

Spring 5-15-2011

# The Effectiveness of Random Drug Testing of School Athletes

Kelly Cann  
*Coastal Carolina University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/honors-theses>

 Part of the [Sports Management Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Cann, Kelly, "The Effectiveness of Random Drug Testing of School Athletes" (2011). *Honors Theses*. 118.  
<https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/honors-theses/118>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College and Center for Interdisciplinary Studies at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [commons@coastal.edu](mailto:commons@coastal.edu).

The Effectiveness of Random Drug Testing of School Athletes

Kelly Cann

Honors Program- Coastal Carolina University

May 5, 2011

## **Introduction**

Len Bias was an outstanding University of Maryland basketball player who was named the ACC (Atlantic Coast Conference) Player of the Year for 1985-1986, was selected to join the ACC Athletes of the Year in 1986, and played in four NCAA tournaments (Frandsen 1). On June 17, 1986, 22 year old Bias was chosen by the Boston Celtics as the second overall pick in the 1986 NBA Draft (1). Two days later, he died from a cocaine overdose (1). In 2004, Taylor Hooton, a rising 17-year-old baseball player at a Plano, Texas high school, committed suicide by hanging himself in his family's home (Andresen 325). He had been taking steroids to build up his body so he could be more competitive in his senior year, and when he stopped taking them, it is believed that he suffered post-steroid depression that likely caused him to take his own life (325). The same year that Len Bias died, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), which is the agency that addresses safety issues in college sports, introduced a policy of random drug testing for college athletes (Burke 397). In Taylor Hooton's case, high schools around the country had already begun random drug testing programs because of a 1995 U.S. Supreme Court ruling (326). Unfortunately, Taylor Hooton had never been selected as one of the athletes at his school to be tested (Andresen 336).

Proponents of drug testing would most likely argue that random drug testing could have saved the lives of Len Bias and Taylor Hooton. Those against random drug testing might respond that this testing could be an avenue used to save lives, but before that can happen, a lot more work would need to be done to change the way the current system operates (or fails to operate) in order to make drug testing fair, effective and efficient.

## **Legal Precedent**

Although many opponents of random drug testing feel that it violates a student's right to privacy, there is legal precedent that states otherwise (Shutler 1265). On June 26, 1995, the United States Supreme Court held that random drug testing of student athletes in public high schools without any suspicion of drug use, was not a violation of their "Fourth Amendment rights and was therefore constitutional" (Shutler 1265). The Fourth Amendment to the constitution states that the government cannot violate the "right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizure" (Scalia 3). The Supreme Court ruled on "random" drug testing. This is testing without suspicion or cause, where student athletes are informed that they can be tested for drug use through urinalysis on a random basis, regardless of whether or not they manifest any signs or symptoms of drug use (Ringwalt 178). "For cause" drug testing is different from random testing because it is performed when there is suspicion or reason to believe that a particular student has been using drugs (178). The court's ruling on random drug testing in public high schools was based on a review of the *Vernonia School District 47J v. Acton* case (Shutler 1265).

### **History of Court Case- Drug Testing in High Schools**

The history of the *Vernonia* case began in 1989, when Vernonia school officials were concerned with what they believed to be an "increase in drug use" among students in their district (Shutler 1273). Vernonia, Oregon, was a small, isolated town with only one high school and school athletics played an important role in the town, resulting in local athletes being admired by other students and the community (Shutler 1273). In 1989, Vernonia school officials became alarmed based on information that led them to believe student athletes in their school district were involved with drugs. They came to this conclusion because athletes were observed by school officials as possibly being under the influence of drugs and alcohol; some athletes

admitted to using drugs; and coaches witnessed an increase in injuries and poor performance by some athletes on the field, which the coaches believed to be related to drug use (Shutler 1273). In addition to these points, it was also noted that there had been a sharp rise in disciplinary reports filed against athletes and other students because they had become "...increasingly rude and disruptive in class" (Shutler 1273). The Vernonia School District felt that there was sufficient evidence to support the school administrators' beliefs that athletes "led" the other students within the "existing drug culture" and that the use of drugs in their schools was preventing school officials from maintaining "order and discipline" (Emese and Jutte 9). Because of these findings, the school district implemented random drug testing for athletes in 1989 to deter student athletes from using drugs, to protect their safety and health and to offer assistance programs for drug users (Scalia 2).

In 1991, student athlete James Acton signed up to play football at a Vernonia public school but was denied participation in football or any sports because he refused to sign the drug testing consent forms (3). He sued the Vernonia School District (*Vernonia School District 47J v Acton*), claiming that their drug testing policy violated his Fourth Amendment right to be protected from "unreasonable searches and seizures" (3). An Oregon District Court denied Acton's claims on the merits of the case, and dismissed the action, but the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed, holding that the random drug policy violated both the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments (3). The Fourteenth Amendment provides the same constitutional guarantee for individuals to be protected from unreasonable searches and seizures as the Fourth Amendment, but extends this guarantee against unreasonable searches and seizures to state officers, which would include public school officials (3). Vernonia school district officials appealed this case to the United States Supreme Court which ruled that the Student Athlete Drug Testing Policy, as

implemented by the Vernonia School District, was constitutional under both the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments (1).

In the U.S. Supreme Court ruling involving the *Vernonia* case, Justice Antonin Scalia delivered the opinion of the Court (Scalia 2). He stated that even though the Vernonia School District offered classes, hosted speakers, held presentations and even used a drug-sniffing dog (all aimed at deterring drug use), there were still major issues with drugs and discipline in its schools and that the “disciplinary problems had reached epidemic proportions” (2). Justice Scalia cited several justifications for the seriousness and urgency of combating drugs in schools (Shutler 1282). He stated that school-aged children were not able to fight the “physical, psychological and addictive effects of drugs” (Shutler 1282). It was also the Court’s belief that if drug use were allowed to spread in a school, it would threaten both the students and the educational process, and that since parents entrust the care of their children to school officials, these officials have a duty to be responsible caretakers (Shutler 1282). Justice Scalia pointed out that student athletes were singled out by their school district in the *Vernonia* case because, as participants in sports activities, they were at an increased risk for drug related injuries and that “students who voluntarily participate in school athletics have reason to expect intrusions upon normal rights and privileges, including privacy” (Scalia 5). According to the Court, these intrusions include the requirements that athletes in public schools have to pass a physical exam, obtain health insurance through the school or sign a waiver if they have their own insurance, maintain a certain grade point average and abide by all rules established by the coach and the athletic director (5). In summary, the highest court in the land concluded that the Vernonia drug testing policy was “reasonable and constitutional” because of “the decreased expectation of

privacy, the relative unobtrusiveness of the search and the severity of the need met by the search” (8).

In a subsequent court case reviewed by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2002 (*Board of Education in Pottawatomie County v. Earls*), the Court expanded the authority of public school administrations to randomly drug test “all junior and senior high school students wishing to participate in extracurricular activities” and not just student athletes (Boire 39). The Supreme Court ruled that random drug tests for middle and high school students participating in any extracurricular activity was “a reasonably effective means of addressing the School District’s legitimate concerns in preventing, deterring, and detecting drug use” (Thomas 3,7). In a dissenting opinion on the *Earls* case (which directly relates to the *Vernonia* case), Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who was joined by Justices John Paul Stevens, Sandra Day O’Connor and David Souter, condemned random drug testing of students by describing the practice as “unreasonable, capricious and even perverse” (Boire 39).

Although the highest court in the country holds that random drug testing of high school athletes and other students involved in extracurricular activities is constitutional, drug testing in high schools remains a controversial issue. Proponents and opponents of drug testing athletes have raised questions and concerns regarding privacy, justification, reliability, deterrence, costs and morale. Although the research on this subject is both limited and outdated, what information is available points to the conclusions that random drug testing, as it exists today in most public high schools and colleges, is discriminatory, unreliable, limited in scope, economically wasteful and not a proven deterrent.

### **Opponents of Drug Testing in High Schools**

Subsequent to the United States Supreme Court's rulings in *Vernonia v. Acton* and *Board of Education v. Earls*, there was another noteworthy court case which involved random drug testing of public high school athletes in the state of Washington (*York et al v. Wahkiakum School District Number 200*) (Emese and Jutte 8). In this matter, the Washington Supreme Court (WSC) ruled that although the random drug testing policy in a school district in that state did not violate the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (based on the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in the *Vernonia* case), it did "violate an article and section of the Washington State Constitution" (8-9). On March 13, 2008, the WSC decided that the state constitution "provides greater protection for Washington citizens against unreasonable searches" (2). The WSC held that public high schools in the state of Washington would need "reasonable and individualized suspicion" against a specific individual before drug testing would be authorized (9). The Washington Supreme Court found a legal way to push aside the rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court as they pertain to random drug testing in high schools within that state.

Advocates of civil liberties have criticized the United States Supreme Court decisions because they believe that drug testing in schools was an "unjustified invasion of privacy" (Taylor 351). Other opponents have argued that the accuracy of these tests is questionable, since students know how to use certain drugs that are undetectable, and they have learned how to dilute their urine by drinking water before the testing process, or, by altering their urine sample with bleach, salt or vinegar (Ringwalt 178). Many physicians have questioned the fact that athletes are intentionally singled out when there is no definitive proof that they use drugs any more than non-athletes do (Taylor 351). In fact, some opponents of drug testing athletes and students in extracurricular activities believe that although random drug testing may deter some students from drug use, "students who participate in extracurricular activities are some of the least likely to use

drugs” (Boire 39). Additionally, those who stand against testing question the costs of conducting the tests which can range from \$14 to \$30 dollars to detect “street” or recreational drugs such as marijuana, cocaine, amphetamines, heroin, opiates, barbiturates and tranquilizers and the cost of steroid testing which start at \$100 dollars per test (Yamaguchi et al 159).

Critics are concerned that testing may “undermine trusting relationships between students and school personnel” (Ringwalt 178). A pilot study was conducted between 1999 and 2000 to assess possible effects of random drug testing as a deterrent to drug use among high school athletes (Goldberg 16). The study was named “SATURN” (Student Athlete Testing Using Random Notification) and the results were published in the *Journal of Adolescent Health* in January of 2003 (Goldberg 16). Assessors found that positive attitudes about school were lower for the group of athletes who were in a drug testing program as compared to athletes in a school that did not have drug testing (Goldberg 22). The same study reported that drug testing might have had some impact on reducing drug use by athletes, but cautioned that these findings could be misleading for several reasons, including, the small sample size used in the SATURN study, the short duration of the study, and the fact that the sample schools were not randomly selected (Goldberg 24). Another research study involving national surveys of 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders regarding the possible deterrent effects of drug testing was conducted by a Research Investigator and Research Scientists with the University of Michigan from 1998-2001 (Yamaguchi et al 159). These researchers determined that among the students surveyed in their study, which included high school male athletes, school drug testing was not associated with the “prevalence or the frequency” of marijuana or other illegal drug use (164). Instead, they found that the strongest predictors of student drug use was the “students’ attitudes toward drug use and perceptions of peer use” and that schools may be doing more to deter drug use if they concentrated on these key

attitudes and perceptions rather than conducting drug testing (164). The U.S. Supreme Court held that drug testing was constitutional in the *Vernonia* case because of all the drug problems that school was reportedly having. However, there were no scientific studies conducted in that school district to actually measure the amount of student drug use there, and as a result, it would have been difficult to determine if the drug testing program was even effective (Yamaguchi et al 159).

Another consideration that has become part of the controversy involving random drug testing in high schools is the amount of money drug testing programs cost the federal government and each state. Federal support for state testing programs is under the administration of the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) and cost the federal government 16.5 million dollars in FY 2008, which was a 6.5 million dollar increase from the year before (Ringwalt 178). This amount is in addition to what each state has to include in its high school budget for drug testing. For example, in the 2007/2008 school year, New Jersey and Florida spent 100,000 dollars each for testing, while Illinois spent 150,000 dollars, and Texas budgeted 3,000,000 dollars for testing of high school athletes (Andresen 337). In that school year, New Jersey tested only 500 student athletes and each one of the students had to be participating in state championships (337). Florida only tested 1% of its students and limited the testing to football, baseball and softball players (337). In the entire state of Illinois, approximately 700 athletes, all participating in state championships, were tested; and in Texas, where three million dollars was budgeted, only 3% of the athletes at only 30% of the state's schools were tested (337). Available testing results from two of these states disclosed that only one Florida high school student tested positive for drug use that school year (2007/2008), and there were two positive results out of 10,000 tests conducted in Texas ( 330 and 335). The Florida drug testing

program in high schools was dropped after 2008 when the Florida legislature discontinued funding for the program (329). If so few students test positive for drugs in any one school year, does this mean that the program is an effective deterrent against drug use and is therefore a success? Proponents would say “yes”; however, opponents might be quick to respond that are not drug users, which is the reason why the number of positive test results are low.

Another point to consider when evaluating the drug testing programs in high schools as they exist today, is identifying what drugs are included in the testing. As of 2008, New Jersey and Illinois were the only two states that were testing for other drugs in addition to steroids (332). According to a recent survey conducted by researchers at the University of Michigan, failing to test students for recreational drugs leaves schools dealing with only a “very small part of the high school drug issue” (332). The percentage of high school students surveyed in the University of Michigan study who had used steroids was much lower than the percentage who admitted to using recreation drugs such as alcohol, marijuana, Vicodin, barbiturates and tranquilizers, hallucinogens, cocaine, Oxycontin and even Ecstasy (332). This study revealed that only 1.4% of twelfth graders surveyed had admitted to using steroids in the preceding year while over 66% admitted to using alcohol and 31% admitted to smoking marijuana during the same time period (332).

Another recent study was conducted by the NCAA and involved surveying college athletes about their drug use. This study disclosed that over one-half of the respondents who admitted to using cocaine and anabolic steroids, reportedly started using these drugs in high school (332). Additionally, over two-thirds of the college athletes who admitted to using amphetamines started using these drugs prior to high school; and the percentage of college athletes using ergogenic drugs (those which increase one’s capacity for mental and physical

exertion), and admitting to first using them in high school, had increased significantly (332). Although there are risks, both physically and mentally, when athletes take steroids, the current drug testing programs in both high schools and colleges today, basically ignore the negative risks that can affect an athlete's life when he uses alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and many prescription medications (333).

As limited as current high school drug testing programs are for the type of drug being tested, they are also limited when it comes to selecting which athletes are tested. For example, in New Jersey and Illinois, only athletes participating in state championships were tested, while in Florida, only one percent of athletes were tested and this testing was limited to the sports of football, baseball, weightlifting and softball (337). Although Texas included all athletes in every sport in their testing program, they only tested 3% of the athletes at less than one-third of the schools in the state (337). Testing should not just be focused on men's sports and during state championships, but should include more women and more athletes (both men and women) at all levels of playing (333). Student athletes should not be ignored or considered low risks for steroid use just because they are not competing at championship levels. If athletes believe the risk of being caught for drug use is minimal because their chances of being tested are very low, they may be more willing to gamble and try steroids and other drugs.

Opponents of testing would also argue about the many inconsistencies in ways different states respond to a positive drug test. Ineligibility to participate in sports from a positive drug test can range for thirty days to one year depending on the state (337). Some school officials will meet with the student's parents and have the student attend drug counseling and/or a drug treatment program, while school administrators in other states will notify law enforcement

officials regarding the positive drug test and/or suspend the athlete from the team and/or suspend him from school (Ringwalt 177).

### **Proponents of Drug Testing in High Schools**

Although the real impact of drug testing high school athletes is still unknown, since studies and research in this area are both limited and outdated, proponents still push for random drug testing as being a worthwhile program. They argue that there is a possibility that drug testing is a deterrent for some students and it may stop them from trying drugs. A positive drug test result mandates some students for drug intervention and results in other students being offered drug counseling. Testing also provides some students with an excuse to back out when their peers are pressuring them to use drugs (Ringwalt 178). Advocates of drug testing believe that testing it is important because it is one way of keeping our athletes safe and it helps prevent sports from being compromised through unfair competition. The Supreme Court has ruled that drug testing is not a violation of a student's right to privacy. Athletes under the influence of drugs are a danger to themselves and to all other athletes on the field. Schools have an obligation to protect all students. The fact that drugs are in schools and students have access to them everyday cannot be ignored. Proponents may concede that high school drug testing programs is in need of some changes. However, they would not agree with dropping the program, as was done in the state of Florida. Those in favor of drug testing may ask opponents what a student's life is worth, and hope that it would be valued at more than 150,000 dollars, which was the drug testing budget amount for the state of Florida before they decided not to renew the drug testing program in that state. If Len Bias was tested for street drugs, he may be alive today. If Taylor Hooton was tested for steroids, he may be alive today.

### **Drug Testing in College**

Drug testing is not limited to athletes in high schools. In 1986, almost a decade before the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that random drug testing of high school athletes was constitutional, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) began random testing of college athletes for performance enhancing substances and recreational drugs (Diacin et al 2). The NCAA was formed in the early 1900s following a directive from President Theodore Roosevelt to address deaths and injuries during intercollegiate football competitions (Burke 397). The association's duties have been expanded, and include responsibilities in areas that are related to an athlete's welfare, benefits and grades and eligibility to compete (397). An important goal of the NCAA is to keep a "level playing field for competition" and random drug testing is a means to achieve that goal (397). According to the NCAA's own "Drug Testing Program 2010-2011", this organization initiated drug testing for college athletes, "So that no one participant might have an artificially induced advantage, so that no one participant might be pressured to use chemical substances in order to remain competitive, and to safeguard the health and safety of participants" ([www.NCAA.org/drugtesting](http://www.NCAA.org/drugtesting) 4).

According to Dr. Gary Green, an Associate Professor at UCLA, who is involved in running the intercollegiate drug testing program for the NCAA, the Association's program is "probably the largest drug testing program in the United States, involving about 10,000 drug tests per year" (397). Although this may appear to be a large number of tests, it is important to note that the NCAA consists of more than 400,000 student athletes playing 23 sports at more than 1000 member institutions that have joined the NCAA (NCAA Drug Testing Program 2010-2011). Not all college athletes are subjected to random drug testing. When NCAA testing first started, it was only conducted at Division I football games and at some NCAA Championships (Diacin 2). Since 1990, testing was expanded to year-round, and included football players in

Division I-A, I-AA, and II, Division I track and field athletes and all athletes participating in NCAA championship events and post-season bowl games (2).

### **Opponents of Drug Testing College Athletes**

The NCAA drug testing program has been controversial for many of the same reasons as high school drug testing programs are. Opponents claim that testing without suspicion violates the athlete's Fourth Amendment rights against unreasonable searches and seizures. The NCAA drug testing program has been challenged in different state courts. For example, the Colorado Supreme Court held that drug testing of student athletes without suspicion was a violation of the Fourth Amendment, while the California State Supreme Court ruled in favor of the NCAA because of the NCAA's "interest in fair competition and the health and safety of athletes as well as athletes' acceptance of diminished privacy..." (2). The majority of courts and arbitration panels have ruled in favor of sports governing bodies and institutions that test college athletes (Mitten 60).

Another criticism involves the reliability of drug test results because certain substances, such as birth control pills, can result in a positive test result and because of the possibility of inaccurate test results caused by human error in the laboratory (2). Additionally, many supplements, sports drinks and protein powders that are legal to buy, but contain a stimulant banned by the NCAA, are responsible for both the majority of positive drug tests administered by the NCAA and the resulting appeals by athletes who claim the banned substance was not declared on the packages (Burke 399).

Approximately one percent of the 11,000 NCAA athletes who are randomly tested each year test positive for performance-enhancing substances such as anabolic androgenic steroids (Mitten 60). Because of a positive test, and the loss of any appeals the athlete is entitled to, the

NCAA will suspend the athlete from participation in all NCAA sports for a period of one year (61). Even though steroids are legal and beneficial for treating “muscle-wasting conditions”, they are banned by sports organizations because they enhance athletic performance (60). Specifically, combining anabolic steroids and increasing physical training can enhance an athlete’s performance because it makes him/her bigger, faster and stronger (Mitten 60). Unfortunately, not only has the non-medical use of anabolic steroids been associated with adverse health effects on the liver and the reproductive, musculoskeletal, and cardiovascular systems, but dangerous psychiatric effects have also been associated with steroid use and users are more likely to engage in substance and alcohol abuse (9 pg248).

### **Proponents of Drug Testing College Athletes**

Most college student-athletes and non-athletes who have been surveyed about drug testing, feel that drug use by athletes is not acceptable, and athletes are obligated to be drug free when participating in sports (Diacin 13). In one survey, the students were in favor of drug testing, but felt it was unfair to test certain athletes multiple times without cause, while other athletes were not tested at all (13). In this same survey, the majority of the students stated that playing intercollegiate sports was a privilege, and that student athletes represent their university, which are the most important reasons to initiate drug testing (14). A student survey conducted at Coastal Carolina University (CCU) in 2011 as part of this thesis, disclosed similar findings of previous surveys. The majority of the seventy survey participants at CCU agreed with random drug testing both high school and college athletes but did not agree with random drug testing of non-athletes at any level of school. Most of the students in this survey felt that drug testing was a deterrent to drug use in high school but not in college. There was very little difference in

responses between CCU athletes and CCU non-athletes. No other significant findings were found in this survey.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

Drug use by competitive athletes is not new. Anxiety about athletes and drug use, specifically performance-enhancing substances, began in the 1950s with the use of anabolic steroids by Soviet athletes at the 1956 World Games in Moscow (Diacin 2). Sport governing bodies such as the International Amateur Athletic Federation and the International Olympic Committee banned specific performance-enhancing drugs in the 1960s and 1970s (2). The NCAA banned anabolic steroid use by college athletes in 1973 (2). Starting in the 1970s, Olympic athletes and athletes participating in other international competitions have been tested for prohibited substances (2). Because of all the media attention, most people are aware that steroids and other performance-enhancing drugs have been taken by Olympic athletes as well as professional athletes, such as baseball and football players. What should be of major concern is the fact that, starting in high school, or possibly middle school, young athletes, like Taylor Hooton, are getting access to steroids and other performance-enhancing substances.

Drug testing in high schools today needs to be re-examined and re-evaluated. If there is a concern, and there should be, that there may be a drug epidemic in middle and high schools, and it is important to provide a safe and drug-free school environment, then stop focusing on athletes to see if they are taking bodybuilding or performance-enhancing drugs. Start fighting alcohol abuse and recreation/street drug use in middle schools and high schools. Make drug education classes mandatory, use drug-sniffing dogs and trained security personnel in schools where the students are at high risk for drug use. Identify the student drug dealers in middle and high schools and expel them. Since random drug testing could potentially have a negative effect on

student/administrative relationships, may violate the student non-athletes' rights to privacy, and result in increased costs to the school with questionable deterrent effects on drug use, we should focus drug testing of all non-athlete students based on cause or suspicion first. In fact, some high schools test non-athlete students based on suspicion (Yamaguchi et al 159). For cause testing needs to be expanded to all schools, especially those in high-risk areas.

The intent of the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Vernonia* case was to stop drug use in high schools, but in reality, drug testing appears to be existence in order to keep the competitive playing field equal and fair for all athletes. Most high schools that test athletes, test specifically for steroid use. After all, athletics is very important in most school districts. A good athletic program can result in large donations of money, equipment, services and sponsorships coming to the school from community support, alumni endowments and major sponsors. Most colleges operate in the same way, relying on outside support for their athletic programs. The NCAA understandably wants to keep the integrity of sports from being jeopardized. One of the best ways the NCAA can respond to a question about integrity in college sports is to discuss the NCAA Drug Testing Program.

Keeping athletes safe and keeping sports from being compromised are important, so there is a need to continue drug testing athletes for steroids and other performance-enhancing drugs. However, steroid testing is not what the U.S. Supreme Court was referring to when delivering its opinion on the need to fight drug use in public middle and high schools. Studies have shown that alcohol use and recreational drug use start in middle school and that a lot more public school students in middle and high schools are using street drugs than trying steroids. One recommendation would be that school budgets for drug testing and drug prevention efforts be focused primarily on getting street drugs out of schools. This does not mean to ignore athletes

who may be using or thinking about using performance-enhancing drugs. Instead, educate athletes, their parents, teachers and coaches on the adverse health effects of steroids (Taylor Hooton). Tell them what signs to look for when someone is using steroids and street drugs, and make sure they are aware of all the possible negative consequences of using steroids and other drugs (ineligibility to play sports, suspension or expulsion from school, loss of athletic scholarships and loss of respect from teammates, peers, family and community). Ask parents of high school athletes to pay for their child's steroid drug testing at school. After learning about the death of high school baseball player Taylor Hooton from depression caused by steroid use, most parents would probably be eager to comply. If a family cannot afford to pay for testing, then the state would pay, just as the state pays for students' school lunches and waives other school fees for families in need. Also, continue drug testing college athletes for steroids and recreational drugs but do not focus on any one group of athletes or limit testing to be done before specific championship games. All athletes deserve to be safe from the adverse effects of steroids and other drugs and so all athletes should be considered in the drug testing program. Lastly, update surveys and studies on drug testing, students attitudes towards testing, the reliability and deterrent effects of testing and students' knowledge of what drugs are currently being used.

### References

- Andresen, S. (2008). A call for drug-testing of high school student-athletes. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 19, 325-337.
- Boire, R. (2002). Dangerous lessons. *The Humanist*, 62, 39-40.
- Burke, L. (2001). An interview with Dr, Gary Green about supplements an doping problems from an NCAA perspective. *International Journal of Sport Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism*, 11, 397-400.
- Diacin, M., Parks, J., & Allison, P. (n.d.). Voices of male athletes on drug use, drug testing, and the existing order in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 26, 1-16.
- Emese, I. & Jutte, L. (2009). (Un)reasonable search in high school athletics. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 80, 8-9.
- Frandsen, M. (2010, June 19). Remembering len bias: former terrapin basketball star's cocaine overdose 24 years ago. *DC Sports Examiner*, <http://www.examiner.com/sports-in-washington-dc/remembering-len-bias-former-terrapin-basketball-star's-cocaine-overdose-24-years-ago>
- Goldgerg, L. (2003). Drug testing athletes to prevent substance abuse: background and pilot study results of the Saturn Study. *Journal of School Health*, 76, 452-458.
- Mitten, M. (2005, November). Is drug testing of athletes necessary? *USA Today*.
- NCAA Drug-testing Program (2010-11). [www.NCAA.org/drugtesting](http://www.NCAA.org/drugtesting).

Ringwalt, C. et al. (2009). Response to positive results from suspicionless random tests in U.S.. public school districts. *Journal of School Health*, 79, 177-183.

Scalia, A. (1995). *Vernonia School District v. James Acton No. 94-590*. Find Law, 1-17.

Retrieved from <http://laws.findlaw.com/us/000/u10263.html>.

Shutler, S. (1996). Random, suspicionless drug testing of high school athletes. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 86, 1265-1303.

Taylor, R. (1997). Compensating behavior and the drug testing of high school athletes. *Cato Journal*, 16, 351-364.

Thomas, C. (2002). *Board of Education No. 92 of Pottawatomie County v. Lindsay Earls et al.* Find Law 1-15. Retrieved from <http://laws.findlaw.com/us/000/01-332.html>

Yamaguchi, R., Johnston, L. & O'Malley, P. (2003). Relationship between student illicit drug use and school drug-testing policies. *Journal of School Health*, 73, 159-164.