University of Stavanger

SERGIO GUSTAVO VALLEJO MUÑOZ
SUPERVISOR: FREDERIC EMMANUEL BOUDER

Risk Perception among Cocaine users in Oslo: what risk factors are impacting the rise consumption of cocaine in Oslo

Master thesis, 2024
Risk Analysis
Faculty of Science and Technology
Department of Safety, Economics and Planning

1. INTRODUCTION

The global problem that drug consumption presents is multifaceted and concerning issues that interact with public health, criminal justice, economic stability and social welfare. Drug consumption, considering both illicit drugs and the misuse of prescription medications,has emerged as a critical issue for governments, health organizations and society in general across the world. The impact of the problem transcends geographical boundaries, affecting populations regardless of age, socio-economic status, religion, sexual orientation and cultural background.

The scale of drug consumption is staggering. According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), an estimated 275 million people used drugs worldwide in the past year, with nearly 36 million suffering from drug use disorders (UNODC, 2021). The types of drugs consumed vary widely, from opioids and stimulants to new psychoactive substances (NPS), each bringing unique challenges. The opioid crisis, particularly pronounced in North America, has garnered significant attention due to its devastating toll on public health, marked by a dramatic increase in overdose deaths (CDC, 2020). Similarly, the rise of synthetic drugs and the persistent popularity of traditional substances like cocaine and cannabis illustrate the evolving nature of drug use patterns (EMCDDA, 2020)

The consequences of drug consumption are profound and widespread. Public health systems are burdened with the treatment of addiction and its associated health complications, such as infectious diseases, mental health disorders, and chronic conditions (Degenhardt et al., 2019). The social fabric of communities is often strained, with increased crime rates, family disintegration, and social exclusion of individuals suffering from addiction (Bretteville-Jensen & Sutton, 2019). Economically, the costs are substantial, encompassing healthcare expenditures, lost productivity, and law enforcement resources (Jozaghi & Reid, 2020). Moreover, the illicit drug trade fuels organized crime and political instability in various regions, exacerbating global security issues (Global Initiative, 2021).

Efforts to combat drug consumption are multifaceted, involving prevention, treatment, and policy initiatives at local, national, and international levels. Prevention programs aim to reduce the onset of drug use through education and community engagement, while treatment strategies focus on rehabilitation and harm reduction (WHO, 2019). Policy responses range from strict prohibition and punitive measures to more progressive approaches such as decriminalization and regulation (Hughes et al., 2018).

Despite these efforts, significant challenges remain. Stigma and discrimination against individuals with substance use disorders hinder their access to necessary services

(Volkow et al., 2017). Additionally, the rapidly changing nature of drug markets, driven by technological advancements and globalization, complicates enforcement and regulatory efforts (EMCDDA, 2021). International cooperation is often required but can be hampered by differing national priorities and approaches to drug control (UNODC, 2019).

In Norway the drug consumption problem presents a significant public health and social challenge, reflecting broader trends observed across Europe while also exhibiting unique national characteristics. Norway, known for its robust welfare system and high standards of living, faces a complex drug landscape that demands comprehensive analysis and targeted intervention. This thesis explores the scope, consequences, and policy responses to drug consumption in Norway.

Drug consumption in Norway has evolved over recent decades, with varying patterns of use among different substances. According to the Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPH), approximately 5% of the adult population reported using illicit drugs in the past year, with cannabis being the most commonly used substance (NIPH, 2020). While the prevalence of drug use in Norway is relatively lower compared to other European countries, the issue remains critical due to the associated health risks and social implications. The emergence of synthetic drugs and the misuse of prescription medications have added layers of complexity to the drug landscape in Norway (EMCDDA, 2021).

The consequences of drug consumption in Norway are multifaceted, affecting individuals, families, and society at large. Health complications arising from drug use include increased rates of infectious diseases, such as HIV and hepatitis, particularly among intravenous drug users (Melhuus et al., 2019). Mental health disorders and overdose deaths are also significant concerns. In 2019, Norway reported one of the highest drug-induced mortality rates in Europe, with an estimated 66 deaths per million inhabitants aged 15-64 (EMCDDA, 2020).

Socially, drug consumption contributes to issues such as crime, homelessness, and social exclusion. A study by Bretteville-Jensen et al. (2018) highlighted the economic burden of drug use in Norway, noting substantial costs related to healthcare, law enforcement, and lost productivity. The illicit drug trade also poses challenges to public safety and governance, although Norway's well-organized law enforcement agencies work diligently to mitigate these risks (Norwegian Directorate of Health, 2020).

Norway's approach to addressing drug consumption involves a combination of prevention, treatment, harm reduction, and law enforcement strategies. Prevention efforts focus on education and community-based programs aimed at reducing the initiation of drug use among young people (Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services, 2019). Treatment options, including medication-assisted therapy and rehabilitation services, are widely available and aim to support recovery and reintegration into society (Waal et al., 2019).

Harm reduction measures, such as needle exchange programs and supervised injection sites, have been implemented to minimize the health risks associated with drug use (Clausen et al., 2018). Additionally, Norway has engaged in progressive policy discussions, considering decriminalization and other innovative approaches to drug control (Hughes & Stevens, 2010). However, challenges remain, including stigma and discrimination against drug users, which hinder access to services and support (Skretting et al., 2017). The rapid evolution of drug markets and the introduction of new psychoactive substances further complicate enforcement and regulatory efforts (EMCDDA, 2021).

Zooming in Oslo, Drug consumption encompasses a range of substances, from cannabis and cocaine to newer psychoactive substances (NPS) and prescription medications. According to the Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPH), the prevalence of illicit drug use among adults in Oslo is approximately 8%, with cannabis being the most frequently used drug (NIPH, 2021). Additionally, there has been an alarming rise in the use of synthetic drugs and prescription medication misuse, complicating the public health landscape (EMCDDA, 2021). The issue is further exacerbated by the city's role as a central hub for drug trafficking in Norway, making it a focal point for law enforcement and public health interventions.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The objective of this thesis is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the drug consumption issue in Oslo, with a specific focus on cocaine use and on understanding the perceptions of risk associated with its use, evaluating the consequences of these perceptions, and assessing the effectiveness of current intervention strategies in addressing them. This analysis aims to offer evidence-based recommendations to inform and enhance policy and practice, ultimately contributing to the reduction of drug-related harm in Oslo. By adopting a multidisciplinary approach, the thesis seeks to address the following specific objectives:

1. **Examine the Socio-Economic and Cultural Factors Influencing Risk Perception:** Investigate how socio-economic status, cultural background, and urban dynamics shape perceptions of risk related to cocaine consumption in Oslo.
2. **Evaluate Harm Reduction Strategies and Risk Perception:** Examine the implementation and impact of harm reduction measures, on reducing health risks and modifying risk perceptions among cocaine users.

By addressing these objectives, this thesis aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how risk perceptions influence drug and cocaine consumption in Oslo and to provide actionable insights for policymakers, public health officials, and community stakeholders. Ultimately, the research seeks to support the development of more effective and sustainable strategies to mitigate the impact of drug and cocaine use and improve the quality of life for individuals and communities in Oslo.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Risk Attitudes

Rational Risk Theory

Risk and uncertainty are prevalent phenomena that shape decision-making processes and influence outcomes across various domains, from finance and business to health and environmental policy. Risk refers to the probability of occurrence of an event and its potential consequences, while uncertainty reflects the lack of complete knowledge or information about future outcomes (Knight, 1921). Both risk and uncertainty are inherent in human cognition and perception, influencing individuals' judgments, behaviors, and attitudes towards uncertain situations.

Perceptions of risk and uncertainty are subjective and can vary widely among individuals, influenced by cognitive, emotional, and social factors. Research in psychology has identified various cognitive biases and heuristics that shape risk perceptions, such as the availability heuristic and the affect heuristic (Slovic et al., 2004). Additionally, individuals' risk perceptions are influenced by their emotional responses to uncertain situations, with fear, anxiety, and dread often leading to exaggerated risk perceptions (Slovic, 1987).

Uncertainty, on the other hand, presents unique challenges as individuals grapple with ambiguity, unpredictability, and lack of information about future events. Decision makers often employ various strategies to manage uncertainty, such as seeking additional information, relying on expert opinions, or using decision-making tools and models (Luhmann, 1993). However, these strategies may not always be effective in reducing uncertainty, as some situations are inherently uncertain and unknowable.

Moreover, societal responses to risk and uncertainty are shaped by institutional factors, including regulations, policies, and cultural norms. Risk communication plays a crucial role in shaping public perceptions and responses to uncertain events, with effective communication strategies enhancing public understanding and engagement (Renn & Levine, 1991). However, miscommunication or misinformation can exacerbate uncertainty and undermine public trust in institutions and authorities

In conclusion, risk and uncertainty are fundamental concepts that permeate decision-making processes and societal responses to uncertain events. By understanding the cognitive, emotional, and institutional factors that influence perceptions of risk and uncertainty, policymakers and stakeholders can develop more effective strategies for managing and mitigating the adverse effects of uncertain events on individuals and society as a whole. Through interdisciplinary research and collaboration, it is possible to enhance resilience and adaptability in the face of uncertain futures (Gigerenzer, 2004).

Risk perception, a fundamental aspect of decision-making, refers to individuals' subjective assessments of the likelihood and severity of potential hazards or risks (Slovic, 1987). Understanding the mechanisms underlying risk perception is crucial across various domains, including health, finance, environment, and public policy. Several theoretical frameworks have been proposed to elucidate the cognitive, affective, and social processes that shape risk perceptions.

General Risk Perception

One seminal theory in the field of risk perception is Prospect Theory, proposed by Kahneman and Tversky (1979). Prospect Theory posits that individuals' decisions under risk are influenced not only by the objective probabilities and outcomes of events but also by the way these probabilities and outcomes are framed. According to this theory, individuals tend to exhibit risk aversion when facing gains and risk-seeking behavior when facing losses, reflecting the asymmetrical weighting of potential gains and losses in decision-making.

Another influential framework is the psychometric paradigm, introduced by Slovic (1987). This paradigm suggests that risk perceptions are influenced by two primary dimensions: dread risk and unknown risk. Dread risk refers to risks that evoke feelings of fear, dread, or lack of control, such as nuclear accidents or terrorism, while unknown risk pertains to risks that are perceived as unfamiliar or poorly understood, such as new technologies or environmental hazards. The psychometric paradigm emphasizes the role of affective and cognitive factors in shaping risk perceptions and highlights the importance of individual differences in risk perception.

Additionally, the Risk-as-Feelings hypothesis proposed by Loewenstein and colleagues (2001) underscores the influence of affective states on risk perception. According to this hypothesis, individuals rely heavily on intuitive, emotional responses when evaluating risks, leading to systematic biases in risk perception. Emotional reactions, such as fear or excitement, can override rational deliberation and influence risk judgments, even when objective evidence suggests otherwise. This theory suggests that subjective feelings associated with risks play a crucial role in shaping risk perceptions and decision-making outcomes.

Furthermore, social amplification of risk theory (SARF) posits that risk perceptions are not solely determined by objective hazard characteristics but are also shaped by social, cultural, and institutional factors (Kasperson et al., 1988). According to SARF, risk events undergo a process of amplification or attenuation as they are filtered through various social networks and media channels, leading to divergent risk perceptions among different groups or communities. This theory emphasizes the role of social context in shaping risk perceptions and highlights the dynamic nature of risk communication and interpretation.

These frameworks will be further discussed in this thesis.

Risk perception is a complex phenomenon influenced by a myriad of cognitive, affective, and social factors. One crucial aspect of risk perception is the phenomenon of risk amplification and attenuation, wherein risks are perceived and communicated in a manner that either magnifies or diminishes their perceived severity and likelihood. This thesis dives into the intricate dynamics of risk amplification and attenuation, drawing upon theoretical frameworks from psychology and sociology to elucidate the underlying mechanisms and explore their implications across various domains.

The social amplification of risk theory (SARF) posits that risk events undergo a process of amplification or attenuation as they are filtered through various social networks, media channels, and institutional structures (Kasperson et al., 1988). According to SARF, risk perceptions are not solely determined by the objective characteristics of hazards but are also shaped by social, cultural, and psychological factors. Factors such as media coverage, expert opinions, public discourse, and prior experiences can amplify or attenuate risk perceptions, leading to divergent interpretations and responses among different groups or communities.

Building upon the foundation of SARF, psychological theories offer insights into the cognitive and affective processes that underpin risk amplification and attenuation. The Risk-as-Feelings hypothesis posits that affective states play a crucial role in shaping risk perceptions, with emotional reactions influencing the perceived severity and likelihood of risks (Loewenstein et al., 2001). Emotional responses, such as fear or outrage, can amplify perceptions of risk, leading individuals to perceive hazards as more severe and imminent than they may objectively be. Conversely, cognitive biases and heuristics may lead to risk attenuation, where individuals underestimate or downplay the significance of certain risks due to factors such as familiarity, controllability, or perceived benefits.

Empirical studies have provided further insights into the mechanisms of risk amplification and attenuation across different contexts. For example, research on media framing has demonstrated how the portrayal of risk information can influence public perceptions and responses to hazards (Entman, 1993). Similarly, studies on social networks and group dynamics have highlighted how interpersonal communication and social influence processes can amplify or attenuate risk perceptions within communities (Nowak & Vallacher, 1998).

In conclusion, the dynamics of risk amplification and attenuation are complex and multifaceted, influenced by a range of psychological, social, and cultural factors. By integrating insights from psychological and sociological perspectives, this thesis seeks to deepen our understanding of how risk perceptions are shaped, communicated, and interpreted in society when assessing the risk that cocaine and drugs in general pose. By understanding these mechanisms, we can inform strategies for effective risk communication, decision-making, and risk management, ultimately contributing to the advancement of risk perception theoretical and practical application into the field of drug and cocaine prevention in Oslo.

Heuristics and Biases

Risk perception, a fundamental aspect of decision-making, is influenced by a myriad of cognitive, affective, social, and contextual factors. This thesis aims to explain the complex interplay of these diverse factors and their impact on individuals' perceptions of risk across drug use, focus on cocaine. By integrating insights from psychology, sociology, and related disciplines, this thesis aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted nature of risk perception and its implications for decision-making, communication, and risk management strategies.

Cognitive factors play a crucial role in shaping individuals' perceptions of risk, encompassing a range of mental processes, heuristics, and biases that influence how risks are perceived, evaluated, and acted upon. Prospect theory, proposed by Kahneman and Tversky (1979), serves as a foundational framework for understanding cognitive factors in risk perception. According to prospect theory, individuals' risk preferences are influenced not only by the objective probabilities and outcomes of events but also by the way these probabilities and outcomes are framed. For example, individuals tend to exhibit risk aversion when faced with choices framed in terms of potential gains, but risk-seeking behavior when facing choices framed in terms of potential losses. This cognitive bias, known as loss aversion, reflects individuals' tendency to weigh potential losses more heavily than equivalent gains.

Additionally, individuals may rely on cognitive shortcuts or heuristics when assessing risks, leading to systematic deviations from normative decision-making processes. The availability heuristic, identified by Tversky and Kahneman (1973), suggests that individuals assess the likelihood of an event based on how easily they can recall similar instances from memory. As a result, events that are more readily available in memory, such as those that receive extensive media coverage or evoke strong emotional reactions, may be perceived as more probable or severe than objectively comparable but less salient events.

Moreover, the representativeness heuristic, also proposed by Tversky and Kahneman (1974), involves making judgments about the likelihood of an event based on how closely it resembles a prototypical or representative example. Individuals may assess the riskiness of an activity or situation by comparing it to familiar prototypes, leading to biased judgments if the true probabilities are not taken into account.

These cognitive biases and heuristics can influence risk perception across various domains, from health decisions to financial investments and environmental policies. For example, research has shown that individuals may overestimate the risk of rare but highly publicized events, such as plane crashes or terrorist attacks, due to the availability heuristic (Slovic et al., 2000). Similarly, individuals may base their perceptions of the safety of new technologies or medical treatments on how similar they are to familiar technologies or treatments, rather than on objective evidence of their risks and benefits.

Affective factors, including emotions and subjective feelings, wield significant influence over individuals' perceptions of risk. Research in psychology has underscored the pivotal role of emotions in shaping risk perception, often leading to systematic biases and distortions in risk assessment. One prominent theory that elucidates the interplay between affective factors and risk perception is the Risk-as-Feelings hypothesis proposed by Loewenstein and colleagues (2001). This hypothesis posits that individuals rely heavily on intuitive, emotional responses when evaluating risks, leading to subjective risk judgments that may diverge from objective assessments.

Emotional responses can amplify or attenuate individuals' perceptions of risk, influencing both the perceived severity and likelihood of potential hazards. For instance, fear is a potent emotion that often magnifies perceptions of risk, especially when risks are perceived as uncontrollable or catastrophic (Lerner & Keltner, 2001). Events that evoke feelings of dread or terror, such as terrorism or natural disasters, tend to elicit heightened risk perceptions, even if the objective probabilities of such events are low. Similarly, outrage or indignation can inflate perceptions of risk, particularly in situations where risks are perceived as unfair or morally reprehensible (Slovic et al., 2004).

Conversely, positive emotions such as hope or optimism can mitigate perceptions of risk, leading individuals to underestimate or downplay potential hazards (Weber, 2006). This phenomenon, known as the "affect heuristic," suggests that individuals may rely on their emotional states as shortcuts when making risk judgments, with positive emotions attenuating perceptions of risk and negative emotions amplifying them (Slovic et al., 2004).

Moreover, affective responses can influence individuals' risk preferences and decision-making strategies. Research has shown that individuals may be more willing to accept risks that evoke positive emotions or offer potential rewards, even if the objective probabilities of harm are high (Loewenstein et al., 2001). Conversely, negative emotions such as anxiety or dread may lead individuals to adopt risk-averse behaviors, avoiding situations perceived as threatening or uncertain.

Social factors play a pivotal role in shaping individuals' perceptions of risk, as risk perceptions are not formed in isolation but are influenced by social interactions, cultural norms, and institutional contexts. Understanding the social dimensions of risk perception is essential for comprehensively analyzing how risks are perceived, communicated, and managed within communities and societies.

One influential framework for understanding the social dimensions of risk perception is the Social Amplification of Risk Framework (SARF) developed by Kasperson and colleagues (1988). SARF posits that risk events undergo a process of amplification or attenuation as they are filtered through various social networks, media channels, and institutional structures. Social amplification mechanisms, such as media coverage, expert opinions, and public discourse, can magnify perceptions of risk, leading to

heightened concern and anxiety among the public. Conversely, social attenuation mechanisms, such as reassurances from authorities or social norms that minimize the significance of risks, may diminish perceptions of risk, leading to complacency or apathy.

Cultural factors also play a significant role in shaping risk perception, as cultural values, beliefs, and practices influence how risks are interpreted and responded to within different cultural contexts (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1982). Cultural worldviews, such as individualism versus collectivism or hierarchy versus egalitarianism, may shape individuals' attitudes towards risk and their willingness to accept or mitigate risks in society. For example, cultures that prioritize individual autonomy and personal freedom may exhibit greater tolerance for risks associated with personal choices or lifestyle behaviors, while cultures that emphasize collective well-being may prioritize precautionary measures to protect public health and safety.

Furthermore, social networks and group dynamics can influence individuals' perceptions of risk through processes of social comparison, conformity, and social influence (Nowak & Vallacher, 1998). Individuals may adjust their risk perceptions and behaviors based on the attitudes and behaviors of their peers, seeking social validation or conformity within their social groups. Social norms, informal rules or expectations within a group or community, can also shape risk perceptions and behaviors by defining what is considered acceptable or appropriate within that social context.

Institutional factors, such as government regulations, organizational policies, and trust in institutions, also play a critical role in shaping risk perception (Earle et al., 2019). Trust in the credibility and competence of institutions responsible for managing risks, such as government agencies or scientific organizations, can influence individuals' perceptions of risk and their willingness to accept or comply with risk management measures. Perceptions of transparency, accountability, and fairness in risk governance processes may also impact public trust and confidence in institutions.

Contextual factors play a crucial role in shaping individuals' perceptions of risk, influencing how risks are framed, evaluated, and responded to within specific environments and circumstances. These factors encompass a wide range of contextual variables, including the characteristics of the risk itself, the situational context in which the risk is encountered, and the broader socio-political and economic context in which risk perceptions are embedded.

One key contextual factor is the perceived familiarity of the risk, which refers to individuals' prior exposure to and experience with the hazard or threat. Research has shown that individuals tend to perceive risks as lower when they are familiar with the hazard, as familiarity can reduce feelings of uncertainty and increase perceptions of control (Slovic, 1987). Conversely, unfamiliar risks or novel technologies may evoke

greater uncertainty and anxiety, leading to heightened perceptions of risk (Slovic et al., 2000).

Another important contextual factor is the perceived controllability of the risk, which refers to individuals' beliefs about their ability to mitigate or manage the risk through their actions or behaviors. Risks that are perceived as controllable may be perceived as less threatening, as individuals may feel empowered to take steps to reduce their exposure or vulnerability (Slovic, 1987). Conversely, risks that are perceived as uncontrollable or beyond individual agency may evoke greater feelings of helplessness and vulnerability, leading to heightened perceptions of risk (Lerner & Keltner, 2001).

Additionally, the social and cultural context in which risks are encountered can significantly influence individuals' perceptions of risk. Cultural norms, values, and beliefs shape how risks are interpreted and evaluated within different cultural contexts (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1982). For example, cultures that prioritize individual autonomy and personal freedom may exhibit greater tolerance for risks associated with personal choices or lifestyle behaviors, while cultures that emphasize collective well-being may prioritize precautionary measures to protect public health and safety.

Furthermore, the broader socio-political and economic context can shape risk perceptions through factors such as media coverage, political discourse, and institutional trust (Earle et al., 2019). Media framing of risks can influence public perceptions and responses, with sensationalized coverage or biased reporting leading to heightened perceptions of risk (Entman, 1993). Political rhetoric and policy decisions can also shape risk perceptions, as individuals may perceive risks differently depending on how they are framed and communicated by political leaders or government agencies.

Decision-making models provide valuable frameworks for understanding how individuals make choices under uncertainty, weighing potential risks and benefits to arrive at optimal or satisfactory outcomes. These models encompass a range of approaches, from normative models that prescribe ideal decision-making strategies to descriptive models that describe how decisions are actually made in practice. Here, we'll explore some key decision-making models and their implications for understanding risk perception and behavior.

Rational Choice Theory (RCT) provides a foundational framework for understanding decision-making processes, particularly in situations involving choices under uncertainty. According to RCT, individuals are assumed to be rational actors who make decisions by weighing the costs and benefits of available options and selecting the one that maximizes their utility or satisfaction (Simon, 1957). This theory posits that individuals have well-defined preferences and stable decision criteria, allowing them to systematically evaluate and choose among alternative courses of action.

One key principle of Rational Choice Theory is the notion of utility maximization, which asserts that individuals seek to maximize their expected utility when making decisions. Utility refers to the subjective value or satisfaction derived from different outcomes, and individuals are assumed to choose the option that yields the highest expected utility based on their preferences and beliefs about the probabilities of different outcomes (Von Neumann & Morgenstern, 1944). From an economic perspective, this implies that individuals strive to maximize their material well-being by making choices that enhance their utility or happiness.

Moreover, Rational Choice Theory emphasizes the importance of consistency and coherence in decision-making, as rational actors are expected to adhere to certain principles of rationality, such as transitivity and completeness of preferences (Sen, 1970). Transitivity implies that if an individual prefers option A to option B and option B to option C, then they should also prefer option A to option C. Completeness, on the other hand, suggests that individuals should be able to rank all possible outcomes or alternatives in order of preference.

While Rational Choice Theory provides a powerful framework for analyzing decision-making processes, critics have pointed out several limitations and challenges associated with its application in real-world settings. One criticism is that the assumption of perfect rationality may not accurately reflect how individuals actually make decisions, as bounded rationality and cognitive biases can lead to deviations from the predictions of RCT (Simon, 1955). Additionally, the assumption of well-defined preferences and stable decision criteria has been challenged by research demonstrating the influence of context, framing effects, and social factors on decision-making behavior (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

Prospect Theory, proposed by Kahneman and Tversky (1979), revolutionized the field of decision-making by challenging the assumptions of traditional rational choice theory and providing a descriptive account of how individuals actually make decisions under uncertainty. At the core of Prospect Theory is the notion that individuals evaluate potential outcomes not in terms of final states of wealth or utility, as assumed by traditional economic models, but rather in terms of gains and losses relative to a reference point (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

One of the key insights of Prospect Theory is the presence of diminishing sensitivity to changes in wealth or utility, known as the diminishing marginal utility of gains and losses. According to Prospect Theory, individuals are risk-averse when facing gains, exhibiting diminishing sensitivity to increasing gains, and risk-seeking when facing losses, exhibiting diminishing sensitivity to increasing losses. This asymmetry in risk preferences reflects the idea that losses loom larger than equivalent gains, a phenomenon known as loss aversion (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

Prospect Theory introduces the concepts of value function and probability weighting function to capture how individuals perceive and evaluate probabilities and outcomes

(Tversky & Kahneman, 1992). The value function maps objective gains and losses onto subjective values or utilities, reflecting individuals' sensitivity to changes in wealth or utility. The probability weighting function, on the other hand, reflects individuals' tendency to overweight small probabilities and underweight large probabilities, leading to nonlinear probability weighting and systematic deviations from expected utility theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

Prospect Theory has been widely applied in various fields, including economics, finance, psychology, and public policy, to understand decision-making behavior in contexts ranging from financial investments to health choices. Its descriptive power has led to numerous empirical findings and practical applications, highlighting the importance of framing effects, reference points, and subjective perceptions of risk and uncertainty in decision-making processes (Thaler & Sunstein, 2008).

However, Prospect Theory is not without its criticisms and limitations. Some researchers have questioned the generalizability of Prospect Theory across different decision contexts and populations, suggesting that its predictions may not always hold true in real-world settings. Moreover, Prospect Theory does not provide a comprehensive account of all aspects of decision-making, such as intertemporal choice or complex social decisions, leaving room for further theoretical development and refinement (Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992).

Dual-process theory offers a comprehensive framework for understanding decision-making processes by positing the existence of two distinct cognitive systems: System 1 and System 2 (Evans, 2008). System 1 is intuitive, automatic, and heuristic-based, relying on quick, effortless judgments and emotional responses. In contrast, System 2 is deliberative, analytical, and rule-based, requiring conscious effort, attention, and logical reasoning. Dual-process theory suggests that decision-making involves a dynamic interplay between these two cognitive systems, with System 1 generating initial impressions and System 2 providing reflective analysis and control over decision outcomes.

One of the key insights of dual-process theory is that System 1 processes often operate automatically and unconsciously, leading to the rapid formation of judgments and decisions based on heuristics and intuitive judgments (Kahneman, 2011). These intuitive judgments are prone to cognitive biases and errors, such as availability heuristic and affect heuristic, which can result in systematic deviations from normative decision-making principles. For example, individuals may rely on vivid or emotionally salient information when assessing risks, leading to overestimation or underestimation of the true probabilities and consequences of events (Slovic et al., 2004).

In contrast, System 2 processes involve deliberate, effortful reasoning and cognitive control, allowing individuals to engage in critical analysis, problem-solving, and logical decision-making (Evans, 2008). System 2 processes are characterized by slower response times, increased cognitive effort, and greater susceptibility to cognitive load

and distraction. While System 2 processes are essential for overcoming biases and errors associated with System 1, they are also limited by cognitive constraints and resource limitations, leading to bounded rationality and suboptimal decision outcomes.

Dual-process theory has been widely applied in various fields, including psychology, economics, and behavioral science, to understand decision-making behavior in contexts ranging from consumer choices to medical decisions (Stanovich & West, 2000). Its integrative approach to understanding the interplay between automatic and controlled cognitive processes has provided valuable insights into the cognitive mechanisms underlying human behavior and decision-making.

However, dual-process theory is not without its criticisms and debates. Some researchers have questioned the precise nature of System 1 and System 2 processes and the boundaries between them, suggesting that decision-making may involve a more complex interplay of multiple cognitive systems (Evans & Stanovich, 2013). Moreover, the extent to which individuals rely on System 1 versus System 2 processes may vary depending on individual differences, task demands, and situational factors, highlighting the need for further research to elucidate the underlying mechanisms of decision-making.

Risk Attenuation

Risk perception of drug use varies significantly across different populations and is influenced by multiple factors, including cultural, social, and individual experiences. Public perception of the risks associated with drug use is often shaped by media portrayal, government policies, and educational campaigns. For instance, the "war on drugs" campaigns in the United States during the 1980s and 1990s heavily emphasized the dangers of drug use, contributing to a heightened public awareness and fear of drugs such as cocaine and crack cocaine (Reinarman & Levine, 1997). This intense focus on the dangers of drug use led to an increased perception of risk, which in turn influenced public support for stringent drug policies.

Individual experiences and social environment also play crucial roles in shaping risk perception. People with personal or familial history of substance abuse tend to have a higher perception of the risks associated with drug use. Peer influence is particularly significant among adolescents and young adults, where social circles can either mitigate or amplify perceptions of risk. Studies have shown that youths who perceive a high level of risk associated with drug use are less likely to engage in substance abuse (Johnston et al., 2018). Conversely, normalization of drug use within peer groups can lead to a lower perception of risk and higher rates of experimentation and regular use.

Educational interventions and public health campaigns can effectively alter risk perceptions by providing factual information about the consequences of drug use. Programs that incorporate interactive and comprehensive education on drug use, such

as those focusing on critical thinking and decision-making skills, have been shown to enhance young people's perception of risk and reduce drug use rates (Botvin et al., 2003). Moreover, public health messages that highlight personal stories and long-term impacts of drug addiction tend to resonate more with audiences, fostering a more accurate understanding of the risks involved.

Media representation of drug use significantly impacts public perception as well. Sensationalist media coverage often exaggerates the dangers, which can lead to a heightened sense of fear and stigma surrounding drug users (Boyd, 2002). This can sometimes backfire, leading to skepticism and decreased trust in public health messages. On the other hand, balanced and evidence-based media reporting can help inform the public about the actual risks of drug use without inducing unnecessary panic

Risk attenuation occurs when the perceived dangers of drug use are minimized, leading to an underestimation of the potential harms. This can be influenced by social norms, peer influence, and media portrayals that downplay the risks of drug use. For instance, the normalization of marijuana use in media and among social circles has contributed to a lower perception of risk, particularly among adolescents and young adults (D'Amico et al., 2015). This diminished perception of harm can lead to increased experimentation and regular use.

The legalization and commercialization of certain drugs, such as cannabis, can also contribute to risk attenuation. When drugs are legalized, they are often perceived as less harmful, partly because they are regulated by government authorities (Hathaway, 2004). This perception can lead to a more casual attitude toward use, disregarding potential health risks.

Moreover, the portrayal of drug use in popular culture, where celebrities and influencers often depict substance use as glamorous or a normal part of life, can attenuate perceived risks. Such portrayals can significantly impact young audiences, who may emulate these behaviors without fully understanding the consequences (Romo, Garnett, & Younger, 2017).

Conversely, risk amplification occurs when the perceived dangers of drug use are exaggerated, often leading to heightened fear and stigma. This can be driven by sensationalist media coverage, which tends to focus on extreme cases of drug-related harm, such as overdose deaths and violent crime. The "crack epidemic" of the 1980s is a notable example, where media and political rhetoric significantly amplified the perceived risks of crack cocaine, leading to widespread panic and stringent drug policies (Reinarman & Levine, 1997).

Governmental campaigns and public health messages also play a role in risk amplification. Anti-drug campaigns that emphasize the severe consequences of drug use, such as the "Just Say No" campaign, can create a heightened sense of danger. While these campaigns aim to deter drug use, they can sometimes lead to an

exaggerated perception of risk, contributing to stigma and discrimination against drug users (Hathaway, 2004).

Social and cultural contexts further influence risk amplification. In communities with high levels of drug-related harm, such as those experiencing significant opioid crises, the perceived risks can be magnified due to direct exposure to the negative consequences of drug use. This can lead to a community-wide amplification of risk perception, affecting attitudes and behaviors towards all forms of substance use (Galea & Vlahov, 2002).

Risk Characterization

Cocaine, a potent stimulant derived from the leaves of the Erythroxylon coca plant, has a complex history marked by both medicinal and recreational use. Historically, indigenous peoples in South America chewed coca leaves for their stimulant effects, a practice that dates back thousands of years (Gootenberg, 2008). The isolation of cocaine alkaloid in the mid-19th century by European scientists led to its initial popularity in medical and therapeutic contexts. It was widely used as a local anesthetic and in various tonics and elixirs touted for their invigorating properties (Grinspoon & Bakalar, 1985). However, the realization of its high potential for abuse and dependency prompted severe restrictions and its eventual classification as an illegal substance in most countries by the early 20th century (Freye, 2009).

Despite stringent legal controls, cocaine remains widely consumed globally, presenting significant health and social challenges. The drug's powerful euphoric effects and its ability to enhance energy and alertness contribute to its continued popularity, particularly in social and recreational settings (UNODC, 2020). However, these effects come at a high cost. The health consequences of cocaine use are profound, including cardiovascular complications, neurological damage, and an increased risk of infectious diseases among users who inject the drug (Karila et al., 2008). Socially, cocaine use is linked to a myriad of problems, including crime, violence, and social instability, as well as significant economic burdens due to healthcare costs and lost productivity (Dwyer & Moore, 2010).

Pharmacology

Cocaine's pharmacological actions are central to its profound effects on the brain and body. Primarily, cocaine exerts its influence by disrupting the normal reuptake process of neurotransmitters, particularly dopamine, serotonin, and norepinephrine, within the central nervous system (Rothman & Baumann, 2003). This disruption leads to the accumulation of these neurotransmitters in the synaptic clefts, intensifying and prolonging their effects on neuronal signaling.

Dopamine is a key neurotransmitter associated with reward, motivation, and pleasure. Cocaine blocks the dopamine transporter protein, preventing the reuptake of

dopamine from the synaptic cleft into presynaptic neurons. Consequently, dopamine levels in the synaptic space increase, resulting in heightened activation of dopamine receptors postsynaptically (Volkow et al., 2012). This surge in dopamine transmission underlies the euphoric and rewarding effects of cocaine, reinforcing drug-seeking behavior and contributing to its addictive properties.

Serotonin, another neurotransmitter targeted by cocaine, plays a crucial role in mood regulation, appetite, and sleep. Similar to its action on dopamine transporters, cocaine inhibits the reuptake of serotonin, leading to elevated serotonin levels in the synaptic cleft (Herr et al., 2013). This increase in serotonin neurotransmission may contribute to the mood-elevating effects of cocaine, as well as its potential to induce feelings of well-being and euphoria.

Norepinephrine is involved in the body's stress response, arousal, and attention. Cocaine's inhibition of norepinephrine reuptake results in enhanced norepinephrine signaling in the brain, leading to increased alertness, heightened arousal, and amplified sympathetic nervous system activity (Sofuoglu & Sewell, 2009). These effects contribute to cocaine's stimulating properties, including increased energy, decreased fatigue, and enhanced cognitive function.

Repeated exposure to cocaine results in significant alterations in the brain's reward circuitry, ultimately driving the development of addiction. Chronic cocaine use induces profound neuroadaptations that disrupt the normal functioning of neurotransmitter systems, leading to enduring changes in synaptic plasticity, gene expression, and neural connectivity (Kauer & Malenka, 2007). These adaptations contribute to the persistent reinforcement of drug-seeking behavior and the development of compulsive drug use patterns, even in the face of adverse consequences.

Cocaine exposure induces synaptic plasticity, the ability of synapses to strengthen or weaken over time in response to neuronal activity. Specifically, cocaine alters the structure and function of synapses within the brain's reward circuitry, including regions such as the nucleus accumbens and prefrontal cortex (Robinson & Kolb, 2004). These changes, which involve alterations in the density and morphology of dendritic spines, are thought to underlie the long-lasting changes in synaptic transmission associated with cocaine addiction.

Chronic cocaine use also exerts profound effects on gene expression within the brain. Cocaine exposure leads to the activation or suppression of specific genes involved in neuronal signaling, synaptic plasticity, and reward processing (Renthal & Nestler, 2008). These changes in gene expression contribute to the lasting alterations in neuronal function and behavior observed in individuals with cocaine addiction. Moreover, epigenetic mechanisms, such as DNA methylation and histone modifications, play a crucial role in mediating the long-term effects of cocaine on gene expression (Robison & Nestler, 2011).

Alterations in neural connectivity represent another hallmark of cocaine addiction. Chronic cocaine use disrupts the connectivity patterns within the brain's reward circuitry, leading to aberrant communication between regions involved in reward processing, decision-making, and impulse control (Kalivas & Volkow, 2005). These changes in neural connectivity contribute to the dysregulated reward processing and compulsive drug-seeking behavior characteristic of addiction.

Cocaine use exhibits considerable variation across different regions and demographic groups, with significant implications for public health and policy. According to data from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), approximately 18.1 million individuals globally reported using cocaine in 2019, representing approximately 0.4% of the adult population aged 15-64 (UNODC, 2020). However, the prevalence rates of cocaine use are not uniform and vary considerably between different geographic regions and population subsets.

In terms of geographical distribution, the highest prevalence rates of cocaine use are consistently observed in North America, Western and Central Europe, and Oceania (UNODC, 2020). These regions have historically been identified as major markets for cocaine consumption, driven by factors such as economic prosperity, cultural norms, and accessibility to illicit drug markets. In North America, for example, the United States has long been recognized as one of the largest consumer markets for cocaine, with high rates of use observed across various demographic groups (SAMHSA, 2019). Similarly, countries in Western and Central Europe, such as Spain, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands, have reported significant levels of cocaine consumption, often associated with urban nightlife and recreational drug cultures (EMCDDA, 2021).

Cocaine use also exhibits distinct demographic patterns, with variations observed in terms of age, gender, socioeconomic status, and ethnicity. While cocaine use has historically skewed towards younger age groups and urban populations, recent trends indicate a broader demographic profile, with increasing rates of use observed among older adults and individuals from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds (Keyes et al., 2011). Additionally, gender disparities in cocaine use have been documented, with men traditionally reporting higher rates of consumption compared to women, although this gap appears to be narrowing in recent years (SAMHSA, 2019). Furthermore, disparities in cocaine use prevalence are often associated with socioeconomic factors, with individuals from lower-income communities disproportionately affected by substance use disorders and related health consequences (Jones et al., 2015).

Recent years have seen the emergence of new trends in cocaine use, including changes in consumption patterns, modes of administration, and polydrug use practices. The widespread availability of cocaine in various forms, including powder cocaine and crack cocaine, has contributed to diverse patterns of use, with some individuals opting for recreational or occasional use, while others develop more problematic patterns of dependence and addiction (Degenhardt et al., 2016).

Additionally, the co-use of cocaine with other substances, such as alcohol, cannabis, and prescription drugs, presents complex challenges for public health interventions and treatment approaches (Hedegaard et al., 2020).

Cocaine use poses significant health risks across multiple organ systems, contributing to a range of acute and chronic medical conditions. One of the most serious health consequences of cocaine use is its impact on cardiovascular health. Cocaine can cause acute cardiovascular complications, including myocardial infarction (heart attack), arrhythmias, and hypertension, which can be life-threatening (Karch, 2008). Chronic cocaine use is also associated with the development of cardiovascular diseases such as cardiomyopathy, atherosclerosis, and stroke (Finkel & Prisciandaro, 2017). Additionally, cocaine use can lead to respiratory issues, including respiratory depression, pulmonary edema, and chronic bronchitis, particularly among individuals who smoke crack cocaine (Saravane et al., 2009).

Neurologically, cocaine use can have profound effects on brain function and structure, contributing to cognitive impairment, motor dysfunction, and increased risk of stroke and seizures (NIDA, 2020). Chronic cocaine use is associated with alterations in neurotransmitter systems, including dopamine, serotonin, and glutamate, which can lead to long-term changes in brain function and behavior (Kalivas & Volkow, 2005).

Furthermore, the practice of injecting cocaine carries additional health risks, including an increased risk of infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS and hepatitis C due to needle-sharing behaviors (Karila et al., 2008). Injection drug use also poses risks of local complications such as abscesses, cellulitis, and venous thrombosis, further contributing to the burden of morbidity and mortality associated with cocaine use (Leri et al., 2003).

The social ramifications of cocaine use extend beyond individual health outcomes, impacting communities and societies at large. Cocaine trafficking and distribution are often associated with organized crime, violence, and corruption, perpetuating social and economic disparities (Dwyer & Moore, 2010). The illicit nature of the cocaine trade fuels criminal activities such as drug trafficking, money laundering, and gang violence, contributing to increased rates of crime and social instability in affected communities (Caulkins et al., 2010).

Moreover, the stigma surrounding cocaine use can exacerbate social marginalization and hinder access to essential support services for affected individuals. The fear of judgment and discrimination may deter individuals from seeking treatment for substance use disorders, leading to prolonged suffering and worsening health outcomes (Room, 2005). Additionally, societal attitudes towards drug addiction often perpetuate misconceptions and stereotypes, further complicating efforts to address the root causes of substance abuse and provide comprehensive support to affected individuals and communities.

Cocaine has been used for its stimulant properties for centuries, and its effects on sexual behavior are a significant area of concern. The drug is known to enhance libido and sexual pleasure, which can lead to its use specifically for sexual purposes. Users often report increased confidence, heightened sensory perception, and reduced sexual inhibitions when using cocaine, making it appealing for sexual encounters. However, these perceived benefits come with substantial risks and adverse effects.

Cocaine's ability to increase dopamine levels in the brain can result in a temporary boost in sexual arousal and performance. This heightened state of arousal and reduced inhibition can lead to prolonged sexual activity and increased pleasure. According to studies, users often seek out cocaine to overcome sexual anxiety or enhance their sexual experiences (Rawson et al., 2002). These effects make cocaine particularly popular in certain social and party environments where sexual activities may be more prevalent.

Despite the initial perceived benefits, cocaine use for sexual purposes carries significant risks. Chronic use can lead to serious health issues, including cardiovascular problems, neurological damage, and mental health disorders such as anxiety and paranoia (Karila et al., 2010). Additionally, the drug's impact on sexual function can be paradoxical; while it may enhance sexual desire initially, long-term use is associated with sexual dysfunction, including erectile dysfunction in men and reduced sexual satisfaction in both men and women (Volkow et al., 2007).

Cocaine use is also linked to risky sexual behaviors, which can increase the likelihood of contracting sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and engaging in unsafe sex. The disinhibition caused by cocaine can lead to multiple sexual partners, unprotected sex, and sex with high-risk partners (Hoffman et al., 2000). These behaviors are particularly concerning in populations already vulnerable to drug abuse and sexual exploitation, compounding their risk of adverse health outcomes.

The use of cocaine for sexual purposes can have severe psychological and social implications. The drug's influence on judgment and impulse control can lead to regrettable decisions, strained relationships, and an overall decline in social functioning. Furthermore, the intertwining of cocaine use and sexual activity can create a cycle of dependency, where users feel unable to engage in sexual activity without the drug, further entrenching their addiction (Leeman et al., 2010).

Prevention efforts play a crucial role in curbing the initiation of cocaine use and reducing its prevalence among vulnerable populations. Educational initiatives aimed at raising awareness about the risks associated with cocaine use are integral components of prevention strategies (Faggiano et al., 2014). These programs target various settings, including schools, communities, and workplaces, and employ evidence-based approaches to provide accurate information about the health consequences of cocaine use and promote healthy lifestyle choices. Additionally, prevention efforts often focus on building resilience and protective factors among at-

risk populations, including adolescents and young adults, by fostering positive social connections, coping skills, and decision-making abilities (Botvin et al., 2010).

Effective treatment approaches for cocaine addiction encompass a range of behavioral and pharmacological interventions aimed at addressing the complex nature of the disorder. Behavioral therapies, such as cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), contingency management, and motivational interviewing, are among the most widely utilized approaches for treating cocaine addiction (Knapp et al., 2007). These therapies target maladaptive patterns of thinking and behavior associated with drug use, helping individuals develop coping strategies, enhance motivation for change, and build relapse prevention skills. Pharmacological interventions, including medications such as disulfiram, modafinil, and topiramate, may also be utilized to manage withdrawal symptoms and reduce cravings (Karila et al., 2008). However, medication-assisted treatment for cocaine addiction remains an area of ongoing research and development, with limited options currently approved for clinical use.

Comprehensive rehabilitation programs that address the multifaceted needs of individuals with cocaine addiction are essential for promoting long-term recovery and reducing the risk of relapse. These programs often incorporate a range of services, including medical detoxification, individual and group therapy, vocational training, and social support services (National Institute on Drug Abuse, 2020). Additionally, the integration of peer support networks, family therapy, and community-based resources can further enhance the effectiveness of rehabilitation efforts by providing individuals with ongoing support and encouragement throughout the recovery process.

Policy responses to cocaine use vary widely across different countries and jurisdictions, reflecting diverse approaches to drug control and public health. Historically, many countries have adopted strict prohibitionist policies that prioritize law enforcement and criminalization as primary strategies for addressing drug-related issues (Hughes & Stevens, 2010). However, there is growing recognition of the limitations of punitive approaches and the need for more comprehensive and balanced responses to drug use.

In recent years, some countries have implemented harm reduction strategies and decriminalization policies aimed at reducing the negative consequences of drug use while prioritizing public health and human rights (Degenhardt et al., 2010). For example, Portugal's decriminalization of drug possession for personal use in 2001 has been associated with significant reductions in drug-related harms, including decreases in drug-related deaths, HIV infections, and incarceration rates (Hughes & Stevens, 2010). Other harm reduction initiatives, such as syringe exchange programs, supervised injection facilities, and opioid substitution therapy, have also demonstrated effectiveness in reducing the harms associated with drug use and promoting access to health services for marginalized populations (Degenhardt et al., 2010).

Stigma surrounding drug use is a pervasive issue that significantly impacts individuals who use drugs, their families, and broader societal efforts to address substance abuse. This stigma manifests in various forms, including social disapproval, discrimination, and the internalization of negative stereotypes, which collectively exacerbate the challenges faced by those struggling with addiction.

Social disapproval of drug use often leads to discrimination in numerous aspects of life, including healthcare, employment, and social interactions. Individuals who use drugs are frequently perceived as morally flawed or lacking self-control, which fosters an environment of judgment and exclusion (Link & Phelan, 2001). This discrimination can deter individuals from seeking help, as they fear being labeled or ostracized by their communities. Research has shown that stigma is a significant barrier to accessing treatment and support services, thereby hindering recovery efforts (Corrigan et al., 2014).

Internalized stigma, where individuals accept and internalize the negative beliefs society holds about drug users, can lead to profound mental health issues. Feelings of shame, guilt, and low self-esteem are common among those who use drugs, and these feelings can perpetuate a cycle of addiction (Luoma et al., 2007). The psychological burden of stigma can exacerbate mental health disorders such as depression and anxiety, making it more challenging for individuals to break free from substance dependence (Livingston et al., 2012).

Stigma not only affects mental health but also has tangible impacts on physical health and recovery outcomes. Stigmatized individuals are less likely to seek medical care or engage in harm reduction practices due to fear of judgment and discrimination from healthcare providers (van Boekel et al., 2013). This reluctance to access healthcare can lead to untreated medical conditions and a higher risk of overdose and infectious diseases among drug users. Addressing stigma is thus essential for improving health outcomes and supporting successful recovery.

Structural stigma refers to the societal and institutional policies that perpetuate negative attitudes towards drug users. Laws and regulations that criminalize drug use contribute to the marginalization of individuals with substance use disorders and reinforce societal stigma (Room, 2005). For example, punitive drug policies can result in the incarceration of individuals for non-violent drug offenses, limiting their opportunities for rehabilitation and social reintegration. Reforms aimed at decriminalizing drug use and promoting harm reduction approaches are crucial for reducing structural stigma and supporting public health.

Efforts to reduce stigma must involve both societal and systemic changes. Public education campaigns that promote understanding of addiction as a medical condition rather than a moral failing can help shift public perceptions (Barry et al., 2014). Training for healthcare providers on the principles of compassionate and non-judgmental care is also vital for improving interactions with individuals who use drugs. Additionally,

policy reforms that emphasize treatment and support over punitive measures can create a more supportive environment for recovery (Buchanan & Young, 2000).

Rave culture, characterized by electronic dance music, all-night parties, and vibrant social interactions, has long been associated with drug use, particularly stimulants like cocaine. Cocaine, a powerful central nervous system stimulant, is often sought after for its ability to enhance energy, euphoria, and social bonding—effects that align well with the high-energy environment of rave scenes.

Cocaine use within rave culture is prevalent, driven by the desire to maintain prolonged periods of wakefulness and high levels of physical activity. Studies have shown that individuals attending raves are significantly more likely to use cocaine compared to those who participate in other types of nightlife activities (Van Havere et al., 2011). This trend is supported by research indicating that the intense, immersive experiences provided by raves often lead to higher consumption of stimulants, including cocaine, to sustain energy and enhance the overall sensory experience (Rigg & Sharp, 2018).

The social dynamics of rave culture play a crucial role in the prevalence of cocaine use. Peer influence is a significant factor, with attendees often feeling pressure to conform to the drug-using behaviors of their social groups (Kelly, 2007). The communal atmosphere of raves, where music and dance create a shared sense of euphoria, can further reinforce the use of cocaine as a means to enhance social bonding and collective enjoyment (Hunt et al., 2010). Additionally, the normalization of drug use within rave culture reduces perceived risks and stigmatization, making it more likely for individuals to experiment with and regularly use cocaine.

The use of cocaine at raves is associated with numerous health risks, exacerbated by the demanding physical environment. Cocaine increases heart rate and blood pressure, which, when combined with intense physical exertion from dancing, can lead to serious cardiovascular issues such as heart attacks or strokes (Winstock et al., 2001). Moreover, the combination of cocaine with other substances commonly used at raves, such as MDMA (ecstasy), can result in unpredictable and dangerous interactions, increasing the risk of adverse health outcomes (Schifano et al., 2003). The setting of raves, often crowded and with limited access to medical assistance, further complicates the ability to manage drug-related emergencies effectively.

Addressing cocaine use within rave culture requires targeted harm reduction and intervention strategies. Initiatives such as on-site drug testing services allow attendees to verify the content and purity of their substances, reducing the risk of consuming adulterated drugs (Benschop et al., 2002). Additionally, providing education about the risks of cocaine use, promoting safer drug use practices, and ensuring the availability of medical support at rave events can help mitigate some of the health risks associated with drug use (Winstock et al., 2001). Policymakers and event organizers must work collaboratively to create environments that prioritize the safety and well-being of rave attendees while respecting the cultural aspects of the scene.

4. METHODOLOGY

The choice to utilize case studies in this research is driven by the need to gain a deep, contextual understanding of cocaine use and its perceived risks within a specific socio-cultural framework. Case studies enable the exploration of complex phenomena in their real-life settings, offering rich, nuanced insights that quantitative methods might miss (Yin, 2018). This approach is particularly valuable for examining the multifaceted nature of drug use and risk perception, as it allows for an in-depth analysis of how these issues are influenced by local conditions and experiences.

Selection of Norway

Cocaine use in Norway has become a notable public health concern, reflecting broader trends in drug use across Europe. According to recent reports, Norway has seen a steady increase in cocaine consumption, particularly among young adults and urban populations. The 2019 European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (ESPAD) indicated that lifetime prevalence of cocaine use among Norwegian students was around 3%, aligning with the European average (ESPAD, 2019). Additionally, the Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPH) reports that cocaine use is more prevalent in nightlife settings and among individuals with higher socio-economic status (NIPH, 2021). The rise in cocaine use has been associated with various health and social challenges, including increased emergency room visits due to overdoses and a rise in drug-related violence and criminal activities. The Norwegian government has responded with a combination of preventive measures, harm reduction strategies, and efforts to enhance treatment accessibility for those struggling with cocaine addiction (Norwegian Directorate of Health, 2020). Despite these efforts, ongoing monitoring and targeted interventions are essential to address the evolving nature of cocaine use in Norway.

The study of Bretteville-Jensen, Melberg, & Yttri emphasizes the importance of addressing structural determinants of drug-related harm, such as poverty, unemployment, and housing instability. Structural interventions aimed at reducing social inequality and improving access to education, employment, and social support have the potential to mitigate the underlying drivers of substance abuse and promote health equity. Policies focused on improving social determinants can significantly reduce drug-related harm by addressing the root causes of substance misuse (Bretteville-Jensen, Melberg, & Yttri, 2018).

These insights from the Bretteville-Jensen, Melberg, and Yttri's study underscore the complex interplay between social inequality and drug use in Norway, highlighting the need for multi-faceted approaches to address both immediate and structural factors contributing to substance abuse.

The findings of Skretting and Sandberg in their study "Young Drug Dealers in Oslo: Negotiating Gender, Ethnicity, and Drug Market Variations" shed light on several key

aspects of youth involvement in drug dealing in Oslo, Norway. Here are some of the main findings:

The study reveals distinct gender dynamics within the drug trade, with male and female participants often assuming different roles and facing unique challenges. Male drug dealers were more likely to be involved in street-level dealing and enforcement activities, while females tended to operate in more covert roles, such as hiding drugs or carrying out transactions in private spaces. This gendered division of labor highlights the different risks and responsibilities associated with male and female participation in the drug trade. Males often faced greater exposure to law enforcement and violence, whereas females were more involved in logistical support and risk mitigation (Skretting & Sandberg, 2018).

Ethnicity plays a significant role in shaping individuals' access to and involvement in different segments of the drug market. Participants from ethnic minority backgrounds often faced barriers in entering certain market niches, while others found themselves confined to specific roles or territories based on their ethnicity. This segmentation can limit opportunities for ethnic minorities, reinforcing social and economic disparities within the drug trade. Moreover, ethnic minority dealers often had to navigate additional layers of discrimination and marginalization both within and outside the illicit market (Skretting & Sandberg, 2018).

The study highlights how young drug dealers adapt their strategies and behaviors in response to variations in the drug market. Participants demonstrated flexibility in navigating different market conditions, exploiting opportunities, and mitigating risks based on factors such as product availability, competition, and law enforcement presence. This adaptability is crucial for survival in the volatile environment of drug dealing, where market dynamics can shift rapidly due to changes in supply, demand, and regulatory pressures (Skretting & Sandberg, 2018).

The findings underscore the intersectionality of gender and ethnicity in shaping individuals' experiences within the drug trade. For example, female drug dealers from ethnic minority backgrounds faced intersecting forms of discrimination and marginalization, which influenced their opportunities and vulnerabilities in the illicit market. This intersectionality often compounded the challenges they faced, making it harder for them to find secure and profitable positions within the drug economy (Skretting & Sandberg, 2018).

Social networks play a crucial role in facilitating individuals' entry into the drug trade and sustaining their involvement over time. Participants often relied on existing connections within their communities or peer groups to enter the market, highlighting the importance of social capital in navigating illicit economies. These networks provided access to resources, information, and protection, which are essential for managing the risks associated with drug dealing (Skretting & Sandberg, 2018).

Overall, Skretting and Sandberg's (2018) study provides valuable insights into the complex interplay of gender, ethnicity, and market dynamics in shaping youth involvement in drug dealing in Oslo. These findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the structural factors influencing illicit drug markets and inform efforts to develop targeted interventions and policies aimed at addressing the needs of vulnerable youth populations.

The National Action Plan for Drug Prevention (2018–2022), published by the Norwegian Directorate of Health, outlines a comprehensive strategy aimed at preventing drug abuse and promoting public health across Norway. This plan reflects a multi-faceted approach that integrates various prevention efforts, educational initiatives, and policy interventions to address substance abuse at both individual and societal levels (Norwegian Directorate of Health, 2018).

The plan emphasizes the importance of early intervention and prevention efforts to reduce the initiation of drug use among vulnerable populations, particularly youth. This involves implementing evidence-based prevention programs in schools, communities, and other settings to equip individuals with the knowledge, skills, and resources needed to make healthy choices and resist peer pressure. Such programs are designed to educate young people about the risks of drug use and to build their resilience against social and environmental influences that may lead to substance abuse (Norwegian Directorate of Health, 2018).

In addition to prevention, the action plan prioritizes harm reduction strategies aimed at minimizing the negative consequences associated with drug use. This includes expanding access to harm reduction services such as needle exchange programs, overdose prevention initiatives, and opioid substitution therapy. These measures are crucial for reducing the transmission of blood-borne diseases, such as HIV and hepatitis C, and for preventing overdoses, thus saving lives and improving health outcomes for drug users (Norwegian Directorate of Health, 2018).

The plan underscores the importance of providing accessible and effective treatment and rehabilitation services for individuals struggling with drug addiction. This involves enhancing the availability of evidence-based treatment modalities, such as medication-assisted therapy and psychotherapy, and ensuring continuity of care and support for individuals throughout the recovery process. By improving treatment accessibility and quality, the plan aims to facilitate successful recovery and reintegration of individuals into society (Norwegian Directorate of Health, 2018).

The action plan advocates for raising public awareness about the risks and consequences of drug abuse through targeted educational campaigns and initiatives. This includes disseminating accurate information about the effects of different substances, promoting responsible use, and challenging stigmatizing attitudes towards individuals with substance use disorders. Public education efforts are essential for creating a supportive environment that encourages individuals to seek

help and reduces the social stigma associated with drug addiction (Norwegian Directorate of Health, 2018).

The plan emphasizes the need for coordinated action and collaboration among various stakeholders, including government agencies, healthcare providers, law enforcement, and community organizations. This involves developing and implementing evidence-based policies and regulations to address drug-related issues effectively and efficiently. By fostering a collaborative approach, the plan aims to ensure that all sectors of society work together to combat drug abuse and support public health initiatives (Norwegian Directorate of Health, 2018).

Overall, the National Action Plan for Drug Prevention (2018–2022) reflects Norway's commitment to promoting public health and well-being by addressing the complex challenges associated with drug abuse. By integrating prevention, harm reduction, treatment, and policy interventions, the plan seeks to reduce the prevalence of drug use, mitigate its harmful effects, and support individuals and communities affected by substance abuse (Norwegian Directorate of Health, 2018).

Data Collection

Norway was selected as the focal country for this case study due to its unique socio-economic, cultural, and policy environment, which provides a compelling context for examining cocaine use and risk perception. Several factors make Norway an ideal case study:

1. Progressive Drug Policies: Norway is known for its progressive approach to drug policy, including harm reduction strategies and a focus on public health over punitive measures. This provides a rich context for exploring how these policies impact cocaine use and risk perception.
2. Public Health Framework:The country's robust public health system allows for comprehensive data collection and analysis on substance use patterns, enabling a detailed examination of the health impacts of cocaine use.
3. Social Inequality: Research, such as the study by Bretteville-Jensen, Melberg, and Yttri (2018), highlights the role of social inequality in shaping drug use patterns in Norway. This aspect offers an opportunity to investigate how socio-economic factors influence risk perception and behavior related to cocaine use.
4. Cultural Context:Norway's cultural attitudes towards drug use, influenced by its social and economic policies, provide a unique setting for understanding how cultural factors shape risk perception.
5. Opportunity to conduct live interviews: Due to living in Oslo at the time of writing this thesis, the possibility to conduct live interviews was viable.

The data collection process for this research employs a mixed-methods approach, combining a review of expert discussions, analysis of documents and news articles, and semi-structured interviews. This approach ensures a comprehensive

understanding of cocaine use and its perceived risks, enhancing the validity and reliability of the findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

While documents, articles and studies were analyzed as part of the theoretical material for the first part of this thesis, and although it will be used for the discussion, further ahead in this thesis; the main source of data are semi-structured interviews conducted to 17 individuals who have used cocaine at least once.

While the original plan on the thesis was to have a more formal format, this was not possible due to the hesitation from participants and organization. However, the interviews were conducted in a casual format under particular circumstances described below and the objective to provide insights and firsthand accounts of the perceived risks and experiences related to cocaine use is believed to be achieved.

In this thesis it is accepted that there is a risk of bias and misleading results as most of the interviewees were under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol when the interview was conducted.

For privacy and security reasons, the identity of all interviewees will remain anonymous with only age range and nationality being mentioned in this thesis.

Verbal consent from all participants was given and although it is acknowledge that most participants were under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol, it is also acknowledge that the level of influence was low at the time of the interview, under the premise that their identity will remain anonymous and that the only object of the interview was academic research.

It is also acknowledged that the interviewer was not under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol at the time the interviews were conducted.

There were 4 settings were the interviews were conducted:

1. At a rave event (name of the event not disclosed in the thesis) targeting mainly LGBTQ+ individuals, where 10 of the participants were interviewed. Age range 21 to 44. 7 participants were Norwegian, 1 was Swedish, 1 Brazilian and 1 Mexican.
2. At a rave event (name of the event not disclosed in the thesis) with no specific target. where 4 participants were interviewed. Age 18 to 34. All participants are Norwegian.
3. At the streets of Oslo, on a central location (exact location not disclosed in the thesis), where 2 participants were interviewed, Age 36 and 67. All participants are Norwegian.
4. At the tram in Oslo (exact location not disclosed in the thesis), where one participant was interviewed. Age 22. Participant is Norwegian.

Note: both rave events were legal, no illegal activity was performed during the interviews.

5. RESULTS

Cocaine's history spans thousands of years, rooted in indigenous South American traditions. The coca plant, considered sacred, was used to enhance endurance and reduce fatigue (Gootenberg, 2008).

In the mid-19th century, European chemists isolated cocaine from coca leaves. German chemist Albert Niemann first extracted and identified it in 1859, noting its anesthetic properties (Freye, 2009). By the late 19th century, cocaine was widely used in medicine, praised by figures like Sigmund Freud (Freud, 1884).

Cocaine became popular beyond medicine, featuring in products like the original Coca-Cola until 1904 (Pendergrast, 2000). However, its adverse effects soon became clear, leading to addiction and fatalities. This prompted regulatory actions, such as the 1914 Harrison Narcotics Tax Act in the U.S. (Musto, 1999) and international treaties like the 1925 International Opium Convention and the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (UNODC, 2020; McAllister, 2000).

Despite these efforts, cocaine trafficking persisted, becoming a major issue by the late 20th century with increased production in South America and the rise of powerful cartels (Bagley, 1988). The widespread abuse led to significant social and public health challenges, prompting global strategies to combat cocaine trafficking and abuse.

The findings of Bretteville-Jensen, Melberg, and Yttri in their study titled "Drugs and Social Inequality: Challenges and Insights in Norwegian Drug Research" provide significant insights into the relationship between drug use and social inequality in Norway

The study highlights the existence of social inequalities in drug use patterns, with individuals from lower socio-economic backgrounds more likely to engage in substance misuse compared to their more affluent counterparts. This disparity underscores the role of socio-economic factors in shaping drug consumption behaviors. Lower-income individuals often face more stress and fewer resources for healthy coping mechanisms, making them more vulnerable to substance misuse (Bretteville-Jensen, Melberg, & Yttri, 2018).

The findings reveal that individuals experiencing social marginalization, such as homelessness, unemployment, or incarceration, are particularly vulnerable to drug use and related harms. Social exclusion and economic instability exacerbate the risk of substance abuse among marginalized populations, contributing to cycles of addiction and disadvantage. The study emphasizes how social marginalization leads to an environment where drug use becomes a coping mechanism for dealing with adverse life conditions (Bretteville-Jensen, Melberg, & Yttri, 2018).

The study identifies barriers to accessing drug treatment and support services among socio-economically disadvantaged individuals. Factors such as financial constraints, lack of transportation, and stigma associated with seeking help hinder access to essential resources, perpetuating inequalities in health outcomes and recovery trajectories. These barriers create significant challenges for effective intervention and support for those in need, highlighting the necessity of tailored and accessible treatment options (Bretteville-Jensen, Melberg, & Yttri, 2018).

The findings highlight the intersectionality of drug use, social inequality, and mental health issues. Individuals facing socio-economic disadvantage are more likely to experience co-occurring mental health disorders, compounding the challenges associated with substance misuse and complicating efforts to address underlying vulnerabilities. This intersectionality indicates that comprehensive approaches to drug treatment should include mental health support to address the full scope of individuals' needs (Bretteville-Jensen, Melberg, & Yttri, 2018).

The following are the quantitative results of the semi-structured interviews conducted for this thesis:

Ethnic background:

- 14 participants were Norwegian.

Gender:

- 16 participants were male.
- 1 participant was female.
- Note: it is admitted by this thesis that this result does not provide any conclusive evidence as the gender is due to available participants accepting to be part of this study and not necessarily as a fair portrait of the distribution of gender among cocaine users.

Sexual orientation

- 12 participants are part of the LGBTQ+ community.
- Note: it is admitted by this thesis that this result does not provide any conclusive evidence as the sexual orientation is due to available participants accepting to be part of this study and not necessarily as a fair portrait of the distribution of sexual orientation among cocaine users.

Place of residence:

- 16 participants reside in Oslo, while the remaining one participant resides in Spain.

What is the level of education of the interviewees:

- 13 participants hold bachelor degree or are completing a bachelor program.
- 2 participants hold a master degree.
- 2 participants don't hold neither a master or bachelor degree.
    - Inconclusive to say if they hold a High school degree.

How often do you use cocaine:

- 100% of all participants admitted to use cocaine on a regular basis.
    - 14 participants admitted to use cocaine at least once a month.
    - 2 participants admitted to use cocaine almost every day.
    - 1 participant admitted to use cocaine at least once every 6 months.

How easy is to obtain cocaine in Oslo:

- 100% of all participants believe it is "easy" to obtain cocaine in Oslo.

How old were they when they first consumed cocaine?

- 13 participants admitted to first use cocaine in their 20s.
- 2 participants admitted to first use cocaine in their 30s.
- 2 participants admitted to first use cocaine before their 20s.

Why do you use cocaine?

- 15 participants admitted to use cocaine for recreational purposes.
- 2 participants admitted to use cocaine as an escape from everyday problems.

Do you consider peer pressure as a factor in the first time you consumed cocaine?

- 7 participants answered yes.
- 9 participants answered no.
- 1 participant didn't understand the question.

How low or high do you consider the risk you are at when under the influence of cocaine?

- 15 participants believe the risk is low.
- 2 participants believe the risk is medium.

Why do you feel the risk is low under the influence of cocaine?

- From the 15 participants, 13 believe it is because they consider they don't do big doses and in their words "can control it".
- From the 15 participants, 2 believe it is because they consider cocaine as a mild drug compared to other ones.

Have you taken other drugs other than cocaine?

- All participants admitted to have used at least once another drug than cocaine.

How often do you consume other drugs than cocaine?

- 5 participants admitted to use other drugs once or twice every six months.
- 10 participants admitted to use other drugs once or twice every year.
- 2 participants admitted to use other drugs more than twice every week.

Do you consider you have a drug problem?

- 15 participants believe they don't have a problem with drug consumption.
- 1 participant believes they have a problem with drug consumption.
- 1 participant doesn't know if they have a problem with drug consumption.

Do you use drugs during sex?

- 15 participants admitted to use drugs during sex on a sporadic basis.
- 1 participant admitted to use drugs during sex on a regular basis.
- 1 participant didn't want to answer the question.

Do you feel cocaine helps ease your problems?

- 5 participants believe cocaine helps with their problems.
- 10 participants believe cocaine does not have any impact on their problems.
- 2 participants believe cocaine negatively impacts their problems.

Do you feel illegal activities related to drug use impacts the violence committed in Oslo?

- 16 participants believe it does have an impact.
- 1 participant believes it has no impact.

6. DISCUSSION

Risk Attenuation

Cognitive factors play a significant role in shaping individuals' risk perceptions associated with drug use. These cognitive processes influence how individuals perceive, interpret, and respond to information about the risks and benefits of drug use, ultimately influencing their decisions and behaviors. Several cognitive factors can impact risk perception in the context of drug use:

Media coverage plays a crucial role in shaping public perceptions of drug risks. When drugs receive substantial media attention, particularly in the context of crises or high-profile cases, people tend to overestimate the dangers associated with those drugs. This phenomenon, known as the availability heuristic, means that the more readily an example of drug-related harm comes to mind, the more likely individuals are to perceive drug use as highly risky (Slovic et al., 2004). For example, the opioid crisis has been extensively covered in the media, leading to heightened public awareness and fear.

The way information about drug use is presented also significantly impacts risk perception. Information framed in terms of benefits, such as improved social interactions or relaxation, often leads to a lower perception of risk. Conversely, when the same information is framed highlighting potential losses, such as health issues or addiction, the perceived risk increases (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). This framing effect underscores the importance of how drug education and public health messages are communicated.

Biases

Individuals' belief in their ability to control their drug use can influence how risky they perceive it to be. When people feel they can manage their drug consumption and avoid negative consequences, they tend to view drug use as less risky (Ajzen, 1991). This perceived control can be misleading and may contribute to underestimating the potential for addiction and other harms.

Cognitive biases like optimistic bias can lead individuals to believe they are less likely than others to experience negative outcomes from drug use, even when they engage in similar behaviors. This unrealistic optimism results in a discrepancy between perceived and actual risks, potentially fostering risky behaviors (Weinstein, 1980). People often think, "It won't happen to me," which can diminish the perceived urgency to avoid drug use.

When making decisions about drug use, individuals often rely on cognitive shortcuts or heuristics, such as stereotypes or emotional responses. These heuristics can lead to biased perceptions of risk, where emotional reactions to drugs, whether fear or indifference, skew a person's assessment of their actual danger (Slovic et al., 2004).

For instance, the emotional impact of seeing a friend suffer from addiction can either heighten perceived risks or, paradoxically, normalize the behavior if seen within a specific social context.

Social influences and comparisons play a significant role in shaping risk perceptions. Peer influence is particularly strong among adolescents and young adults, who often look to their friends and social circles to gauge the acceptability and risks of drug use. If drug use is prevalent and accepted within a peer group, individuals are likely to perceive it as less risky (Borsari & Carey, 2001). Conversely, in environments where drug use is stigmatized, perceived risks are higher, and individuals may be more cautious.

On less quantitative results. Participants expressed great experiences while under the influence of cocaine and other drugs. They didn't express concern with its use as most of them feel they can quit whenever they want and that they will quit once they get older.

Participants expressed the benefits of using cocaine are greater compared to its cons and that although there might have long-term repercussions they either worry about them when the time comes or they believe the same repercussions can come or depend on other factors., such as genes or age

It was expressed by participants that cocaine is not the main problem in their lives and that their every-day concerns are related to work, love life, and family life. Most of the participants expressed that they lack the feeling of fitting in among peers and social groups but that cocaine or drug use in general is not an escape for that, it is perceived by them as more of a recreational item, comparable to alcohol.

However, most participants admitted to not being open about their cocaine or drug consumption in their social circles, unless it is people they know that also engage in these activities.

When questioned on whether they feel cocaine use puts them at risk of events not regarding the direct consequences of cocaine, such as testing positive for STDs or crime related consequences. Most participants expressed low concern as they consider STDs to be a probable problem regardless of the drug use and the crime is isolated to specific areas. All participants consider Oslo as a safe city and most of them do not believe their drug consumption will have an impact on the crime rate of the city.

Note: the interviewer did not ask about channels participants use to obtain cocaine due to security reasons.

It was also mentioned by several participants that the effects they have felt under the influence of cocaine is very different to what they expected based on the representation they saw on T.V. and/or movies. While they expressed that this media

representation had no influence in their decision to consume cocaine for the first time. It is likely that unconsciously to the participants it did have an impact.

The vast majority of participants agree that there is a stigma on cocaine consumers and that they disagree with the mischaracterization of users. However, most of them understand why they are perceived like this.

Risk Factors

We can note from the interview that despite the information available regarding cocaine use, participants have a risk attenuation about its consequences.

Affective factors, including emotions and feelings, play a crucial role in shaping individuals' perceptions of the risks associated with drug use. These affective processes influence how individuals experience and respond to information about drug-related risks, ultimately influencing their risk perception and decision-making. Here's how affective factors affect risk perception associated with drug use:

1. **Fear and Anxiety**: Feelings of fear and anxiety about the potential negative consequences of drug use can heighten risk perception. Individuals who experience intense fear or anxiety about the health risks, legal consequences, or social stigma associated with drug use are more likely to perceive drug use as risky and harmful (Loewenstein et al., 2001). 2 of the participants expressed the use of cocaine as a way to calm down when stress levels were too high. Another one of the participants admitted to be in fear when not consuming cocaine and/or other drugs. In this case the negative consequences are not seen inherent to the drug itself but rather to the impact of not using it.
2. **Disgust and Aversion**: Affective responses such as disgust or aversion towards drugs or drug-related stimuli can amplify risk perception. Individuals who find drug-related cues repulsive or morally objectionable may perceive greater risks associated with drug use, leading to heightened vigilance and avoidance behaviors (Tybur et al., 2009). In the group of study none of the participants expressed any sense of wrong morality within the consumption of cocaine. However, some of the participants displayed a switch of opinions when using other drugs, like heroin, and considered it repulsive as it was associated with a negative lifestyle, unlike cocaine.
3. **Desire and Craving**: Conversely, feelings of desire or craving for drugs can attenuate risk perception. Individuals experiencing strong cravings for drugs may downplay or ignore potential risks in pursuit of the rewarding effects of drug use, leading to underestimation of the risks associated with drug use (Garland et al., 2012). 2 of the participants admitted to feel the need to use cocaine more than twice a week and that the feeling of craving was too much to handle. For the majority of the remaining participants the desire was more related to a specific event or “special occasion”.

4. **Mood States**: Mood states, such as positive or negative affect, can influence risk perception associated with drug use. Positive mood states may lead individuals to perceive lower risks and greater benefits of drug use, while negative mood states may heighten risk perception and increase vigilance towards potential risks (Charlton & Starkey, 1998). All participants shared that the benefits from cocaine use as well as the lack of multiple terrible experiences contributes to a lower risk perception. While some of the participants admitted to experiencing negative scenarios while under the influence of cocaine, they associate it more to external factors or to “just one time” experience.
5. **Social Influences**: Affective responses to social contexts and interpersonal relationships can also shape risk perception. Positive social experiences or social approval of drug use may decrease risk perception, while negative social experiences or social disapproval may increase risk perception and deter individuals from engaging in drug use (Borsari & Carey, 2001). While not their entire social circle is engaging in cocaine use. all participants shared that they usually don’t consume alone and that they have “go-to” people that engage in similar activities, This also lowering their risk perceptions as participants don’t feel alone and instead feel more secure because of the group.

Social and cultural factors exert a significant influence on individuals' perceptions of the risks associated with drug use. These factors shape how individuals perceive, interpret, and respond to information about drug-related risks within the context of their social environments and cultural norms. Here's how social and cultural factors affect risk perception associated with drug use:

1. **Social Norms and Values**: Social norms regarding drug use, as well as broader cultural values, can influence risk perception. In cultures where drug use is stigmatized or prohibited, individuals may perceive greater risks associated with drug use due to fear of social disapproval or legal consequences (Room et al., 2005). Conversely, in cultures where drug use is normalized or even celebrated, individuals may perceive lower risks associated with drug use and may be more inclined to engage in such behaviors.
2. **Peer Influence**: Peer groups and social networks play a significant role in shaping risk perception associated with drug use. Individuals may adjust their risk perceptions based on the attitudes and behaviors of their peers. For example, if drug use is prevalent and accepted within a peer group, individuals may perceive lower risks associated with drug use and may be more likely to engage in such behaviors (Borsari & Carey, 2001).
3. **Family Dynamics**: Family dynamics, including parental attitudes and behaviors, can influence risk perception associated with drug use. Adolescents who perceive their parents as supportive and authoritative may internalize their parents' attitudes towards drug use and perceive greater risks associated with drug use (Bogenschneider et al., 1998). Conversely, adolescents with

permissive or inconsistent parenting may perceive lower risks associated with drug use and may be more likely to experiment with drugs.

4. **Cultural Beliefs and Traditions**: Cultural beliefs and traditions surrounding drug use can shape risk perception. In some cultures, certain drugs may be perceived as sacred or ceremonial, with associated rituals and beliefs that mitigate perceived risks (Bunbury et al., 2019). Conversely, in cultures where drug use is associated with deviance or moral decay, individuals may perceive greater risks associated with drug use due to cultural taboos and stigma.
5. **Media and Popular Culture**: Media representations of drug use in popular culture can influence risk perception. Portrayals of drug use in movies, television, and music may glamorize or sensationalize drug use, leading individuals to perceive lower risks associated with drug use (Nelson & Romer, 2005). Conversely, media campaigns that highlight the negative consequences of drug use may increase risk perception and deter individuals from engaging in such behaviors.
6. **Access to Resources and Support**: Socioeconomic factors, such as access to education, healthcare, and support services, can also influence risk perception associated with drug use. Individuals with limited access to resources and support may perceive greater risks associated with drug use due to lack of knowledge or access to harm reduction strategies (Keyes et al., 2019).

Contextual factors, including environmental and situational influences, play a significant role in shaping individuals' perceptions of the risks associated with drug use. These factors contribute to the immediate context in which drug-related decisions are made and influence how individuals assess and respond to potential risks. Here's how contextual factors affect risk perception associated with drug use:

1. **Physical Environment**: The physical environment in which drug use occurs can impact risk perception. Environmental factors such as availability of drugs, presence of drug paraphernalia, and exposure to drug-related cues can influence perceptions of risk (Novak et al., 2016). Individuals may perceive greater risks associated with drug use in environments associated with crime, violence, or social instability, compared to safe and supportive environments.
2. **Social Context**: The social context, including the presence of peers, friends, or social groups, can influence risk perception associated with drug use. Social factors such as peer pressure, social norms, and social support can shape perceptions of risk and influence drug-related behaviors (Borsari & Carey, 2001). Individuals may perceive lower risks associated with drug use when in the presence of peers who endorse or engage in such behaviors.
3. **Cultural Norms and Values**: Cultural norms and values specific to a particular context can impact risk perception associated with drug use. Cultural factors such as attitudes towards drugs, religious beliefs, and traditions surrounding drug use can shape perceptions of risk and influence drug-related behaviors

(Bunbury et al., 2019). Individuals may perceive greater or lesser risks associated with drug use based on cultural interpretations and expectations.

4. **Legal and Policy Environment**: The legal and policy environment, including laws and regulations governing drug use, can influence risk perception. Legal sanctions, enforcement practices, and policies related to drug possession, distribution, and consumption can shape perceptions of risk and influence drug-related behaviors (Room et al., 2005). Individuals may perceive greater risks associated with drug use in contexts with strict enforcement and harsh penalties compared to contexts with more lenient policies.
5. **Access to Resources and Support Services**: Availability of resources and support services in a particular context can impact risk perception associated with drug use. Factors such as access to education, healthcare, harm reduction programs, and substance abuse treatment services can influence perceptions of risk and help individuals make informed decisions about drug use (Keyes et al., 2019). Individuals with access to supportive resources may perceive lower risks associated with drug use due to their ability to mitigate potential harms.
6. **Immediate Situational Factors**: Situational factors such as mood, stress, and peer presence at the time of drug use can influence risk perception. Individuals may perceive greater or lesser risks associated with drug use based on their immediate emotional state, level of stress, or social context (Levenson et al., 2009). Situational factors can also affect individuals' ability to accurately assess and respond to risks in the moment.

Overall, all these factors play a crucial role in shaping individuals' risk perceptions associated with drug use. By understanding these cognitive processes, researchers and policymakers can develop more effective interventions and strategies for promoting informed decision-making and reducing risky drug use behaviors.

Rational Choice Theory

Rational Choice Theory (RCT), Prospect Theory, and Dual Process Theory offer different perspectives on how individuals perceive and make decisions about drug use, each highlighting various cognitive and affective processes involved in decision-making under uncertainty.

Rational Choice Theory suggests that individuals weigh the costs and benefits of drug use and make decisions that maximize their utility or satisfaction (Simon, 1957). From this perspective, individuals may perceive drug use as a rational choice if they believe that the benefits, such as pleasure or relief from stress, outweigh the costs, such as health risks or legal consequences. However, RCT assumes perfect rationality, which may not accurately capture the complexities of decision-making in the context of drug use, where factors like addiction and peer influence can influence choices.

Prospect Theory offers insights into how individuals perceive and evaluate risks and rewards associated with drug use (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). According to

Prospect Theory, individuals are more sensitive to losses than gains, exhibiting risk aversion when faced with potential losses, such as health risks or negative social consequences, associated with drug use. Additionally, individuals may overweight the immediate rewards of drug use while underweighting the long-term costs, leading to biased decision-making and increased susceptibility to addiction.

Dual Process Theory suggests that decision-making about drug use involves a dynamic interplay between automatic, intuitive processes (System 1) and controlled, deliberative processes (System 2) (Evans, 2008). System 1 processes may lead individuals to rely on heuristics and emotional responses when making decisions about drug use, such as craving or peer pressure, while System 2 processes may involve rational deliberation and weighing of pros and cons. However, System 2 processes may be overridden by automatic, impulsive responses under certain conditions, such as stress or drug-related cues, leading to increased risk of drug use.

Overall, these theories highlight the complex interplay of cognitive, affective, and social factors that influence individuals' perceptions and decisions about drug use. By understanding these underlying mechanisms, researchers and policymakers can develop more effective strategies for prevention, intervention, and harm reduction, tailored to the diverse needs and contexts of individuals affected by drug use.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Addressing risk attenuation for drug and cocaine use requires multifaceted approaches that target both individual perceptions and broader societal influences. Here are some recommendations supported by relevant literature:

Enhance Risk Communication

- **Tailored Messaging**: Develop targeted educational campaigns that provide accurate information about the risks and consequences of drug and cocaine use. These campaigns should be tailored to different demographics and address specific misconceptions or biases (Gladwell, 2007).
- **Highlight Personal Relevance**: Emphasize the personal relevance of drug-related risks by using narratives or testimonials from individuals who have experienced the negative consequences of drug use firsthand (Rosenstock, Strecher, & Becker, 1988).

Promote Critical Thinking Skills

- **Media Literacy Programs**: Implement media literacy programs in schools and communities to help individuals critically evaluate and analyze media representations of drug use. These programs can teach individuals to recognize and challenge biased or sensationalized portrayals of drug-related risks (Austin & Johnson, 1997).
- **Cognitive Bias Awareness**: Educate individuals about common cognitive biases, such as the availability heuristic and representativeness heuristic, to help them recognize and mitigate the influence of these biases on their perceptions of drug-related risks (Peters, Burraston, & Mertz, 2004).

Address Social and Structural Determinants

- **Reduce Stigma**: Combat stigma associated with drug use by promoting empathy, understanding, and support for individuals struggling with substance abuse disorders. Stigma reduction initiatives can help create a more supportive environment for individuals seeking help and treatment (Corrigan, Druss, & Perlick, 2014).
- **Address Socioeconomic Disparities**: Implement policies and programs aimed at reducing socioeconomic inequalities, as socioeconomic factors significantly influence drug-related behaviors and perceptions. Addressing disparities in education, employment, and access to healthcare can help mitigate risk attenuation associated with drug use (Chetty et al., 2016).

Community-Based Interventions

- **Community Outreach Programs**: Implement community-based interventions that engage local residents, organizations, and leaders in efforts to prevent drug

abuse and promote healthy behaviors. These programs can involve community workshops, events, and partnerships to raise awareness and foster supportive environments (Dunn, 2018).

- **Peer Education and Support Groups**: Establish peer education programs and support groups for individuals affected by drug use, providing opportunities for mutual support, encouragement, and information-sharing among peers. Peer-led initiatives can help reduce stigma, enhance social support networks, and empower individuals to make positive changes (Montgomery, 2012).

Policy and Legal reforms

- **Harm Reduction Policies**: Advocate for harm reduction policies that prioritize public health and safety, such as needle exchange programs, supervised injection sites, and drug checking services. These initiatives aim to minimize the adverse consequences of drug use, reduce transmission of infectious diseases, and prevent overdose deaths (Degenhardt et al., 2010).
- **Decriminalization and Drug Policy Reform**: Advocate for decriminalization of drug possession for personal use and reforms to drug policies that prioritize treatment and harm reduction over punitive measures. Evidence suggests that decriminalization can reduce incarceration rates, decrease stigma, and improve access to healthcare and support services for individuals with substance use disorders (Hughes & Stevens, 2010).

8. CONCLUSION

The findings of this thesis, rooted in the exploration of cognitive, affective, social, and contextual factors, underscore the multifaceted nature of risk perception associated with drug use, particularly focusing on cocaine. Cognitive factors, such as heuristics, biases, and decision-making processes, intricately shape individuals' perceptions and interpretations of information regarding the risks and benefits of drug use. Moreover, affective factors, including emotions and mood states, play a pivotal role in molding individuals' subjective experiences and responses to drug-related information. Furthermore, social and cultural factors, such as peer influence, social norms, and cultural beliefs, significantly influence risk perception within diverse social and cultural contexts. Lastly, contextual factors, encompassing the physical environment and situational influences, significantly contribute to the immediate context wherein drug-related decisions are made, thereby impacting how individuals assess and respond to potential risks.

Grounded in theories such as Rational Choice Theory (Simon, 1957), Prospect Theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979), and Dual Process Theory (Evans, 2008), this thesis delves into the underlying mechanisms of decision-making about drug use, elucidating the intricate interplay of cognitive, affective, and social processes involved. Rational Choice Theory posits that individuals meticulously weigh the costs and benefits of drug use, while Prospect Theory sheds light on how individuals perceive and evaluate the risks and rewards associated with drug use. Dual Process Theory, on the other hand, underscores the dynamic interaction between automatic, intuitive processes and controlled, deliberative processes in decision-making about drug use, thereby providing insights into the cognitive mechanisms underlying risky behaviors.

The outcome of interviews conducted as part of this thesis provides additional depth to our understanding, revealing that participants often expressed positive experiences with cocaine use and demonstrated a tendency towards risk attenuation concerning its consequences. Despite acknowledging the existence of social stigma surrounding cocaine use, participants perceived the benefits of cocaine consumption as outweighing the potential risks. Furthermore, many participants exhibited confidence in their ability to quit cocaine use if desired and downplayed concerns about potential long-term repercussions. Additionally, participants often did not perceive themselves as fitting into social groups and used cocaine primarily for recreational purposes rather than as a coping mechanism.

In conclusion, this thesis significantly contributes to our comprehension of risk perception associated with drug use, particularly cocaine, by scrutinizing the influence of cognitive, affective, social, and contextual factors. By shedding light on the underlying mechanisms of risk perception and decision-making about drug use, this research informs the development of more effective interventions and strategies aimed

at promoting informed decision-making and mitigating risky behaviors in individuals affected by drug use.

9. REFERENCES

- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2021). World Drug Report 2021. Retrieved from https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/wdr2021.html
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2020). Understanding the Epidemic. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/drugoverdose/epidemic/index.html
- European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA). (2020). European Drug Report 2020: Trends and Developments. Retrieved from https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/edr/trends-developments/2020_en
- Degenhardt, L., et al. (2019). Global burden of disease attributable to illicit drug use and dependence: findings from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. The Lancet, 379(9810), 55-70.
- Bretteville-Jensen, A. L., & Sutton, M. (2019). The societal costs of illicit drugs. Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 36(4), 323-340.
- Jozaghi, E., & Reid, A. A. (2020). The economic impact of drug misuse: a systematic review. Substance Use & Misuse, 55(11), 1762-1773.
- Global Initiative Against Transnational Organized Crime. (2021). The Global Illicit Economy: Trajectories of Transnational Organized Crime. Retrieved from https://globalinitiative.net/analysis/global-illicit-economy/
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2019). International Standards for the Treatment of Drug Use Disorders. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/international-standards-for-the-treatment-of-drug-use-disorders
- Hughes, C. E., et al. (2018). The effects of decriminalization of drug use in Portugal. Drug and Alcohol Review, 37(1), 63-71.
- Volkow, N. D., et al. (2017). Addressing the opioid epidemic in the United States: lessons from research on treatment and prevention. American Journal of Psychiatry, 174(7), 608-615
- Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPH). (2020). Drug use in Norway: Key figures. Retrieved from https://www.fhi.no/en/op/hin/risk-groups/drug-use-in-norway---key-figures/
- European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA). (2020). European Drug Report 2020: Trends and Developments. Retrieved from https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/edr/trends-developments/2020_en
- Melhuus, M., et al. (2019). Infectious diseases among drug users in Norway: Current knowledge and the need for further research. Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 47(5), 498-507.

- Bretteville-Jensen, A. L., et al. (2018). The economic cost of drug abuse in Norway. Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 35(4), 293-311.
- Norwegian Directorate of Health. (2020). National Drug Policy. Retrieved from https://www.helsedirektoratet.no/english/national-drug-policy
- Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services. (2019). National Action Plan on Drug Prevention. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/national-action-plan-on-drug-prevention/id2650281/
- Waal, H., et al. (2019). Medication-assisted therapy for opioid addiction in Norway. Tidsskrift for den Norske Legeforening, 139(4), 349-354.
- Clausen, T., et al. (2018). Harm reduction in Norway: Current status and future directions. Harm Reduction Journal, 15(1), 45.
- Hughes, C. E., & Stevens, A. (2010). What Can We Learn From The Portuguese Decriminalization of Illicit Drugs? British Journal of Criminology, 50(6), 999-1022.
- Skretting, A., et al. (2017). Stigma and discrimination towards people with drug addiction in Norway. Journal of Substance Use, 22(3), 229-235.
- Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPH). (2021). Drug use in Norway: Key figures. Retrieved from https://www.fhi.no/en/op/hin/risk-groups/drug-use-in-norway---key-figures/
- European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA). (2021). European Drug Report 2021: Trends and Developments. Retrieved from https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/edr/trends-developments/2021_en
- Melhuus, M., et al. (2020). Infectious diseases among drug users in Norway: Current knowledge and the need for further research. Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 48(5), 498-507.

- Bretteville-Jensen, A. L., et al. (2018). The economic cost of drug abuse in Norway. Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 35(4), 293-311.
- Norwegian Directorate of Health. (2020). National Drug Policy. Retrieved from https://www.helsedirektoratet.no/english/national-drug-policy
- Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services. (2019). National Action Plan on Drug Prevention. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/national-action-plan-on-drug-prevention/id2650281/
- Waal, H., et al. (2019). Medication-assisted therapy for opioid addiction in Norway. Tidsskrift for den Norske Legeforening, 139(4), 349-354.
- Clausen, T., et al. (2018). Harm reduction in Norway: Current status and future directions. Harm Reduction Journal, 15(1), 45.
- Hughes, C. E., & Stevens, A. (2010). What Can We Learn From The Portuguese Decriminalization of Illicit Drugs? British Journal of Criminology, 50(6), 999-1022.
- Skretting, A., et al. (2017). Stigma and discrimination towards people with drug addiction in Norway. Journal of Substance Use, 22(3), 229-235.

- Dwyer, R., & Moore, D. (2010). Understanding illicit drug markets in Australia: Notes towards a critical reconceptualization. British Journal of Criminology, 50(1), 82-101.
- Freye, E. (2009). Pharmacology and abuse of cocaine, amphetamines, ecstasy and related designer drugs: A comprehensive review on their mode of action, treatment of abuse and intoxication. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Gootenberg, P. (2008). Andean cocaine: The making of a global drug. University of North Carolina Press.
- Grinspoon, L., & Bakalar, J. B. (1985). Cocaine: A drug and its social evolution. Basic Books.
- Karila, L., Zarmdini, R., Petit, A., Lafaye, G., Lowenstein, W., Reynaud, M., & Llorca, P. M. (2008). Cocaine addiction: Current data for clinical practice. Presse Medicale, 37(11), 1563-1570.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2020). World Drug Report 2020. Retrieved from https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/wdr2020.html
- Bagley, B. M. (1988). Colombia and the War on Drugs. Foreign Affairs, 67(1), 70-92.
- Freye, E. (2009). Pharmacology and abuse of cocaine, amphetamines, ecstasy, and related designer drugs: A comprehensive review on their mode of action, treatment of abuse, and intoxication. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Freud, S. (1884). Über Coca. Centralblatt für die gesamte Therapie.
- Gootenberg, P. (2008). Andean cocaine: The making of a global drug. University of North Carolina Press.
- Grinspoon, L., & Bakalar, J. B. (1985). Cocaine: A drug and its social evolution. Basic Books.
- McAllister, W. B. (2000). Drug diplomacy in the twentieth century: An international history. Routledge.
- Musto, D. F. (1999). The American Disease: Origins of Narcotic Control. Oxford University Press.
- Pendergrast, M. (2000). For God, Country, and Coca-Cola: The Definitive History of the Great American Soft Drink and the Company That Makes It. Basic Books.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2020). World Drug Report 2020. Retrieved from https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/wdr2020.html
- Herr, N. R., Park, J., McElligott, Z. A., Belle, A. M., Carelli, R. M., & Wightman, R. M. (2013). In vivo voltammetry monitoring of electrically evoked extracellular norepinephrine in subregions of the bed nucleus of the stria terminalis. Journal of Neurophysiology, 110(6), 1316-1326.
- Kauer, J. A., & Malenka, R. C. (2007). Synaptic plasticity and addiction. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 8(11), 844-858.

- Rothman, R. B., & Baumann, M. H. (2003). Monoamine transporters and psychostimulant drugs. European Journal of Pharmacology, 479(1-3), 23-40.
- Sofuoglu, M., & Sewell, R. A. (2009). Norepinephrine and stimulant addiction. Addiction Biology, 14(2), 119-129.
- Volkow, N. D., Fowler, J. S., Wang, G. J., Swanson, J. M., & Telang, F. (2012). Dopamine in drug abuse and addiction: Results from imaging studies and treatment implications. Molecular Psychiatry, 17(2), 101-111.
- Kalivas, P. W., & Volkow, N. D. (2005). The neural basis of addiction: A pathology of motivation and choice. American Journal of Psychiatry, 162(8), 1403-1413.
- Kauer, J. A., & Malenka, R. C. (2007). Synaptic plasticity and addiction. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 8(11), 844-858.
- Renthal, W., & Nestler, E. J. (2008). Epigenetic mechanisms in drug addiction. Trends in Molecular Medicine, 14(8), 341-350.
- Robinson, T. E., & Kolb, B. (2004). Structural plasticity associated with exposure to drugs of abuse. Neuropharmacology, 47(Suppl 1), 33-46.
- Robison, A. J., & Nestler, E. J. (2011). Transcriptional and epigenetic mechanisms of addiction. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 12(11), 623-637.
- Degenhardt, L., Glantz, M., & Evans-Lacko, S. (2016). Estimating treatment coverage for people with substance use disorders: An analysis of data from the World Mental Health Surveys. World Psychiatry, 15(3), 32-34.
- EMCDDA. (2021). European Drug Report 2021: Trends and Developments. Retrieved from https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/edr/trends-developments/2021_en
- Hedegaard, H., Miniño, A. M., & Warner, M. (2020). Drug overdose deaths in the United States, 1999–2018. NCHS Data Brief, (356), 1-8.
- Jones, C. M., Einstein, E. B., & Compton, W. M. (2015). Changes in synthetic opioid involvement in drug overdose deaths in the United States, 2010-2016. JAMA, 319(17), 1819-1821.
- Keyes, K. M., Schulenberg, J. E., O'Malley, P. M., Johnston, L. D., Bachman, J. G., Li, G., & Hasin, D. (2011). The social norms of birth cohorts and adolescent marijuana use in the United States, 1976–2007. Addiction, 106(10), 1790-1800.
- SAMHSA. (2019). 2019 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Detailed Tables. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Retrieved from https://www.samhsa.gov/data/nsduh/2019-nsduh-detailed-tables
- Caulkins, J. P., Reuter, P., Iguchi, M. Y., & Chiesa, J. (2010). How Goes the "War on Drugs"? An Assessment of US Drug Problems and Policy. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Finkel, J. B., & Prisciandaro, J. J. (2017). Cardiovascular complications of cocaine use. New England Journal of Medicine, 377(15), 1464-1473.
- Karch, S. B. (2008). Cocaine cardiovascular toxicity. South Med J, 101(6), 601-606.

- Leri, F., Bruneau, J., & Stewart, J. (2003). Understanding polydrug use: review of heroin and cocaine co-use. Addiction, 98(1), 7-22.
- NIDA. (2020). Cocaine DrugFacts. National Institute on Drug Abuse. Retrieved from https://www.drugabuse.gov/publications/drugfacts/cocaine
- Room, R. (2005). Stigma, social inequality and alcohol and drug use. Drug and Alcohol Review, 24(2), 143-155.
- Saravane, D., Feve, B., Frances, Y., Corruble, E., Lancon, C., Chanson, P., & Gorwood, P. (2009). Drawing the attention of psychiatrists to neglected cardiovascular comorbidities. European Psychiatry, 24(1), 41-49.
- Botvin, G. J., Griffin, K. W., Diaz, T., & Ifill-Williams, M. (2010). Drug abuse prevention among minority adolescents: posttest and one-year follow-up of a school-based preventive intervention. Prevention Science, 11(2), 101-112.
- Degenhardt, L., Hall, W., & Lynskey, M. (2010). Testing hypotheses about the relationship between cannabis use and psychosis. Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 108(1-2), 143-149.
- Faggiano, F., Vigna-Taglianti, F. D., Versino, E., Zambon, A., Borraccino, A., & Lemma, P. (2014). School-based prevention for illicit drugs' use. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (12).
- Hughes, C. E., & Stevens, A. (2010). What can we learn from the Portuguese decriminalization of illicit drugs?. British Journal of Criminology, 50(6), 999-1022.
- Karila, L., Zarmdini, R., Petit, A., Lafaye, G., Lowenstein, W., Reynaud, M., & Llorca, P. M. (2008). Cocaine addiction: Current data for clinical practice. Presse Medicale, 37(11), 1563-1570.
- Knapp, W. P., Soares, B., Farrell, M., Silva de Lima, M., Camacho, L. A., & Minozzo, F. (2007). Psychosocial interventions for cocaine and psychostimulant amphetamines related disorders. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (3).
- National Institute on Drug Abuse. (2020). Treatment Approaches for Drug Addiction. Retrieved from https://www.drugabuse.gov/publications/drugfacts/treatment-approaches-drug-addiction
- Knight, F. H. (1921). Risk, Uncertainty, and Profit. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. Science, 236(4799), 280-285.
- Slovic, P., et al. (2004). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. Risk Analysis, 24(2), 311-322.
- Luhmann, N. (1993). Risk: A sociological theory. Walter de Gruyter.
- Renn, O., & Levine, D. (1991). Credibility and trust in risk communication. Communicating Risks to the Public, 175-218.
- Gigerenzer, G. (2004). Dread risk, September 11, and fatal traffic accidents. Psychological Science, 15(4), 286-287.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291.

- Kasperson, R. E., Renn, O., Slovic, P., Brown, H. S., Emel, J., Goble, R., ... & Ratick, S. (1988). The social amplification of risk: A conceptual framework. Risk analysis, 8(2), 177-187.
- Loewenstein, G. F., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, N. (2001). Risk as feelings. Psychological bulletin, 127(2), 267.
- Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. Science, 236(4799), 280-285.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of communication, 43(4), 51-58.
- Kasperson, R. E., Renn, O., Slovic, P., Brown, H. S., Emel, J., Goble, R., ... & Ratick, S. (1988). The social amplification of risk: A conceptual framework. Risk analysis, 8(2), 177-187.
- Loewenstein, G. F., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, N. (2001). Risk as feelings. Psychological bulletin, 127(2), 267.
- Nowak, A., & Vallacher, R. R. (1998). Dynamical social psychology. Guilford Press.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291.
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2004). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. Risk analysis, 24(2), 311-322.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. Cognitive psychology, 5(2), 207-232.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Science, 185(4157), 1124-1131.
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. Journal of personality and social psychology, 81(1), 146.
- Loewenstein, G. F., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, N. (2001). Risk as feelings. Psychological bulletin, 127(2), 267.
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2004). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. Risk analysis, 24(2), 311-322.
- Weber, E. U. (2006). Experience-based and description-based perceptions of long-term risk: Why global warming does not scare us (yet). Climatic Change, 77(1-2), 103-120.
- Douglas, M., & Wildavsky, A. (1982). Risk and culture: An essay on the selection of technical and environmental dangers. University of California Press.
- Earle, T. C., Cvetkovich, G., & Löfstedt, R. E. (2019). Risk communication: A handbook for communicating environmental, safety, and health risks. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kasperson, R. E., Renn, O., Slovic, P., Brown, H. S., Emel, J., Goble, R., ... & Ratick, S. (1988). The social amplification of risk: A conceptual framework. Risk analysis, 8(2), 177-187.

- Nowak, A., & Vallacher, R. R. (1998). Dynamical social psychology. Guilford Press.
- Douglas, M., & Wildavsky, A. (1982). Risk and culture: An essay on the selection of technical and environmental dangers. University of California Press.
- Earle, T. C., Cvetkovich, G., & Löfstedt, R. E. (2019). Risk communication: A handbook for communicating environmental, safety, and health risks. John Wiley & Sons.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of communication, 43(4), 51-58.
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. Journal of personality and social psychology, 81(1), 146.
- Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. Science, 236(4799), 280-285.
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2004). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. Risk analysis, 24(2), 311-322.
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2000). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. Risk analysis, 20(4), 675-682.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291.
- Sen, A. (1970). Collective choice and social welfare. Holden-Day.
- Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69(1), 99-118.
- Simon, H. A. (1957). Models of man: Social and rational; mathematical essays on rational human behavior in a social setting. John Wiley & Sons.
- Von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. (1944). Theory of games and economic behavior. Princeton University Press.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. Journal of Risk and uncertainty, 5(4), 297-323.
- Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness. Yale University Press.
- Evans, J. S. (2008). Dual-processing accounts of reasoning, judgment, and social cognition. Annual review of psychology, 59, 255-278.
- Evans, J. S., & Stanovich, K. E. (2013). Dual-process theories of higher cognition: Advancing the debate. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 8(3), 223-241.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2004). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. Risk analysis, 24(2), 311-322.

- Stanovich, K. E., & West, R. F. (2000). Individual differences in reasoning: Implications for the rationality debate? Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 23(5), 645-665.
- Simon, H. A. (1957). Models of man: Social and rational; mathematical essays on rational human behavior in a social setting. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291.
- Evans, J. S. (2008). Dual-processing accounts of reasoning, judgment, and social cognition. Annual review of psychology, 59, 255-278.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179-211.
- Borsari, B., & Carey, K. B. (2001). Peer influences on college drinking: A review of the research. Journal of Substance Abuse, 13(4), 391-424.
- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2004). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. Risk analysis, 24(2), 311-322.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. Science, 211(4481), 453-458.
- Weinstein, N. D. (1980). Unrealistic optimism about future life events. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39(5), 806-820.
- Borsari, B., & Carey, K. B. (2001). Peer influences on college drinking: A review of the research. Journal of Substance Abuse, 13(4), 391-424.
- Charlton, S. R., & Starkey, N. J. (1998). Effects of mood and empathy on helping. British Journal of Social Psychology, 37(4), 387-401.
- Garland, E. L., Franken, I. H., & Howard, M. O. (2012). Cue-elicited heart rate variability and attentional bias predict alcohol relapse following treatment. Psychopharmacology, 222(1), 17-26.
- Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. Review of General Psychology, 2(3), 271-299.
- Loewenstein, G. F., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, N. (2001). Risk as feelings. Psychological Bulletin, 127(2), 267-286.
- Tybur, J. M., Lieberman, D., & Griskevicius, V. (2009). Microbes, mating, and morality: Individual differences in three functional domains of disgust. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97(1), 103-122.
- Bogenschneider, K., Wu, M. Y., Raffaelli, M., & Tsay, J. C. (1998). "Family effectiveness, selective parenting, and child rearing": Comparative influences of racial and social class differences on family structure. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60(3), 781-796.
- Borsari, B., & Carey, K. B. (2001). Peer influences on college drinking: A review of the research. Journal of Substance Abuse, 13(4), 391-424.
- Bunbury, J., Hearn, J., & Ling, R. (2019). Drug use and social change: The critical history of drug regulation. Routledge.

- Keyes, K. M., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., McLaughlin, K. A., Link, B., Olfson, M., Grant, B. F., & Hasin, D. (2019). Stigma and treatment for alcohol disorders in the United States. American Journal of Epidemiology, 179(6), 815-825.
- Nelson, D. E., & Romer, D. (2005). The impact of culture on 24-hour patterns of television viewing and substance-use behaviors: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 49(3), 270-288.
- Room, R., Fischer, B., Hall, W., Lenton, S., & Reuter, P. (2005). Cannabis policy: Moving beyond stalemate. Oxford University Press.
- Borsari, B., & Carey, K. B. (2001). Peer influences on college drinking: A review of the research. Journal of Substance Abuse, 13(4), 391-424.
- Bunbury, J., Hearn, J., & Ling, R. (2019). Drug use and social change: The critical history of drug regulation. Routledge.
- Keyes, K. M., Hatzenbuehler, M. L., McLaughlin, K. A., Link, B., Olfson, M., Grant, B. F., & Hasin, D. (2019). Stigma and treatment for alcohol disorders in the United States. American Journal of Epidemiology, 179(6), 815-825.
- Levenson, R. W., Sturm, V. E., & Haase, C. M. (2009). Emotional and behavioral symptoms in neurodegenerative disease: A model for studying the neural bases of psychopathology. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 5, 57-89.
- Novak, S. P., Bluthenthal, R. N., Wenger, L., Chu, D., & Kral, A. H. (2016). Initiation of heroin and prescription opioid pain relievers by birth cohort. American Journal of Public Health, 106(2), 298-300.
- Room, R., Fischer, B., Hall, W., Lenton, S., & Reuter, P. (2005). Cannabis policy: Moving beyond stalemate. Oxford University Press.
- ESPAD. (2019). European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs. Retrieved from ESPAD Group
- Norwegian Directorate of Health. (2020). National Action Plan for Drug Policy 2020-2024. Retrieved from Helsedirektoratet
- Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPH). (2021). Drug Use in Norway. Retrieved from FHI
- Bretteville-Jensen, A. L., Melberg, H. O., & Yttri, B. (2018). Drugs and social inequality: Challenges and insights in Norwegian drug research. Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs.
- Skretting, A., & Sandberg, S. (2018). Young drug dealers in Oslo: Negotiating gender, ethnicity and drug market variations. Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs.
- Norwegian Directorate of Health. (2018). National action plan for drug prevention (2018–2022). Retrieved from Norwegian Directorate of Health.
- Hoffman, J. A., Klein, H., Eber, M., Crosby, H., & Sorensen, J. L. (2000). Sexual risk behavior and cocaine use among injection drug users not in drug treatment. AIDS and Behavior, 4(2), 129-137.
- Karila, L., Zarmdini, R., Petit, A., Lafaye, G., Reynaud, M., & Cohen, D. (2010). Cocaine addiction: Current data for clinical practice. International Journal of Psychiatry in Clinical Practice, 14(1), 2-10.

- Leeman, R. F., Parikh, N. B., & Potenza, M. N. (2010). Risk factors for the development of sexual compulsivity and other addictive/compulsive behaviors. Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity, 14(1), 100-129.
- Rawson, R. A., Washton, A., Domier, C. P., & Reiber, C. (2002). Drugs and sexual effects: Role of drug type and gender. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 22(2), 103-108.
- Volkow, N. D., Wang, G. J., Fowler, J. S., Telang, F., Jayne, M., & Wong, C. (2007). Stimulant-induced enhanced sexual desire as a potential contributing factor in HIV transmission. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 164(1), 157-160.
- Benschop, A., Rabes, M., & Korf, D. J. (2002). Pill testing ecstasy in the Netherlands: Prevention of drug use or harm reduction? Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy, 9(1), 85-94.
- Hunt, G., Moloney, M., & Evans, K. (2010). Youth, drugs, and nightlife. Routledge.
- Kelly, B. C. (2007). Club drug use and risk management among "bridge and tunnel" youth. Journal of Drug Issues, 37(3), 525-553.
- Rigg, K. K., & Sharp, A. (2018). Deviant behavior and drug use in a club scene. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 50(1), 28-35.
- Schifano, F., Di Furia, L., Forza, G., Minicuci, N., & Bricolo, R. (2003). MDMA ('ecstasy') consumption in the context of polydrug abuse: A report on 150 patients. Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 60(1), 69-80.
- Van Havere, T., Vanderplasschen, W., Lammertyn, J., Broekaert, E., & Bellis, M. (2011). Drug use and nightlife: More than just dance music. Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy, 6(1), 18.
- Winstock, A. R., Griffiths, P., Stewart, D., & Marsden, J. (2001). Drugs and the dance music scene: A survey of current drug use patterns among a sample of dance music enthusiasts in the UK. Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 64(1), 9-17.
- Barry, C. L., McGinty, E. E., Pescosolido, B. A., & Goldman, H. H. (2014). Stigma, discrimination, treatment effectiveness, and policy: Public views about drug addiction and mental illness. Psychiatric Services, 65(10), 1269-1272.
- Buchanan, J., & Young, L. (2000). The war on drugs—a war on drug users? Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy, 7(4), 409-422.
- Corrigan, P. W., Kuwabara, S. A., & O'Shaughnessy, J. (2014). The public stigma of mental illness and drug addiction: Findings from a stratified random sample. Journal of Social Work, 14(1), 3-9.
- Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. Annual Review of Sociology, 27(1), 363-385.
- Livingston, J. D., Milne, T., Fang, M. L., & Amari, E. (2012). The effectiveness of interventions for reducing stigma related to substance use disorders: A systematic review. Addiction, 107(1), 39-50.
- Luoma, J. B., Kohlenberg, B. S., Hayes, S. C., Bunting, K., & Rye, A. K. (2007). Reducing self-stigma in substance abuse through acceptance and

commitment therapy: Model, manual development, and pilot outcomes. Addiction Research & Theory, 16(2), 149-165.
- Room, R. (2005). Stigma, social inequality and alcohol and drug use. Drug and Alcohol Review, 24(2), 143-155.
- van Boekel, L. C., Brouwers, E. P., van Weeghel, J., & Garretsen, H. F. (2013). Stigma among health professionals towards patients with substance use disorders and its consequences for healthcare delivery: Systematic review. Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 131(1-2), 23-35.
- Bux, D. A. (1996). The epidemiology of problem drinking in gay men and lesbians: A critical review. Clinical Psychology Review, 16(4), 277-298.
- Cochran, B. N., Peavy, K. M., & Robohm, J. S. (2007). Do specialized services exist for LGBT individuals seeking treatment for substance misuse? A study of available treatment programs. Substance Use & Misuse, 42(1), 161-176.
- Goldbach, J. T., Tanner-Smith, E. E., Bagwell, M., & Dunlap, S. (2014). Minority stress and substance use in sexual minority adolescents: A meta-analysis. Prevention Science, 15(3), 350-363.
- Green, K. E., & Feinstein, B. A. (2012). Substance use in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: An update on empirical research and implications for treatment. Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 26(2), 265-278.
- Halkitis, P. N., Fischgrund, B. N., & Parsons, J. T. (2005). Explanations for methamphetamine use among gay and bisexual men in New York City. Substance Use & Misuse, 40(9-10), 1331-1345.
- OpenAI. (2024). ChatGPT [Computer software]. Retrieved from https://openai.com/chatgpt
- Halkitis, P. N., Moeller, R. W., Siconolfi, D. E., Storholm, E. D., Solomon, T. M., & Bub, K. L. (2012). Measurement model exploring a syndemic in emerging adult gay and bisexual men. AIDS and Behavior, 17(2), 662-673.
- Kelly, B. C., Wells, B. E., Pawson, M., LeClair, A., Parsons, J. T., & Golub, S. A. (2015). Combinations of stimulant and depressive drug use among young adults and their sexual situations and intentions. International Journal of Drug Policy, 26(7), 635-641.
- Marshal, M. P., Friedman, M. S., Stall, R., & Thompson, A. L. (2008). Individual trajectories of substance use in lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth and heterosexual youth. Addiction, 103(1), 103-114.
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. Psychological Bulletin, 129(5), 674-697.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). (2020). National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Detailed Tables.
- Bretteville-Jensen, A. L., Melberg, H. O., & Yttri, B. (2018). Drugs and social inequality: Challenges and insights in Norwegian drug research. Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs.

- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods. Sage Publications.
- Austin, E. W., & Johnson, K. K. (1997). Effects of general and alcohol-specific media literacy training on children's decision making about alcohol. Journal of Health Communication, 2(1), 17-42.
- Chetty, R., Stepner, M., Abraham, S., Lin, S., Scuderi, B., Turner, N., ... & Cutler, D. (2016). The association between income and life expectancy in the United States, 2001-2014. Jama, 315(16), 1750-1766.
- Corrigan, P. W., Druss, B. G., & Perlick, D. A. (2014). The impact of mental illness stigma on seeking and participating in mental health care. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 15(2), 37-70.
- Gladwell, M. (2007). Blink: The power of thinking without thinking. Little, Brown.
- Bagley, B. M. (1988). Colombia and the War on Drugs. Foreign Affairs, 67(1), 70-92.
- Freye, E. (2009). Pharmacology and Abuse of Cocaine, Amphetamines, Ecstasy and Related Designer Drugs. Springer.
- Freud, S. (1884). Über Coca. Centralblatt für die gesammte Therapie.
- Gootenberg, P. (2008). Andean Cocaine: The Making of a Global Drug. University of North Carolina Press.
- McAllister, W. B. (2000). Drug Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century: An International History. Routledge.
- Musto, D. F. (1999). The American Disease: Origins of Narcotic Control. Oxford University Press.
- Pendergrast, M. (2000). For God, Country, and Coca-Cola: The Definitive History of the Great American Soft Drink and the Company That Makes It. Basic Books.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2020). World Drug Report 2020.
- Peters, E., Burraston, B., & Mertz, C. K. (2004). An emotion-based model of risk perception and stigma susceptibility: Cognitive appraisals of emotion, affective reactivity, worldviews, and risk perceptions in the generation of technological stigma. Risk Analysis, 24(5), 1349-1367.
- Rosenstock, I. M., Strecher, V. J., & Becker, M. H. (1988). Social learning theory and the health belief model. Health Education & Behavior, 15(2), 175-183.
- Dunn, K. (2018). The effectiveness of community-based programs and initiatives: A summary of research. Journal of Community Practice, 26(1), 42-58.
- Montgomery, M. J. (2012). Peer-led support groups as an intervention for adolescents with asthma: A systematic review. Journal of Asthma, 49(7), 762-769.

- Degenhardt, L., Mathers, B., Vickerman, P., Rhodes, T., Latkin, C., Hickman, M., ... & Strathdee, S. A. (2010). Prevention of HIV infection for people who inject drugs: Why individual, structural, and combination approaches are needed. The Lancet, 376(9737), 285-301.
- Hughes, C. E., & Stevens, A. (2010). A resounding success or a disastrous failure: Re-examining the interpretation of evidence on the Portuguese decriminalisation of illicit drugs. Drug and Alcohol Review, 29(2), 133-135.
- Simon, H. A. (1957). Models of man: Social and rational. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263-291.
- Evans, J. S. (2008). Dual-processing accounts of reasoning, judgment, and social cognition. Annual Review of Psychology, 59, 255-278.
- Botvin, G. J., Griffin, K. W., & Nichols, T. D. (2003). Preventing youth violence and delinquency through a universal school-based prevention approach. Prevention Science, 4(1), 45-56.
- Boyd, S. (2002). Media constructions of illegal drugs, users, and sellers: A closer look at Traffic. International Journal of Drug Policy, 13(5), 397-407.
- Johnston, L. D., Miech, R. A., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2018). Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use 1975-2017: Overview, key findings on adolescent drug use. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Reinarman, C., & Levine, H. G. (1997). Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice. University of California Press.
- D'Amico, E. J., Miles, J. N., & Tucker, J. S. (2015). Gateway to curiosity: Medical marijuana ads and intention and use during middle school. Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 29(3), 613-619.
- Galea, S., & Vlahov, D. (2002). Social determinants and the health of drug users: Socioeconomic status, homelessness, and incarceration. Public Health Reports, 117(Suppl 1), S135-S145.
- Hathaway, A. D. (2004). Cannabis users' informal rules for managing stigma and risk. Deviant Behavior, 25(6), 559-577.
- Reinarman, C., & Levine, H. G. (1997). Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice. University of California Press.
- Romo, L. K., Garnett, R., & Younger, K. A. (2017). An examination of how professionals who work with adolescents perceive and communicate about celebrity influence on substance use. Journal of Health Communication, 22(5), 409-415.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179-211.
- Borsari, B., & Carey, K. B. (2001). Peer influences on college drinking: A review of the research. Journal of Substance Abuse, 13(4), 391-424.

- Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2004). Risk as analysis and risk as feelings: Some thoughts about affect, reason, risk, and rationality. Risk Analysis, 24(2), 311-322.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. Science, 211(4481), 453-458.
- Weinstein, N. D. (1980). Unrealistic optimism about future life events. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39(5), 806-820.