of respondents said they do not smoke when police are around, but respondents likely endorsed only those items that applied to the respondents' specific situation. Many smoke in places where they do not have to worry about random police attention at all. There was, however, a race difference in endorsement of this etiquette, with Whites and Asians reporting it more than Blacks and Latinos. This relative lack of deference to police authority among Black and Latino marijuana users might explain at least some of their higher arrest rate. However, the tendency of Blacks in particular to avoid public smoking ought to make up to it.

Endorsement of marijuana etiquettes was distributed in a more predictable way than public smoking situations: Responsible/considerate marijuana smoking was more commonly practiced among Joints and Mixed Users, White users, and female users. There is also a noteworthy relational dimension to Blacks' choice of smoking partners as they are particularly likely to report smoking mainly with family/relatives and not around people they don't know.

An important caveat is that significance differences indicate modest association, strong divisions within the sample are not observed. Our participants were more alike than they were different. However, these results do suggest some subtle differences in meanings of and motivations for marijuana use, and marijuana use etiquette, based on race and gender and user

type. The decision of whether to smoke and where may follow a complex and sophisticated cost-benefit analysis accounting for many factors.

Ethnographic Results

Subjects in the ethnographic component provide considerable illumination about the importance of various marijuana etiquettes in their lives. Ethnographers asked subjects to indicate whom they hid or concealed their marijuana consumption from, and the possible consequences of becoming known as a user. Various etiquettes (or efforts to conceal) were reported by most subjects in the ethnographic baseline interview protocols. What is particularly striking is how these subjects assumed that their marijuana consumption would occur in private settings, and how important their relationships with parents, siblings, and children were in the etiquettes mentioned.

In the following illustrative materials, subjects consistently mention variations upon the core conduct norms behind the seclusion etiquette: *don't smoke around others and don't tell others about use. Conceal use from parents, children, and nonusing friends.* Other co-workers and bosses were mentioned in passing. Concerns about police contacts were rarely mentioned, although some were based upon actual observations of or experience with police or actual arrest. The gender, ethnicity, age, and preferences for blunts or joints of the subject is provided for each quote below.

Respect for parents and family members

[Q: Do you intentionally smoke marijuana/blunts away from others who you know to be non-smokers.]

Omar (male, black/Native American, 24, blunts then joints)¹ Yeah! Yeah! Definitely! Well I don't want to be the one that influences someone to do something and they can say, Oh I wouldn't have been smoking if it wasn't for you. Like my cousin comes around a lot but I always make sure I go in the other room or the bathroom or something so I'm not smoking right in his face. I never smoke around her (mother). [Q: What if she comes over and you've been smoking?] Then I usually put the blunt out, wait until she leaves, then spark it back up again. Well my mother knows I smoke but I just give her respect by not doing it around her.

Gemi (Japanese-American male, 19, blunts only): [Q: Who do you hide it from?] The cops. [Q: Parents?] They don't ask; they don't know. Well, actually, no, my father knows. My mom knows. My brother, he probably knows. I haven't told him.

Britney (white female, 20, joints then blunts)¹: I don't tell my parents. I wouldn't want them to worry. It's kind of like an unspoken thing. Like I wouldn't call my mom and say, "Mom, I got so high last night." I would want my parents to think I'm being productive and not like wasting my life smoking marijuana.

A-Zone (white male, 16, blunts then joints): I think my mom knows that I use marijuana. I think she only thinks that I do it at parties so she would be disappointed.

Airhead (Asian/Latina, 25, blunts then joints): I don't really hide. I just don't do in front of them which is my father and my younger siblings my younger sister and brother. Oh yeah my school, my job, and um, my daughter school.

Renegade (Chinese American female, 28, joints then blunts): Um, my parents. So, just primarily my relatives and my parents. Um, just don't smoke around them. Don't

¹This means that Omar is a Mixed User, but prefers blunts over joints. Britney prefers joints over blunts but is also a Mixed User.

talk about it around them. Don't smoke before I see them. I would feel bad because they would be probably worried about my health and disappointed in me in some way. But I'd feel more bad for how they're feeling than anything else.

Most ethnographic subjects clearly referred to etiquette norms of respect for family. The effective conduct norm towards parents/family seemed to be: *don't smoke and don't tell*. Even when parents/family was aware of marijuana use, another etiquette norm was: *conceal marijuana use as a sign of respect for family members*. Thus, parents and children were persons they would intentionally NOT smoke around, as a way of respecting their preferences for believing the subject was not using (or was only an occasional consumer). In the double-edged sword that etiquette is: by obeying these etiquettes, these subjects were also seeking to avoid the minor stigma of disappointment and possible informal sanction from parents/family that blunts/joints smoking may represent.

Respect for other associates

A-Zone (white male, 16, blunts then joints) Teachers wouldn't like it at all if they caught me high and they would probably turn me in to the principal. I don't see myself getting caught by a teacher ...I don't think they can make like a definite accusation like that.

Britney (white female, 20, joints then blunts): Um, except for that one time that I smoked in front of my boyfriend at the party. He doesn't smoke, and he has a negative opinion about smoking. So I wouldn't want him to have a negative opinion.

Salt Lick: Like in my apartment I wouldn't really want to smoke in the living room because my roommates could be bothered by it. I don't really avoid because I only smoke in my apartment these days. Well I'm not really in my parents' house any more but I would never speak about it or leave paraphernalia lying about. [Q: If discovered?] I think I would be a little embarrassed but it wouldn't be anything tragic.

Dufa (white male, 20, joints then blunts): If my students learned I was a regular pot smoker they would probably...because most of them look up to me it would probably make them think that smoking was a good idea and, you know, honestly I think smoking is probably a good idea for them but I don't wanna be the one to tell them that. And I think they should wait until they are a little bit older to start smoking too. And I don't think I would get fired because I don't smoke before going to work.

Renegade (Chinese American female, 28, joints then blunts): Um, my parents. And actually, some of my co-workers smoke; I smoke with them, but, um, I have even smoked with my boss before.

Marijuana etiquette requires consumers to assume that most persons are nonusers, as the latter would likely disapprove of and stigmatize both the behavior and smoker if it was known. The appropriate etiquette is to conceal and not inform others about one's use. This etiquette is applicable to most persons that the smoker encounters in their regular life. This concealment etiquette may not apply when persons or colleagues share about their use of marijuana, and/or engage in a common episode of blunts or joints use together (Dunlap et al 2005).

Respect for nonsmokers

Door (African-American male, 37, joint then blunts): I don't avoid non-smokers but I don't smoke around them. Because that is disrespectful and I know that is something that they don't do. So I hang with them but I don't smoke around them. I do avoid smoking around them though. I'm not trying to get anybody else addicted or get anybody else interested in smoking. I don't even smoke cigarettes around them. I just wait until they leave or I might try to rush them along after a certain point. {This

includes:} Family, mother, father, sisters, brothers, co-workers, class peers, police.
(Laughter)

Gemi (Japanese-American male, 19, blunts only): Um, well, no, not because I'm smoking marijuana or blunts. But just like smoking, you know, like if someone doesn't like smoke in the house, then I won't smoke in the house. [Q: Have you ever been asked to put something out?] No. No. But just be respectful of people. People who don't want smoke in the house.

Dufa (white male, 20, joints then blunts): I don't even know too many non-smokers. I just don't bring it [marijuana smoking] up. If my boss found out I smoke I don't think he would care. He probably does too. I mean it's a smoking world.

Roy Earl (white Hispanic male, 26, blunts then joints): It just doesn't matter. If I feel like smoking I'll smoke and if I don't then I won't. I always have something laying around. I don't know if they have fucking people out here that have their lives ruled by this shit but I'm not part of that little cliché. Nah! Fuck them! (Laughter) Not unless I feel like the situation is completely inappropriate, I wouldn't and if someone was really uncomfortable and I felt that it was fully appropriate anyways then they need to fucking get over it. If something like that is going to ruffle your little Underoos then you need a holiday in Cambodia.

The etiquette of not smoking marijuana is greatly influenced by broader social etiquettes that expect tobacco smokers to avoid smoking around nonsmokers. Avoidance around nonsmokers includes recognition of the stigma directed at both tobacco and marijuana smoking. Roy Earl was one of the few who claimed to openly smoke marijuana whenever he wanted to—although he probably would not if the situation was “completely inappropriate.”

Attempts to create a smokefree environment

Diamond (African-American female, 38, joints then blunts): [Q: How do you hide your marijuana use?] I have a perfume bottle and go in the bathroom and like I'm taking you know, just spray perfume and that's it and lifts up the window. No I don't do it around him. I do it away from him [boy friend who disapproves].

Triple A (African-American male, 20, joints then blunts) And then good, ole' Febreze (deodorant) works wonders.

Attempts to avoid recognition as marijuana user

A-Zone (white male, 16, blunts then joints): After I smoke, I'll put eye drops in. I don't carry bud around with me or on me. Like if I just finished smoking, I'll give some time before I go back to the school or go home. I air out a little bit to get the smell out. I try to eat something before I go home so I don't look hungry or whatever or give any signs and that is about it.

Subjects report a range of strategies to reduce the possibility of even being detected as marijuana users. Mainly this involves going to bathrooms to smoke, using deodorants to cover the smell, and concealing stashes of marijuana in hidden locations. Generally, subjects appear satisfied with their concealment techniques, and none reported negative consequences from doing so. Moreover, the NYPD does not seek out personal caches of marijuana, especially in private settings.

Put work/school performance before marijuana smoking

Triple A (African-American male, 20, joints then blunts): I don't normally have marijuana on myself. I work with (people) who smoke just about every day and folks

are always, “Come over and smoke!” But the vast majority of the times I probably turn them down. I mostly smoke in private residences. I don’t smoke in public, I don’t smoke at work, and I don’t smoke at home.

Airhead (Asian/Latina, 25, blunts then joints): Like last week I had a dime bag. I wanted to smoke but then I had too much to do so I didn’t smoke it. I had it for a couple of days. I’ll say I had it for like four days. Yeah I smoke daily but at that time that I had it, I had too much paper to do. [Q: Do you mean you were too busy or you didn’t wanna be that high?] A: No I was too busy and I couldn’t stop and roll.

Many blunts/joints smokers reported an etiquette of “having priorities straight.” So they devoted most of their time and energy to their conventional roles (school, jobs, families, relationships). This left them with limited time to engage in blunts/marijuana consumption (Dunlap et al 2006). Even when the product had been purchased and/was easily available to them, many reported not using it in most situations. Consumption episodes were mainly reported to occur at parties or on weekends in private locations (Dunlap et al 2005).

Use marijuana only when in the mood or right situation

Triple A (African-American male, 20, joints then blunts): Sometimes I’m just not in the mood because, like I said, since marijuana and blunts aren’t that important to me. Like sometimes if I’m wind up and tired I’m not going to smoke because I don’t want to exacerbate that feeling, you know, languid and like try to get home.

Britney (white female, 20, joint then blunts): We buy marijuana in, you know, a couple-gram increments. In fact, right now there’s marijuana in my house. And I’m often not in the mood to smoke marijuana. I often don’t want to, because it can make me tired or unproductive. So it’s always around and I don’t often smoke it.

Roy Earl (white Hispanic male, 26, blunts then joints): I keep it in my pocket and otherwise I close my bedroom door. [Q: What if others learned:] They would fucking smoke all my weed. I’m into sharing--but some of these guys get like carried away...and girls.

Best times for marijuana use

Door (African-American male, 37, joint then blunts): Well I tend not to smoke before three or four o’clock in the afternoon. I like to wait until afternoon or evening. I can hold a whole bag in my pocket all day long.

These ethnographic subjects reported an etiquette that primarily limited their consumption to groups settings with other users (Dunlap et al 2005), and where the marijuana was shared—rather than being consumed alone. The etiquette also meant use when the user’s “mood” was right, or other elements in the setting were pleasant. Even minor obstacles to use (setting not right, or not in the mood) would reduce the likelihood of smoking. Roy Earl was one of few who mentioned a concern about moochers (“guys get carried away”) who want to smoke for free when marijuana was being shared in a cypher or session (Dunlap et al 2005).

Concern about police and concealment tactics

Omar (black/Native American male, 24, blunts then joints) If I am outside and I’m smoking and the cops come. I’ll just like pinch it out real quick with my hand and put it in my mouth until they go pass. If they jump out on me or come toward me, I [may] swallow it.

Omar was one of the few ethnographic subjects who provide a discussion (above) that reflected his concerns about police and/or arrest. This seems to be based upon experience (either personal

or observed in the community) of police stops for marijuana smoking. He did not mention being arrested later in the interview.

This analysis of ethnographic responses to questions about how they conceal their marijuana use from others reveals two important themes which were documented above. First, the ethnographic subjects do not report being too concerned about the possibility of having police contacts and/or arrests. While some subjects (e.g. only Omar and Gemi above) occasionally mentioned police in passing, none reported elaborate planning to evade police. Most ethnographic subjects did not even mention police at all. While most subjects were aware that police stopped and arrested people for marijuana smoking and possession, they did not conceptualize the possibility of police (or law enforcement) as a deterrent to or influence upon their marijuana-related behaviors. A direct deterrence effect was not clearly evident (also see Golub et al. 2003 for such impact among arrestees). That is, no ethnographic respondent even hinted that their fear of police and/or arrest for marijuana smoking was the main reason they did not consume in public.

Second, ethnographic subjects reported far more concern about stigma avoidance by limiting information about their marijuana use among relevant persons in their immediate social networks. That is, they were far more concerned with whether key persons would express disapproval and stigmatize them (even in a minor way) for their marijuana use. So compliance with seclusion etiquettes may also involve concealing ones marijuana use (especially the extent of use) from parents, children, and others in ones social networks—in addition to avoiding public settings where police contacts may occur. These themes also emerged in the analysis of the PGQ data above.

Discussion

Overall, blunts users and joints users are aware of the civic norms against public use and/or sale of marijuana. They are aware not only of the legal consequences to themselves but of the social consequences of their use among family, friends, and associates. Although their observance of etiquette has implications for keeping them out of legal trouble, the primary motivations they cite for observing etiquette are social, to maintain close relationships and avoid others' disapproval. The three types of marijuana users are equally likely to report both complying with various etiquettes (which reduces public visibility of use) and evading civic norms when using in public settings.

In large measure, blunts and joints users and the marijuana subcultures in NYC appear to have accommodated to quality-of-life policing and marijuana enforcement by shifting their informal norms and ritual use practices and now follow a variety of **marijuana etiquettes** so as to reduce or minimize contacts with official social controls (police and courts). But these etiquettes appear most important for evading observation and potential stigma from significant relationships with nonusers (including parents, relatives, and children) who would likely disapprove.

Police enforcement and a variety of other government policies to promote civic norms appear to subtly influence the development of conduct norms and etiquettes followed within marijuana subcultures and their participants (see Johnson et al 2006a). Given that police in NYC are targeting public marijuana smokers (Golub, Johnson, Dunlap 2007; Ream et al 2006b) for arrest, black PGQ respondents had the highest proportion who claimed to never use in public locations--a modest deterrent effect. Yet even when using marijuana outdoors, marijuana consumers are quite cautious where they use, with whom, and how long they do so (Johnson et al 2006ab; Dunlap et al 2005). Thus, policing of the civic norms may be most effective when

they lead to the formation of and support development of etiquettes and norms within private networks.

In so doing, marijuana prohibition supporters and opponents may find a semblance of agreement. This may constitute an effective compromise: law enforcement and nonusers essentially permit marijuana users and sellers to use and distribute in private settings. By doing so, they also appear to comply with civic norms by concealing use/sales at public settings. In adjusting to this tenuous agreement, pro-marijuana groups can promote guidelines or practices (or conduct norms and etiquettes) designed to limit potential harms from becoming known as a marijuana consumer as well as sanctions from police and nonusers. For example, “Guidelines for Sensible Cannabis Use” (Cannabis Action Network 2005) suggest:

1. Adults should use cannabis as part of a healthy, balanced and responsible lifestyle.
2. The decision to use cannabis should be made freely, not as a result of social pressure.
3. Cannabis users should be well informed about its effects including both legal and health risks and personal consequences.
4. Never use cannabis as an excuse or a cue for antisocial or irresponsible behavior.
5. Cannabis users should model and reward responsible use, especially with new users.
6. Use cannabis as part of positive social interactions, rather than primarily in isolation or as a remedy for negative feelings.
7. Develop sensible cannabis user limits based on personal, health, situational, and cultural factors. Be objective about your cannabis use and listen to the constructive advice of others.
8. Avoid cannabis use that puts you or others at risk, such as when driving, at work, or in public places. Remember, personal use of cannabis is still illegal and penalties can be stiff.
9. Use of cannabis by minors is inappropriate and should be discouraged.
10. Cannabis use should contribute to, rather than detract from, users’ health, well-being, creativity, work, relationships, and social obligations.

While marijuana prohibitionists would deny that “Cannabis users make responsible decisions and exercise good judgments,” and that such use may be safe, they would likely agree with items 4-6, 8, and 9. Moreover, cannabis users who follow these guidelines will likely evade the attention of police and many nonusers who may disagree.

The ethnographic data reported above specified several of the conduct norms within both joints and blunts subcultures which help understand the reasons for complying with marijuana etiquettes. Despite a heavy police presence and numerous arrests for marijuana smoking in public settings (Golub, Johnson, Dunlap 2006, 2007, Johnson et al. 2006), very few ethnographic respondents mentioned concerns about being stopped by police or arrested—so the threat of police contact does not loom as an important concern among ethnographic subjects. A general norm of “not using when police are around” was endorsed by a majority of PGQ subjects as a general etiquette consistent with the qualitative data.

Rather the ethnographic subjects (and many of the PGQ respondents) were far more concerned to limit their exposure to informal stigma by society and the possible disapproval by significant others in one’s social relationships. The guiding conduct norm appeared to be: *don’t use around and don’t tell* significant others and associates about one’s joint or blunts use. Even when such others (nonusers) were probably aware that they did so, most respondents systematically concealed the extent of their use and/or involvement with marijuana from non-using others.

To accomplish this concealment of their blunts or joints use, ethnographic subjects followed several marijuana etiquettes and practices. These include: *Show respect for parents, children, and family members and for associates* (by not using when they are around); *respect nonsmokers (of tobacco as well as marijuana)*; *attempt to create a smokefree environment or mask the smell of marijuana*; *attempt to avoid recognition as a marijuana user*; *avoid use in public settings, use only in private settings*. A wide variety of other conduct norms bordered on being marijuana etiquettes as they involved choices and self-controls that the person made which limited their consumption or use patterns: *not use during the day, nor at work/school, not while concentrating or working, not use too often, only in moderation*.

Analysis of the quantitative PGQ data revealed several additional findings. Most marijuana etiquette items were endorsed by equivalent proportions of blunts, joints, and mixed users, although four items did differentiate that blunt users were significantly less likely than joint/mixed users to endorse four items (Not in morning, Not around children, Not too often, in moderation, and Not while concentrating).

These findings could be employed, especially by pro-blunt/marijuana users, to encourage the private and moderate consumption of cannabis—especially in private settings where arrests are unlikely to occur. This would be an intervention promoted by other subculture participants to prevent the informal stigma from family/friends, provide compliance with civic norms, and prevent some of the potential harms (contacts with police, arrest, and disposition) associated with marijuana consumption in public settings. While such actions will not prevent consumption or lead to abstinence by marijuana consumers, it may further remove marijuana consumption from public view and police attention.

The findings in this article suggest the importance in future research for further study of whether and how the informal norms and marijuana etiquettes followed within private life may affect and be affected by public policies propagated through civic norms. This would involve more carefully measurement of the conduct norms and etiquettes associated with various criminal law, regulatory compliance, and civic norms, and whether and how the police enforcement can influence the informal conduct norms and etiquettes within the networks of associations in which people live.

Acknowledgements

This analysis was supported by a grant from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, entitled “Marijuana/Blunts: Use, Subcultures and Markets” (1R01 DA/CA13690-03, Eloise Dunlap, Principal Investigator), and “Behavioral Science Training in Drug Abuse Research” (T32 DA007233-23). The authors acknowledge with appreciation the many contributions of Ellen Benoit, Ricardo Bracho, Flutura Bardhi, Andrew Golub, Anthony Nguyen, Doris Randolph, and to this research.

Points of view and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the positions of NIDA, National Development and Research Institutes, Medical and Health Research Association of New York City, Inc., nor Adelphi University

Biographies

Bruce D. Johnson (Ph.D. 1971 Columbia University) is one of the America’s authorities on the criminality and illicit sales of drugs in the street economy and among arrestees and minority populations. He directs the Institute for Special Populations Research at the National Development and Research Institutes. He is a professional researcher with five books and over 130 articles based upon findings emerging from over 30 different research and prevention projects funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse and National Institutes of Justice. He also directs the nation’s largest pre- and postdoctoral training program in the U.S.

Dr. Geoffrey Ream (PhD 2004, Psychology, Cornell Univ,) was a postdoctoral fellow who made substantial contributions to the Blunts project. He has also analyzed several internet and major quantitative data sets in his doctoral work and as a postdoc.

Eloise Dunlap, Ph.D. (Ph.D, 1988, Berkeley) has extensive qualitative experience in research and publications that address the role of crack and marijuana users, and drug-abusing African-American families, and their households. She is/has been Principal Investigator of six NIDA-funded projects, including Blunts/Marijuana: Use, Subcultures, and Markets.

Stephen J. Sifaneck, (Ph.D. CUNY Graduate Center) is a Project Director/Co-Investigator in the Institute for Special Populations Research (IPSR) at National Development and Research Institutes (NDRI) Inc. in New York City. His publications include articles and chapters about the sale and use of marijuana, heroin and prescription drugs, ethnographic research methodologies, and subcultural urban issues.

Glossary

Blunts, marijuana smoked in a low cost cigar shell.; Civic norms, regulations designed to prevent unwanted behaviors in public settings.; Conduct norms, norms that guide and direct interaction on a regular basis.; Etiquette, informal rules or guidelines to take into account the response of others to one's actions.; Public Space, locations that are not clearly private, and where the general public may go.; Quality-of-life policing, developed in New York City in the 1990s, police focus upon many minor offenses and violations..

References

- Almond, Gabriel A.; Verba, Sidney. Civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations. Sage; Thousand Oaks CA: 1989.
- Amster, Randall. Street people and the contested realms of public space. LFB Scholarly Publishing; New York: 2004.
- Becker, Howard S. The other side; Perspectives on deviance. Free Press of Glencoe; New York: 1964.
- Blumstein, Alfred; Wallman, Joel, editors. The crime drop in America. Revised edition. Cambridge University Press; New York: 2006.
- Boire, Richard G. Marijuana Law. Ronin Publishing; Oakland CA: 1996.
- Bonnie, Richard J.; Whitebread, Charles H, II. The marijuana conviction: A history of marijuana prohibition in the United States. Lindesmith Center; New York: 1999.
- Cannabis Action Network. Postcard flyers for marijuana users. Berkeley, CA: 2005.
- Ric, Curtis; Wendel, Travis. Mangai Natarajan and Mike Hough, Illegal drug markets: From research to prevention policy. 11. Criminal Justice Press; Monsey, New York: 2000. Toward the development of a typology of illegal drug markets; p. 121-152.
- Caulkins, Jonathan P.; Pacula, Rosalie L. Marijuana markets: Inferences from reports by the household population. Journal of Drug Issues Winter 2006:173–200.
- Durkheim, Emile; Hill, Michael Ortiz. Professional ethics and civic morals. Routledge; London:
- Dunlap, Eloise. Marijuana/Blunts: Use, Subcultures, and Markets. NDRI Proposal to National Institute on Drug Abuse; New York: 2001.
- Dunlap, Eloise; Benoit, Ellen; Sifaneck, Stephen J.; Johnson, Bruce D. Social constructions of dependency by blunts smokers: Ethnographic reports. International Journal of Harm Reduction 2006;17:171–812.
- Dunlap, Eloise; Johnson, Bruce D.; Sifaneck, Stephen J.; Benoit, Ellen. Sessions, cyphers, and parties: Settings for informal social controls of blunt smoking. Journal of Ethnicity and Substance Abuse 2005a;4(3):43–77.
- Dunlap, Eloise; Sifaneck, Stephen J.; Johnson, Bruce D.; Benoit, Ellen. Impact of marijuana/blunts on work and school performance: An Ethnographic Inquiry. Presentation to Society for Study of Social Problems. 2005b in preparation
- Earleywine, Mitch. Mind-altering drugs: The science of subjective experience. Oxford University Press; New York: 2005.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Reports. Washington, DC: 2005.
- Gallup, Poll. Who supports marijuana legalization? Support rising; varies most by age and gender. Nov 1;2005 2005
- Golub, Andrew Bruce; Johnson, D.; Dunlap, Eloise. Smoking marijuana in public: The spatial and policy shift in New York City's arrests, 1992-2003; Harm Reduction Journal. 2006. p. 22[266] Online-<http://www.harmreductionjournal.com/content/3/1/22>
- Golub, Andrew; Johnson, Bruce D.; Dunlap, Eloise. Ethnic disparities in marijuana arrests in New York City. Criminology and Public Policy 2007;6(1):131–164.
- Golub, Andrew; Johnson, Bruce D.; Dunlap, Eloise. Subcultural evolution and substance use. Addiction Research and Theory 2005a;13(3):217–229.

- Golub, Andrew; Johnson, Bruce D.; Dunlap, Eloise. The growth in marijuana use among American youths in the 1990s and the extent of blunts smoking. *Journal of Ethnicity and Substance Abuse* 2005b;4(3):1–21.
- Golub, Andrew; Johnson, Bruce D.; Taylor, Angela; Eterno, John. Quality-of-life policing: Do offenders get the message? *Policing: International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* 2003;26(4):690–707.
- Hechter, Michael; KarlDieter, Opp, editors. *Social Norms*. Russell Sage Foundation; New York: 2001.
- Johnson, Bruce D. *Marihuana users and drug subcultures*. John Wiley; New York: 1973.
- Johnson, Bruce D.; Bardhi, Flutura; Sifaneck, Stephen J.; Dunlap, Eloise. Marijuana argot as subculture threads: Social constructions by users in New York City. *British Journal of Criminology* 2006a;46(1):46–77.
- Johnson, Bruce D.; Golub, Andrew; Dunlap, Eloise; Sifaneck, Stephen J.; McCabe, James. Policing and social control of public marijuana use and selling in New York City. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum* 2006;6(5):55–85.
- Johnson, Bruce D.; Dunlap, Eloise; Golub, Andrew; Sifaneck, Stephen J.; Bardhi, Flutura. Blunts/ Marijuana Users: Their experiences of contacts with police and marijuana arrests for public view smoking and possession in NYC. Presentation at Society for the Study of Social Problems. 2006b
- Johnson, Bruce D.; Golub, Andrew; Dunlap, Eloise; Alfred Blumstein and Joel Wallman. *The crime drop in America*. Revised edition. Cambridge University Press; New York: 2006. The rise and decline of drugs, drug markets, and violence in New York City; p. 164-206.
- Liberty, Hilary J.; Johnson, Bruce D.; Fortner, Neil. Detecting cocaine use through sweat testing: Multilevel modeling of sweat patch length-of-wear data. *Journal of Analytic Toxicology* 2004;28(8):667–673.
- Knack, Stephen. *Social capital and the quality of government: Evidence from the United States*. Washington, DC: 2000. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2504
- Miriam-Webster. *Collegiate Dictionary*. Tenth Edition. Springfield MA: 1999.
- National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse. *Marijuana: A Signal of Misunderstanding*. Government Printing Office; Washington, DC: 1971.
- National Institute on Drug Abuse. 2005. website: www.nida.nih.gov/
- National Institute on Drug Abuse. *Drug Use among High School Students. Monitoring the Future Survey*; Rockville, MD: 2004.
- New York State. *Penal Law of the State of New York*. Looseleaf Law Publications; Flushing New York: 2005.
- Office of National Drug Control Policy. Washington, DC: 2006. website: www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov
- Ream, Geoffrey; Johnson, Bruce D.; Sifaneck, Stephen; Dunlap, Eloise. Distinguishing blunts users from joints users: A comparison of marijuana use subcultures. In: Cole, Spencer, editor. *Street Drugs: New Research*. Nova Science Publishers; Hauppauge, NY: 2006. p. 245-273.
- Ream, Geoffrey L.; Johnson, Bruce D.; Dunlap, Eloise; Sifaneck, Stephen J. Race, public use, etiquette, and other determinants of marijuana-related police contact in New York City; Presented at College on Problems of Drug Dependence; Scotsdale AZ. 2007; in review
- Reinarman, Craig; Cohen, Peter D.A.; Kaal, Hendrien L. The limited relevance of drug policy: Cannabis in Amsterdam and in San Francisco. *American Journal of Public Health* 2004;94(5):836–842. [PubMed: 15117709]
- Reinarman, Craig; Cohen, Peter. Lineaments of cannabis culture: Rules regulating use in Amsterdam and San Francisco; Presented at American Sociological Association; San Francisco. 2004;
- Sifaneck, Stephen J.; Johnson, Bruce D.; Dunlap, Eloise. Cigars-for-Blunts: Marketing of flavored tobacco products to youth and minorities. *Journal of Ethnicity and Substance Abuse* 2005;4(3):23–42.
- Stephen, J. Sifaneck; Ream, Geoffrey; Johnson, Bruce D.; Dunlap, Eloise. Retail marijuana purchases in designer and commercial markets in New York City: Sales units, weights, and prices per gram. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2007IN PRESS

- Sifaneck, Stephen; Kaplan, Charles D. Keeping off, stepping on and stepping off: The stepping stone theory reevaluated in the context of the Dutch cannabis experience. *Contemporary Drug Problems* 1995;22:483–512.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. 2004 National Survey on Drug Use & Health. Rockville, MD: 2005.

Table 1
Side-by-Side Description of the Ethnographic and Peer Group Questionnaire data sets

Ethnographic Subjects			Peer Group Subjects		
Gender	N	Valid %		N	Valid %
Male	52	53.6%	Male	311	55.7%
Female	44	45.4%	Female	247	44.3%
Trans	1	1.0%	Missing	21	
Age at Recruitment	N	Valid %		N	Valid %
14-17	25	25.8%	14-17	122	23.3%
18-20	21	21.6%	18-20	96	18.4%
21-24	13	13.4%	21-24	160	30.6%
25-29	19	19.6%	25-29	78	14.9%
30+	19	19.6%	30+	67	12.8%
			Missing	56	
Current Education	N	Valid %		N	Valid %
In HS or Voc/Ed	27	28.1%	In Jr/Sr. High	164	29.7%
College	21	21.9%	In College/Univ/Trade Sch.	124	22.4%
Not in school	48	50.0%	Not in school or college	265	47.9%
			Missing	28	
Ethnicity				N	Valid %
Black	31	32.0%	Black Only	172	29.7%
White	32	33.0%	White Only	139	24.0%
Asian	13	13.4%	Asian Only	37	6.4%
Latino/Hispanic	19	19.6%	Latino/Hispanic Only	111	19.2%
Native American	2	2.1%	Other/Mixed/Multiple	120	20.7%
Preferred Product(s) Used	N	Valid %		N	Valid %
Blunts	29	29.9%	Blunts (not joints)	210	36.8%
Joints/Pipes/Bongs	10	10.3%	Joints (not blunts)	125	21.9%
Blunts/Joints	24	24.7%	Mixed (use both)	178	31.2%
Joints/Blunts	34	35.1%	Non-User	58	10.2%
			Missing	8	

Table 2
Prevalence of Smoking Situations and Police Avoidance Strategies Etiquettes and their Distribution Across Race, Gender, and User Type

	Overall	User Type				Race						Gender			
		Joints	Blunts	Mixed	χ^2	White	Black	Latino	Asian	Other	χ^2	Male	Female	χ^2	
Private Situations:															
Parties	72%	76%	70%	71%		85%	62%	71%	84%	67%	***	74%	70%		
At home	60%	69%	49%	67%	***	77%	50%	48%	72%	62%	***	59%	61%		
School, studying	14%	7%	15%	19%	*	21%	9%	14%	8%	15%	*	16%	12%		
Creative pursuits	21%	25%	14%	27%	**	34%	11%	14%	20%	26%	***	23%	17%	+	
Social Situations:															
With friends	89%	92%	87%	88%		98%	85%	79%	96%	88%	***	88%	90%		
Together with partner	35%	33%	34%	38%		43%	33%	34%	24%	32%		35%	36%		
Time-Delimited Situations:															
Before going to sleep	41%	50%	35%	42%	*	59%	26%	35%	48%	43%	***	41%	40%		
When get up in the morning	26%	21%	27%	26%		30%	20%	23%	28%	30%		29%	19%	***	
Public but Limited Exposure Situations															
Concerts, outdoor music festivals	28%	34%	20%	34%	**	46%	15%	25%	38%	26%	***	27%	28%		
Bars, clubs	23%	32%	16%	25%	**	36%	13%	22%	28%	22%	***	24%	23%		
Cafes, coffeeshops	7%	8%	5%	10%		11%	2%	7%	13%	10%	*	9%	5%		
Cinema, movie	9%	3%	8%	13%	*	10%	7%	11%	12%	7%		11%	5%	***	
At work, during work	11%	9%	11%	13%		16%	7%	6%	16%	14%	+	16%	5%	***	
Fully Public Situations															
Park, nature, outdoors	44%	40%	40%	50%	+	58%	33%	40%	52%	43%	**	46%	41%		
On the street, sidewalk	44%	43%	45%	45%		59%	33%	49%	56%	36%	***	46%	43%		
Police Avoidance Strategies															
Never smoke in public	34%	38%	34%	31%		21%	43%	34%	17%	39%	***	27%	43%	***	
Of participants who did not repudiate public smoking (n = 313):															
Don't worry about police, use where I want	17%	15%	19%	16%		17%	12%	19%	15%	24%		20%	12%	+	
Use in secluded area	67%	65%	69%	67%		71%	65%	63%	70%	67%		68%	68%		
Mask smell by smoking cigar/cigarette	22%	17%	20%	27%		26%	18%	19%	20%	24%		21%	24%		
Keep moving while smoking	47%	55%	43%	46%		59%	39%	48%	55%	36%	*	45%	52%		

Pearson chi-square test of independence

+ p < .10

* p < .05

** p < .01

*** p < .001.

Table 3
Prevalence of Marijuana Etiquettes and their Distribution Across Race, Gender, and User Type

		User Type		Race							Gender		
		Overall	χ^2	White	Black	Latino	Asian	Other	χ^2	Male	Female	χ^2	
Etiquettes to Avoid Legal Consequences													
Not when police around	62%	63%	64%	60%		72%	62%	53%	72%	57%	*	61%	65%
Not in public spaces	23%	26%	22%	24%		16%	35%	21%	16%	19%	**	21%	27%
Not in a nonsmoking setting	24%	28%	18%	29%	*	32%	26%	16%	20%	21%	+	21%	29%
Not in traffic, driving	27%	30%	21%	31%	*	36%	23%	20%	17%	29%	*	22%	32%
Etiquettes to Avoid Social Consequences													
Not in the presence of children	51%	55%	43%	57%	*	57%	53%	42%	48%	48%		46%	57%
Not with relatives	22%	24%	18%	24%		30%	16%	21%	26%	18%	+	21%	23%
Not with parents	51%	50%	50%	54%		60%	52%	45%	64%	43%	+	48%	55%
Only with friends and partner	16%	14%	17%	16%		18%	19%	8%	8%	17%		13%	20%
Mainly with family, relatives	4%	3%	4%	6%		1%	9%	3%	8%	2%	*	4%	4%
Not around people I don't know	21%	21%	20%	22%		17%	28%	11%	0%	28%	***	19%	23%
Etiquettes to Avoid Personal Consequences													
Not during work, study	39%	44%	33%	43%	+	43%	37%	33%	56%	38%		36%	43%
Not during the day	16%	16%	17%	14%		9%	20%	10%	16%	22%	*	16%	14%
Not in the morning	23%	29%	17%	26%	*	26%	28%	16%	20%	21%		22%	26%
Not too often, in moderation	27%	38%	16%	31%	***	35%	25%	18%	24%	28%	+	23%	32%
Not while concentrating	16%	24%	10%	18%	**	30%	8%	6%	8%	24%	***	13%	21%
Only if I have no other commitments	14%	15%	9%	20%	**	24%	12%	6%	8%	16%	**	13%	16%
Not in combination with alcohol	7%	5%	8%	8%		8%	7%	8%	8%	6%		6%	10%
													+

Pearson chi-square test of independence

+ p < .10

* p < .05

** p < .01

*** p < .001.