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Abstract

Arrests resulting from drug-related offending from January through December 2007 were compared between an urban and a rural county, both in the Midwest. Marijuana and methamphetamine were found to explain significantly more drug-related arrests in both counties with methamphetamine accounting for a significantly higher percentage of rural than urban drug arrests after controlling for the differences in total population sizes of the two counties ($X^2 = 10.26, 2 df$, $p < 0.01$). A descriptive parsimonious socioeconomic and demographic profile was established for the typical methamphetamine/rural drug offenders.

INTRODUCTION

Since the war on drugs was declared in the early 1970s and picked up momentum in the eighties, drug abuse has gained a place as one of the most researched social problems of our time. Considerable attempts have been made to create what has come to be referred to as the profile of a typical drug offender. Over the years, drug offending has been epitomized by crack cocaine, marijuana, and heroin (see Stephens, McGee, and Braithwaite 2007; Hopwood, Baker, and Morey 2008; Brecht, Huang, and Hser 2008) and the phenomenon has largely been perceived and conceptualized only as an urban social problem.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in research on profiles of offenders of specific types of drugs. Available research findings especially on rural drug involvement continue to yield mixed and sometimes contradictory results, with the exception of the now commonplace finding that drug users are mainly inner city black males. This notion has lingered on while the drug problem steadily shifts from the crowded urban streets where the likelihood of being detected and apprehended are at an all-time high to the otherwise less-patrolled rural communities that have traditionally been assumed to be drug safe. The result is an uneven distribution of preventative resources, treatment facilities, and educational opportunities, all of which are skewed toward urban communities, while the drug problem continues to migrate to presumed rural safe zones.

This background creates and highlights a growing need to empirically verify the types of drug involvement that are common among the residents of rural communities and to collate a parsimonious profile of rural drug offenders. In response to that need, this study compares arrests for drug involvement in two counties, one with most of the known rural characteristics such as social, cultural homogeneity, collective efficacy, and residency stability (Grinstein-Weiss, Curley and Porter 2007; Boyd, Hayes, Wilson and Beasley-Smith 2008), and another with the common urban distinctive that includes overcrowded neighborhoods, socio-cultural and economic heterogeneity, residency instability, and diminished collective efficacy and a weak sense of normlessness (Raudenbush, Sampson, Wilson, 1990; Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997). These communities form a recipe for highlighting the postulated types of drugs that characterize rural communities and for building a sparse inventory of the socio-economic and demographic profile of the typical methamphetamine/rural drug offender.

Study Objectives

There were three interconnected but intrinsically different objectives for this study: (1) to offer an empirical verification that drug offending is largely and uniquely an urban phenomenon; (2) to establish the expected profile of choice among rural residents; and (3) to produce an accurate and parsimonious inventory of the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of a typical rural drug offender. To achieve these objectives, a three-stage process was involved. First, drug-related arrests were compared to the total population of two counties, one of which was large urban and the other predominantly rural. Second, a tally was made of the drugs involved in the drug-related arrests in both counties. Lastly, socio-economic and demographic profiles of the arrestees in the rural county were compiled.
characteristics such as social and cultural homogeneity, collective efficacy, and residency stability (Grinstein-Weiss, Curley and Pajarita 2007; Boyd, Hayes, Wilson and Bealsley-Smith 2006), and another with the common urban distinctiveness that includes overcrowded neighborhoods, socio-cultural and economic heterogeneity, residency instability, diminished collective efficacy and a strong sense of normlessness (Shaw and McKay, 1942; Sampson and Wilson, 1990; Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997). These comparisons pave the way for highlighting the type of drugs that characterize rural communities and for building a sound inventory of the socio-economic and demographic profile of the typical methamphetamine/rural drug offender.

Study Objectives
There were three interconnected but intrinsically different objectives in this study: (1) to offer an empirical verification that drug offending is not a largely unique urban phenomenon; (2) to establish the drug of choice among rural residents; and (3) to produce an accurate and parsimonious inventory of the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of a typical rural drug offender. To achieve these objectives, a three-stage process was involved. First, drug-related arrests were compared to the total population for two counties, one of which was largely urban and the other predominantly rural. Second, a tally was made of all the drugs involved in the drug-related arrests in both counties. Lastly, socio-economic and demographic profiles of the arrestees in the rural county were compiled.
effect on different racial communities. The 19th century campaigns against opiate products targeted Chinese immigrants, the 20th century criminalization of marijuana focused on Mexicans and other Hispanics and to a lesser extent African Americans, while the widespread war against cocaine in general and crack cocaine in particular, focused largely on African Americans (Gerber and Jensen 2001). Thus, the manifest result of the war on drugs was disproportionate incarceration of racial minority citizens. While rural communities continue to receive less attention than urban areas, ostensibly because they experience less drug problems, residents of rural communities who might be in need of help are not likely to seek interventive attention because culturally appropriate educational opportunities are also not likely to be available to them (Warner and Leukefeld 2001).

Yet, drug abuse, especially methamphetamine, has been on the increase in the rural areas as indicated by such parameters as arrests, availability of methamphetamine labs, and paraphernalia seizures (Stroops, Tindall, Mateyoke-Scrivner and Leukefeld 2005; Hertz 2000). To be sure, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration reported in 2005 that while there were only 10 methamphetamine treatments per 100,000 for ages 12 and over in 1992, the treatments rose to 64 per 100,000 in 2004 (Zabransky 2007).

**Methamphetamine**

Compared to cocaine and other abused substances, methamphetamine is easy to manufacture, it produces a longer lasting euphoria, and its short- and long-term effects can be extreme (Hertz 2000). Since its metabolism rate is lower than that of other stimulants, methamphetamine's euphoria is more sustained and may last for as long as eight hours (see Cartier, Farabee, and Prendergast 2006). Unlike other stimulants, research has also shown that although arrestees in rural areas are more likely to have used drugs in general including cocaine, heroin, marijuana, and any other hard drug, the drug of choice in most rural areas is methamphetamine (Stroops, et al. 2005). This is particularly true because the ingredients needed to make methamphetamine are readily available in rural places. The common names for homemade methamphetamine include speed, meth, crystal, and crank, while purer forms of the drug are variously referred to as ice or glass.

The manufacture process, known as pseudoephedrine reduction, involves use of common household items such as iodine, pseudoephedrine, anhydrous ammonia, and lye, which is often found in pain medicines (Stroops, et al. 2005). The main ingredient, anhydrous ammonia, which is an agricultural fertilizer, is a common possession among farmers. This underscores further the reason why the manufacture and circulation of methamphetamine remains largely a rural enterprise. Even more pertinenty, the distinctive odor of ammonia is too detectable for locating a methamphetamine lab in a crowded urban street. As a rural commodity, distribution of methamphetamine follows familial and friendship patterns as opposed to strict urban dealer-buyer relationship. In addition to the typical methamphetamine user being a rural dweller, Edwards (1992) has shown that the user is characteristically a poor, unemployed young white male. Other factors to be predictive of methamphetamine use, especially relapse during after treatment, included race, gender, and previous drug abuse treatment (Pennell, Ellett, Rienick, and Gannon 1999; Hillhouse, Marinelli-Carvalho, Gonsalves, Ang, and Rawson 2001). There is also evidence that offenders charged with drug violations are more likely than other offenders to have earlier criminal histories (Bouffard and Richardson 2007), and that drug-involved offenders manifest higher rates of mental health problems than non-drug-involved offenders (Grabintz and Saum 2005).

Like methamphetamine, marijuana violations have similarly associated more with the rural than with urban populations. A recent study by the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse found persons living in non-metropolitan areas to be over twice as likely than those in metropolitan areas to report that marijuana was fairly easy to obtain (NHSDA 2002). In addition to race and gender, specific socio-demographic characteristics that have been linked to likelihood of success in completing drug treatment programs include drug type and offense type (Butzin, Saum, and Scarpetti 2002; Lang and Bello 2000; Mateyoke-Scrivner, Webber, Staton, and Leukefeld 2004). This present study examines data from rural and an urban county with a view to verifying the reported rural-urban differentials in drug offending and to isolate a parsimonious characterization of rural drug offenders.
be extreme (Hertz 2000). Since its bolism rate is lower than that of other stimulants, methamphetamine’s mania is more sustained and may for as long as eight hours (see Jerker, Farabee, and Prendergast 2003). Unlike other stimulants, amphetamine has also shown that although states in urban areas are more to have used drugs in general, including cocaine, heroin, marijuana, any other hard drug, the drug of sale in most rural areas is methamphetamine (Stroops, et al. 2005). This is particularly true because the ingredients needed to make methamphetamine are readily available in rural places. The common es for homemade methamphetamine include speed, ice, crystal, and crank, while purer is of the drug are variously referred to as ice or glass.

The manufacture process, known pseudophedrine reduction, involves use of common household is such as iodine, pseudophedrine, anhydrous ammonia, and which is often found in pain icines (Stroops, et al. 2005). The ingredient, anhydrous ammonia, which is an agricultural fertilizer, is a mon possession among farmers. The underscores further the reason that the manufacture and circulation of methamphetamine remains largely a el enterprise. Even more thinently, the distinctive odor of amphetamine is too detectable for locating methamphetamine lab in a crowded an street. As a rural commodity, distribution of methamphetamine is es familial and friendship patterns opposed to strict urban dealer- er relationship. In addition to the methamphetamine user being a commuter, Edwards (1992) has shown that the user is also characteristically a poor, unemployed, young white male. Other factors found to be predictive of methamphetamine use, especially relapse during and after treatment, included race, gender and previous drug abuse treatment (Pennel, Ettelt, Rienick, and Grimes 1999; Hillhouse, Marinelli-Carsey, Gonsalves, Ang, and Rawson 2007). There is also evidence that offenders charged with drug violations are more likely than other offenders to have had earlier criminal histories (Bouffard and Richardson 2007), and that drug-involved offenders manifest higher rates of mental health problems than non-drug-involved offenders (Gray and Saum 2005).

Like methamphetamine, marijuana violations have similarly been associated more with the rural than urban populations. A recent study by the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse found persons living in non-metropolitan areas to be more likely than those in metropolitan areas to report that marijuana was fairly or very easy to obtain (NHSDA 2002). In addition to race and gender, other specific socio-demographic characteristics that have been linked to the likelihood of success in completion of drug treatment programs include age and offense type (Butzin, Saum, and Scarpitti, 2002; Lang and Belenko 2000; Mateyoke-Scrivner, Webster, Staton, and Leukfeld 2004). The present study examines data from a rural and an urban county with a view to verifying the reported rural-urban differentials in drug offending and to isolate a parsimonious characteristic of rural drug offenders.

### Study Methods

The arrest data in two Midwestern counties were examined. One of the counties, characterized by a large metropolis, was mainly urban with most of the residents living in the city located at the heart of the county (U.S. Census Bureau 2008). The other was predominantly rural with only scattered townships and a fairly stable settlement that epitomizes rural populations. All the arrests that were entered for the analysis took place from January through December 2007. For that year, there were 225 and 1,251 drug-related arrests in the rural and urban counties, respectively. At the time, the rural county had a total population of 47,518 while the urban county had 343,112 (U.S. Census Bureau 2008). The data included social, economic, demographic, educational, and health backgrounds, specific arrest charges, previous crime histories, and treatment regimens of individual arrestees. The significance of the relationship between the two samples with respect to drug choices was established by using the chi-square.

### RESULTS

All the arrests in both counties were classified according to the violations for which they were originally arrested and charged; individual case dispositions were not considered. Three broad drug-type categories emerged. They were marijuana, methamphetamine, and “other” drug types. The distribution of the arrests in the two samples is presented in Table 1. The rate of marijuana-related arrests did not vary in any significant way between the rural and urban samples (53.8 percent
and 52.8 percent, respectively). The chi-square was used to measure the statistical significance of this difference for all three categories. The chi-square coefficient was 10.26 with two degrees of freedom, which was statistically significant at the .01 level of probability. There was an evident interaction term between marijuana and methamphetamine for the rural sample, but since the same was not available in the urban sample, it was not entered into the analyses. From these results, it is evident that the “other” category in the urban sample was more than three times larger than the “other” category in the rural sample. While almost all drug violations in the rural county could be traced to marijuana and methamphetamine, about percent of drug violations in the urban county were accounted for by other drug types. The most commonly reported under the “other” category included cocaine, heroin, ketamine, glue, and Lysergic Acid Diethylamide (LSD).

In order to meet the other major objective of the study, which was to generate a parsimonious profile, the inventory of the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of a typical rural drug offender, rural county sample was analyzed for the drug offender characteristics. The results are presented in Table 2. As already demonstrated by current literature, drug users are more likely than non-users to have a history of contact with law enforcement and others a history of drug treatment (Pennel, Ellett, Rienick, and Grimes 1999; Hillhouse et al. 2007). Of the 225 rural county drug-related arrestees in this study, a large majority (84 percent) had experienced at least one previous arrest and about 12 percent had a history of as many as six arrests. The study also sought to establish the modal marital status of the rural drug offenders. About 60 percent had never been married while 22 percent had divorced and another 19 percent were married.

Existing literature has also suggested that methamphetamine users are typically poor, unemployed, young white males (Edwards 1992). The current study sought to test these claims as well. To address the extent of the assertion of poverty and unemployment among the rural drug offenders, three variables were tested, namely, employment status, length of time on the current job, and current hourly wages. Approximately 97 percent of the subjects were employed at the time of arrest. Almost all those who were employed, over 90 percent received an hourly wage of less than 10 dollars while only 11 percent of the arrestees earned 16 dollars or more per hour. Further, approximately 6 percent of all the arrestees had been on their current job for less than six months and that only 9 percent of the subjects had been employed.

In order to meet the other major objective of the study, which was to generate a parsimonious profile, the inventory of the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of a typical rural drug offender, rural county sample was analyzed for the drug offender characteristics. The results are presented in Table 2. As already demonstrated by current literature, drug users are more likely than non-users to have a history of contact with law enforcement and others a history of drug treatment (Pennel, Ellett, Rienick, and Grimes 1999; Hillhouse et al. 2007). Of the 225 rural county drug-related arrestees in this study, a large majority (84 percent) had experienced at least one previous arrest and about 12 percent had a history of as many as six arrests. The study also sought to establish the modal marital status of the rural drug offenders. About 60 percent had never been married while 22 percent had divorced and another 19 percent were married.

Existing literature has also suggested that methamphetamine users are typically poor, unemployed, young white males (Edwards 1992). The current study sought to test these claims as well. To address the extent of the assertion of poverty and unemployment among the rural drug offenders, three variables were tested, namely, employment status, length of time on the current job, and current hourly wages. Approximately 97 percent of the subjects were employed at the time of arrest. Almost all those who were employed, over 90 percent received an hourly wage of less than 10 dollars while only 11 percent of the arrestees earned 16 dollars or more per hour. Further, approximately 6 percent of all the arrestees had been on their current job for less than six months and that only 9 percent of the subjects had been employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Type</th>
<th>Rural county</th>
<th>Urban county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>121 (53.8%)</td>
<td>661 (52.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methamphetamine</td>
<td>88 (39.1%)</td>
<td>278 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16 (7.1%)</td>
<td>312 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>225 (100.0%)</td>
<td>1,251 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*χ² = 10.26, 2 df, p < 0.01
time on the current job, and current hourly wages. Approximately 50 percent of the subjects were not employed at the time of arrest. Among those who were employed, over 60 percent received an hourly wage of less than 10 dollars while only 11 percent of the arrestees earned 16 dollars or more per hour. Further, approximately 70 percent of all the arrestees had been on their current job for less than six months and that only 9 percent of the subjects had been employed.

In order to meet the other major objective of the study, which was to generate a parsimonious profile, the inventory of the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of a typical rural drug offender, rural county sample was analyzed for the drug offender characteristics. The results are presented in Table 2. As already demonstrated by current literature, drug users are more likely than non-users to have a history of contact with law enforcement and others a history of drug treatment (Pennel, Ellett, Rienick, and Grimes 1999; Hillhouse et al. 2007). Of the 225 rural county drug-related arrestees in this study, a large majority (84 percent) had experienced at least one previous arrest and about 12 percent had a history of as many as six arrests. The study also sought to establish the modal marital status of the rural drug offenders. About 60 percent had never been married while 22 percent had divorced and another 19 percent were widowed.

Existing literature has also suggested that methamphetamine users are typically poor, unemployed, young white males (Edwards 1992). The current study sought to test these claims as well. To address the extent of the assertion of poverty and employment among the rural drug offenders, three variables were tested, namely, employment status, length of time on the current job, and current hourly wages. Approximately 50 percent of the subjects were not employed at the time of arrest. Among those who were employed, over 60 percent received an hourly wage of less than 10 dollars while only 11 percent of the arrestees earned 16 dollars or more per hour. Further, approximately 70 percent of all the arrestees had been on their current job for less than six months and that only 9 percent of the subjects had been employed.

The claim that most of the rural arrestees, who also happen to be predominantly marijuana and methamphetamine users, are young, white males who were similarly tested. According to the results presented in Table 2, nearly 65 percent of the rural drug-violation arrestees were less than thirty years old. Over 80 percent of the arrestees were male. Whites represented 90.6 percent of the arrested population while 5.8 percent had Hispanic origins. All other racial minority groups together accounted for 3.6 percent of the total arrests.

DISCUSSION

From the findings of this study, it is evident that drug abuse afflicts rural areas no less than it does urban communities. More specifically, the study revealed that marijuana is the most commonly abused drug and this is true for both rural and urban settings. This is an important finding as it serves as a refutation of the commonly held notion that cocaine, in its various forms, is the drug of choice for most drug offenders. The finding is therefore an
Table 2. Rural Drug Offender Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>N = 225</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of prior arrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time on current job (in months)</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly wages in $ (for the employed, N=117)</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

empirical pointer to the direction in which policy makers should look in the raging war on drugs. Although abuse of methamphetamine was common in both rural and urban areas, a significantly higher concentration of arrests related to methamphetamine violations were found in the rural county compared to the urban county after controlling for the differences in population size. One of the main reasons for this trend may be the distinctive odor of the ingredients of the drug, particularly anhydrous ammonia, which would increase the risk of being detected and apprehended in places with high population density as is the case of urban streets and neighbor-

hoods. Given the ease with which methamphetamine is manufactured and the fact that it produces a longer lasting euphoria with extreme short- and long-term effects (Hertz, 2000), the need to identify and develop more rigorous and effective drug alleviation programs in rural areas becomes paramount.

One way in which to confront the rural drug problem is through Drug Court programs that allow offenders to participate in intense supervision and treatment regimens and to stay out of further violations as a tradeoff for being diverted from possible incarceration. Drug Court programs are routinely non-adversarial and allow the offenders to interact with the judge in an ongoing participation process, which promotes rehabilitation. They also offer great rewards and sanctions in addition to saving local and state tax money that would be spent in the upkeep of offenders had they been jailed or incarcerated.

This study also revealed that typical methamphetamine users are unmarried white males who are unemployed or works an unstable job that typically pays low wages. Unmarried persons, who also happen to be generally younger, tend to have relatively little in their social network than the married and this is especially true if the person is also uneducated. This combination frees one from obligations that would conventionally hold a person down to some accepted forms of behavior. If all other factors are equal, the unmarried persons are more likely to venture into risky and often illegal type of behavior than the married. As a result, an increase in youth communities programs in the rural areas would go to channel the youths' energies to law-abiding growth trajectories.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Drug-related offending known to cross rural-urban boundaries and, marijuana is the most commonly abused drug, methamphetamine more of a rural than an urban drug. The finding that drug offending is no longer an urban-only phenomenon prompts a need to rethink the current secondary position of communities in relation to resource allocation for programs that target citizens with drug-related problems and to redistribute the resources...
participation process, which promotes rehabilitation. They also offer graduated rewards and sanctions in addition to saving local and state tax money, which would be spent in the upkeep of offenders had they been jailed or incarcerated.

This study also revealed that a typical methamphetamine user is an unmarried white male who is either unemployed or works an unstable job that typically pays low wages. Unmarried persons, who also happen to be generally younger, tend to have less social capital; they have invested relatively little in their social networks than the married and this is especially true if the person is also uneducated. This combination frees one from obligations that would conventionally hold a person down to socially accepted forms of behavior. If all other factors are equal, the unmarried persons are more likely to venture into risky and often illegal types of behavior than the married. As a result, an increase in youth community programs in the rural areas would help to channel the youths’ energies toward law-abiding growth trajectories.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Drug-related offending knows no rural-urban boundaries and, while marijuana is the most commonly abused drug, methamphetamine is more of a rural than an urban drug. The finding that drug offending is no longer an urban-only phenomenon prompts a need to rethink the current secondary position of rural communities in relation to resource allocation for programs that target citizens with drug-related problems and to redistribute the resources accordingly. Such resources should include not only law enforcement, treatment and detoxification facilities, but also educational programs that help raise the communal awareness about the adverse effects of drug abuse and how to ensure continued community safety. The study also showed that the socio-demographic characteristics of the rural drug users are different from the stereotypical inner city drug offender. The typical methamphetamine drug offender is a young unmarried white male with a history of arrests for drug or non-drug related offenses and no stable employment. This discovery should form the basis on which the target rural population in need of drug-related treatment and rehabilitation should be identified.

The data for this study were obtained from government agencies. Since deliberate manipulation of data by government agencies for the purpose of image-building is not uncommon (Hagan 2003; Mubua and Grenier 2008), a possibility of such manipulation in the data used for this study cannot be entirely ignored although there was no evidence to suggest that it occurred. It is also acknowledged that while most of the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the rural drug offender may be true of most rural communities, the racial composition of the sample may be a reflection of the common characteristics of most rural communities thereby whittling down, to some degree, the claim that rural drug offenders are predominantly white. However, this particular finding does not deviate from observations made in other countries that have racial heterogeneity. In the Czech Republic, for example, use of methamphetamine
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