

Perceptions of High School Student Athletes
and Non-Athletes, Teachers, and Administrators
Relevant to the Drug and Alcohol Prevention
Policy: A Case Study

by

Ashleigh E. Hess

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

Honors College

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the

degree of

Honors Baccalaureate of Science in Mathematics (Honors Associate)

Presented May 28, 2010
Commencement June 2010

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Ashleigh E. Hess for the degree of Honors Baccalaureate of Science in Mathematics presented on May 28, 2010. Title: Perceptions of High School Student Athletes and Non-Athletes, Teachers, and Administrators Relevant to the Drug and Alcohol Prevention Policy: A Case Study

Abstract approved:

Mentor's Name

In public high schools, drug and alcohol prevention programs and policies have been ineffective in their deterrence of drug and alcohol use and abuse (Skager R., 2007). It is important to consider the needs of students and to create an effective, student centered drug and alcohol prevention program and policy.

This study evaluated the perceived extent of drug and alcohol use and abuse from the perspectives of students and faculty members in a selected high school in the Pacific Northwest, as well as created guidelines for a drug and alcohol prevention program and policy that could eventually be implemented at the high school level. Anonymous surveys and interviews were used to gather data for this thesis. Fifty-seven students responded to seventeen statements on the student survey. Nine faculty members participated in short interviews.

Some of the findings from this study include, but are not limited to: schools must provide a positive environment that students care about, so that it is easier for students to invest their energy into genuine, positive alternatives that can replace the desire to use and/or abuse of drugs and alcohol; and the cost of employing a school resource officer and a specialized drug and alcohol counselor to work together to reduce the occurrences of substance use and abuse would be significantly mitigated by the impact generated by

maintaining a school environment of frank, clear education, minimized use of drugs and alcohol, and appropriate punishment.

Future studies should focus on: the effectiveness of parent and student drug and alcohol prevention programs; and the effectiveness of alternative consequences to suspensions and expulsions.

Key Words: drugs, alcohol, substance use and abuse, prevention policies, prevention programs

Corresponding e-mail address: ashleighhess17@gmail.com

© Copyright by Ashleigh E. Hess
May 28, 2010
All Rights Reserved

Perceptions of High School Student Athletes
and Non-Athletes, Teachers, and Administrators
Relevant to the Drug and Alcohol Prevention

Policy: A Case Study

by

Ashleigh E. Hess

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

Honors College

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the

degree of

Honors Baccalaureate of Science in Mathematics (Honors Associate)

Presented May 28, 2010

Commencement June 2010

Honors Baccalaureate of Science in Mathematics thesis of Ashleigh E. Hess presented on May 28, 2010.

APPROVED:

Mentor, representing Public Health

Committee Member, representing English

Committee Member, representing Sociology

Chair, Department of Public Health

Dean, University Honors College

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University, University Honors College. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Ashleigh E. Hess, Author

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis mentor, Dr. Ray Tricker for all of his support and assistance throughout the duration of this thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. Robin Pappas and her amazing ability to drastically improving my writing, as well as Dr. Scott Akins, whose insights into the material are greatly appreciated. Furthermore, I would like to thank the Pacific Northwest school's principal, faculty members, and students for assisting me with this thesis. Without these people, this thesis would not be possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction and Statement of the Problem	1
Research Questions	2
Methods and Procedures	2
Limitations	3
2. Literature Review	4
Zero Tolerance Policy	4
Prevention Programs	6
Extracurricular Drug Testing	8
Additional Prevention Programs for Student Athletes	10
Student Perceptions on	12
Alcohol	12
Tobacco Products	14
Marijuana	15
Illicit and Prescription Drugs	16
Drugs and Alcohol in Schools	17
Perceived Challenges to Implementing Drug and Alcohol	18
Prevention Programs	18
Randomized Drug Testing	20
3. Results	22
1. Strategies to deter drug and alcohol use and abuse among students.....	22
2. Do students believe that drug use and abuse will continue no matter what policy is implemented?	25
3. Concerns related to random drug testing	31
4. Perceived challenges to implementing drug and alcohol prevention programs and policies	36
5. School policies and perceptions of success	38
4. Discussion of Results	45

5. Conclusion	53
6. Recommendations	55
Bibliography	56
Appendices	60
Appendix A. Student Survey	60
Appendix B. Faculty Interview Questions	63

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
2.1 The drug and alcohol prevention program at your school deters students from using and abusing drugs and alcohol	25
2.2 No matter what drug and alcohol prevention program is implemented, students will still use drugs and alcohol	26
2.3 The drug and alcohol prevention program is helpful for students who are deciding whether or not to use drugs and alcohol	26
2.4 Drug and alcohol policies implemented by the school's administration will deter students from using and abusing drugs and alcohol	27
2.5 Administrators and policy makers do not understand the pressures of being an adolescent so they could not create an adequate drug and alcohol prevention program	28
2.6 Drug and alcohol policies implemented by the administration do not affect me	28
2.7 A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse helps prevent drug and alcohol use and abuse	29
2.8 A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse should be held once per year	30
2.9 A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse should be offered as a mandatory class for graduation	30
3.1 Students who participate in extra-curricular activities and athletics should be randomly drug tested	33
3.2 Random drug testing in athletics is necessary but not in other extra-curricular activities	33
3.3 Random drug testing is an invasion of a student's privacy and is a waste of government funds	34
3.4 If students were forced to participate in random drug testing, many students would stop participating in extra-curricular activities and athletics	35

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
3.5 I would not participate in extra-curricular activities and athletics if I had to submit to a random drug test in order to participate	35

I dedicate this thesis to my parents,
without them I would not be where I am today.

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

Studies have shown that drug and alcohol use and abuse can have negative effects on adolescents' minds and bodies (Aarons, et al., 1998). For this reason, it is important to investigate students' perceptions about substance use and abuse as well as what students consider to be potential deterrents to drug and alcohol use. Furthermore, in order for public schools to effectively educate students, there must be a learning and developmental environment that reduces drug and alcohol related incidences. Understanding student and faculty perceptions towards drug and alcohol use will allow schools to create an environment that fosters student growth and responsibility.

In public high schools, drug and alcohol prevention programs and policies have been ineffective in their deterrence of drug and alcohol use and abuse (Skager R., 2007). These policies originate with the administration and typically have no student involvement in their creation and implementation. For this reason, it is important to consider the needs of students and to create an effective, student centered drug and alcohol prevention program and policy.

This study will focus on male and female high school students in grades ten through twelve in a selected high school in the Pacific Northwest and examine the perceived extent of drug and alcohol use and abuse from the perspectives of the students, the administrators, and the teachers/coaches. It will also explore the policies that have been implemented by administrators and the perceived success of these policies. The goal of this project will be to create guidelines for a drug and alcohol prevention program and policy that could eventually be implemented at the high school level.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. Currently, what strategies do public high schools use to deter drug and alcohol use and abuse among students, and are there more deterrents for athletes than for non-athletes?
2. Do students believe that drug use and abuse will continue no matter what policy is implemented?
3. What concerns do administrators, coaches, students and student-athletes have related to random drug testing for high school athletes?
4. What challenges do administrators perceive to implementing drug and alcohol prevention programs and policies?
5. What policies have been adopted at the school to lower the rates of drug and alcohol use and abuse by adolescents, and to what degree do administrators, teachers/coaches, students and student athletes feel that the policies have been successful in their mission?

Methods and Procedures

Anonymous surveys and interviews were used to gather data for this thesis. Surveys and interviews were conducted in a conveniently selected high school in the Pacific Northwest.

The school principal e-mailed the teachers in the school about involving one or more of their class periods in this study. One teacher made two class periods available, a second teacher made a third class period available for the study. Each class had approximately forty students. Students who participated were informed about the study and were given an informed consent document as well as a parental consent form that had to be signed and

returned to the classroom teacher before the student could take the survey. Students who did not obtain consent to participate in the survey were able to complete a word search or work on other homework during the survey completion time. Students who were in both teachers' class were only allowed to take the survey one time. Fifty-seven ($n=57$) student participants were anonymously surveyed during the school day at a time period designated by the classroom teacher. The anonymous surveys were then collected and analyzed.

Nine interviews were conducted with staff members. Faculty members who responded favorably to being interviewed for this study were interviewed. They were given an informed consent document prior to the interview being conducted. The interviews were scheduled over a three-week time period and were conducted at time designated by the interviewees. The interviews were scheduled for fifteen- to twenty-minute blocks of time. In order to maximize confidentiality, no information describing interviewees was included.

Limitations

There are several quantitative limitations to this study. It involves only one high school in the Pacific Northwest. The number of students is limited to the number of teachers who responded to volunteer their class(es). This number became smaller because only about sixty percent of students in the classes returned the parental consent forms, which resulted in a study of four percent of the student population. In regard to qualitative limitations, faculty interviews were transcribed by hand without voice recording in order to maximize confidentiality.

Literature Review

Across the United States, high schools, school districts, and state education agencies have implemented policies and prevention programs in order to discourage students from engaging in potentially destructive behaviors, specifically those involving drugs and alcohol. Recently, studies have been supporting the notion that “students who feel connected to their school are less likely to engage in a variety of health-risk behaviors such as alcohol and illegal drug use” (Jones, Fisher, Greene, Hertz, & Pritzl, 2007). By providing students with healthy alternatives for social interaction and adjusting to the difficulties of being an adolescent, it is assumed that students will be less likely to engage in drug and alcohol use and abuse. The following literature review will delve into background information for three research questions (1, 2, & #4). The remaining research questions will be answered in the results and discussion sections. Topics investigated will be: the Zero Tolerance Policy; Prevention Programs; Extracurricular Drug Testing; Additional Prevention Programs for Student Athletes; Student Perceptions of Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana, Illicit Drugs, and Drugs and Alcohol in Schools; and Perceived Challenges to Implementing Drug and Alcohol Prevention Programs.

Zero Tolerance Policy

The 2006 study *Healthy and Safe School Environment, Part I: Results from the School Health Policies and Programs* gathered data from 51 state education agencies, 461 school districts, and 1,025 schools across the United States on issues regarding policies and prevention programs that promote a safe school environment. The study explains that most states had adopted a policy prohibiting cigarette smoking, smokeless tobacco use, and cigar or pipe smoking and that 100 percent of districts nationwide had adopted a policy prohibiting

cigarette smoking among students. It further explains, “Nationwide, 99.9% of districts had adopted a policy prohibiting alcohol use by students on school property, and 98.8% had adopted a policy prohibiting alcohol use by students at off-campus, school sponsored events” (Jones, Fisher, Greene, Hertz, & Pritzl, 2007, p. 529). Only 54.1 percent of schools questioned had signs designating the school as a tobacco-free zone (Jones, Fisher, Greene, Hertz, & Pritzl, 2007, p. 537).

When looking at school drug and alcohol policies, the most talked about is the Zero Tolerance Policy. It is difficult to find a precise definition of the phrase because it has been modified over the last three decades since the phrase was first coined to deal with the federal drug policy of the 1980s (Skiba, 2000, p. 2). “Zero tolerance has been intended primarily as a method of sending a message that certain behaviors will not be tolerated, by punishing all offenses severely, no matter how minor” (Skiba, 2000). The title and the message were first applied to school districts in 1989 in California, New York and Kentucky, which “mandated expulsion for drugs, fighting, and gang-related activity” (Skiba, 2000, p. 2). Three years later, the policy had been reproduced throughout the United States and was broadened to cover smoking as well as school disruption (Skiba, 2000, p. 2). There is much debate about the effectiveness of such strict one-size-fits-all policy. Yet in a 2001 Associated Press poll, more than 80 percent of respondents supported zero tolerance policies (McCollum, 2004, p. 21). Skiba remarks that there is variation in the definition of zero tolerance at the district level because many districts apply a strict interpretation of zero tolerance where major and minor infractions are punished equally while others have developed a graded scale on which the consequences are determined proportionally to the severity of the incident.

Prevention Programs

Opposing the Zero Tolerance Policy is the reform policy, which stresses prevention over punishment and which designates that alcohol and drug use and/or abuse as a public health issue that is masking some deeper struggle within the student. This prevention method is less punitive and more education based. The Healthy and Safe School Study found that a significant number of schools had some type of prevention policy in place, but the study did not provide details regarding the policies or their implementation. They did find that most schools nationwide do not allow tobacco advertisements on school grounds, and most have procedures that inform students about tobacco-related rules (Jones, Fisher, Greene, Hertz, & Pritzl, 2007). High school programs that address drug and tobacco resistance include, but are not limited to, Life Skills Training: Booster Program; Lions-Quest Skills for Adolescence; Project ALERT Plus; and The Strengthening Families Program: For Parents and Youth 10-14 (National Institute on Drug Abuse, 2003); and Too Good For Drugs (The Mendez Foundation, 2010). These programs are designed to address decision making skills, personal responsibility, as well as cognitive social skills. Healthy and Safe School also mentioned that most schools have plans in place to inform all students about alcohol related rules and consequences. The study notes that in addition to using school-based programs, nearly 40% of schools surveyed have also participated in a “community-based alcohol-use prevention program, such as Students Against Destructive Decisions (SADD)” (Jones, Fisher, Greene, Hertz, & Pritzl, 2007). SADD is only one of the numerous alcohol prevention programs currently offered in the United States.

Additional programs include AlcoholEdu, Every 15 Minutes, and others. SADD’s mission is to “provide students with the best prevention tools possible to deal with the issues

of underage drinking, other drug use, impaired driving, and other destructive decisions” (Students Against Destructive Decisions, 2010). AlcoholEdu is an interactive program that “provides students with information about drinking through interactive online media, and exercises that reinforce key concepts” (Join Together, 2004). Another alcohol education program that emphasizes interactivity is Every 15 Minutes. The two-day program is an “event designed to dramatically instill teenagers with the potentially dangerous consequences of drinking alcohol and texting while driving” (Every 15 Minutes, 2010). The previously mentioned programs all promote drug and alcohol education in order to prevent the use and/or abuse of the substances.

These prevention programs are just a handful of perhaps dozens. What is not widely researched is exactly which among them is successful. Follow up research has concluded that skills-focused programs “appear to have a positive effect on drug knowledge, decision making, self-esteem and peer pressure resistance...and showed a statistically significant reduction of marijuana use...and hard drugs” (Faggiano, Vigna-Taglianti, Versino, Zambon, Borraccino, & Lemma, 2008, p. 393), while affective programs, those that focus only on self-esteem or self-awareness building, “improve decision making skills and drug knowledge...but no evidence of effectiveness is shown for prevention of drug use” (Faggiano, Vigna-Taglianti, Versino, Zambon, Borraccino, & Lemma, 2008, p. 393). Finally, knowledge based programs have been shown to increase drug knowledge but when it comes to actual drug use, they are comparable to regular curriculum and is less effective than normative programs (Faggiano, Vigna-Taglianti, Versino, Zambon, Borraccino, & Lemma, 2008, p. 393). These prevention programs are all targeted to the entire student population, yet

the implementation of alcohol and drug testing has only been aimed towards students who participate in extracurricular activities.

Extracurricular Drug Testing

Recently introduced has been the technique of randomly drug testing students who participate in extracurricular activities. When first introduced, drug testing was deemed to be an invasion of students' privacy and a violation of the Fourth Amendment, which prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures (Institute for Behavior and Health, 2010). There have been two landmark Supreme Court Cases that have voted otherwise. The Case of Veronia School District 47J v. Acton in 1995 attested that it was unconstitutional to have all athletes take a urinalysis drug test in order to participate in sports; however, the Supreme Court voted 6-3 that student drug testing for athletes is constitutional (Institute for Behavior and Health, 2010). The second case in 2002 involving the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 92 of Pottawatomie County, et al, Petitioners v. Lindsay Earls et al., considered whether it is unconstitutional under the Fourth Amendment for all middle and high school students to consent to a urinalysis drug test in order to take part in any extracurricular activities (Institute for Behavior and Health, 2010). Again, the Supreme Court voted in favor of the requirement and expressed that the students who participate in extracurricular activities have a diminished expectation of privacy and that urine tests are minimally intrusive to their privacy (U.S. Supreme Court Media (OYEZ), 2010). Even though the Supreme Court has ruled in favor of random drug testing of students who participate in extracurricular activities, there still remains much controversy over its appropriateness (Yamaguchi, Johnston, & O'Malley, 2003, p. 159).

However, according to the Institute for Behavior and Health there are four primary goals for student drug testing programs:

- To deter and prevent drug use
- To reinforce all other prevention efforts
- To identify students who need help getting and staying drug-free, and
- To prepare students for workplace drug testing. (Institute for Behavior and Health, 2010)

Currently, there have been two approaches to extracurricular randomized drug tests: mandatory and voluntary. According to Prevention Not Punishment, mandatory is a situation in which “All students in a designated group are eligible for student drug testing (athletes, participants in extracurricular activities, student drivers, etc.),” while voluntary testing is a condition in which “Students, with parental consent, may choose to be part of the student drug testing program by signing consent forms or choose not to join the program without penalty” (Institute for Behavior and Health, 2010). In each program, students who are involved are eligible to be drug tested daily, even if they were recently tested. A student’s specimen is divided and run through a drug panel with the specific substances to be identified. If a student’s specimen tests positive for illegal substances, then another portion of the sample is tested. Following a second positive result, the student is evaluated by a counselor. Schools do not suspend or expel students who do test positive, yet the student can be asked to leave non-academic extracurricular activities for durations of time until the student is deemed to be drug free (Institute for Behavior and Health, 2010). In one particular case study, students who tested positive were notified, as well as their parents, and would meet with authorized district personnel and the coach or supervisor of the extracurricular

activity. If there was no medical explanation for the positive test, then an “initial offense resulted in a ten-day suspension from any extracurricular activity and in the student and parents being notified of local area drug and alcohol abuse prevention resources” (Barrington, 2008, p. 52). A second offense initiated a 30-day suspension from extracurricular activities, and a third offense resulted in suspension for the remainder of the academic year (Barrington, 2008, p. 52). Follow-up testing is continued to confirm whether the student remains drug free, but if there are recurring positive tests, the student may be referred to treatment (Institute for Behavior and Health, 2010). Drug testing is one of the numerous ways that districts can deter drug and alcohol use for students participating in extracurricular activities; however, there seem to be more deterrents for students-athletes.

Additional Prevention Programs for Student Athletes

Student athletes are first of all, students, and they must conform to the norms established for all students. They must also adhere to the additional standards set for athletic competition. Thus, it can be hypothesized that student athletes encounter more deterrents to using drugs and alcohol than non-student athletes. In addition to school- and district-wide drug and alcohol policies and prevention programs, student athletes have more severe consequences for using drugs and alcohol, but they also have the option of participating in several other drug and alcohol prevention programs specifically designed for student athletes. When student athletes are caught using drugs or alcohol, they face the same consequences as non-athletes would; however, it is likely that they will also be suspended from competition in their sport(s) as well. Although consequences are a two-fold for student athletes, student athletes often have access to additional prevention. Currently, there are two athlete specific

programs that have been designed to curb the use and abuse of drugs and alcohol. They are Adolescents Training and Learning to Avoid Steroids (ATLAS) and Athletes Targeting Healthy Exercise & Nutrition Alternatives (ATHENA). ATLAS is a “team-based, educational intervention designed to reduce adolescent athletes’ intent to use anabolic androgenic steroids (AAS)” (Goldberg, et al., 1996, p. 1555). While the program focuses on the avoidance of AAS, the interactive intervention sessions include classroom and exercise training sessions that are given by peer educators and are facilitated by coaches and strength trainers (Goldberg, MacKinnon, Elliot, Moe, Clarke, & Cheong, 2000, p. 332). The content of the program includes discussion of nutrition for athletics, exercise alternative to AAS and supplements, and the effects of substance abuse in athletics, as well as role-playing activities demonstrating strategies for refusing drugs and creating messages that promote healthy lifestyles (Goldberg, MacKinnon, Elliot, Moe, Clarke, & Cheong, 2000). The study conducted by Linn Goldberg, et al., founder of the ATLAS program, on the ATLAS program found that the “use of alcohol and other illicit drugs and associated harmful activities can be prevented with a sex specific, team centered education” (Goldberg, MacKinnon, Elliot, Moe, Clarke, & Cheong, 2000).

The ATHENA Program is for female student athletes and focuses on disordered eating behaviors and body shaping drug use (Oregon Health and Science University, 2008). Similarly to the ATLAS Program, ATHENA is peer led and involves the coach and team leader implementing the program. The program consists of eight lessons, which cover topics like goal-setting and self-monitoring of nutrition behaviors, and the participants learn skills to help them make healthy choices in life (Oregon Health and Science University, 2008). A study of ATHENA by Goldberg, et al., revealed that the program helped female student

athletes reduce dependence on body shaping drugs and promoted healthy eating habits (Elliot, Goldberg, Moe, DeFrancesco, Durham, & Hix-Small, 2004, p. 1048). Thus far, research has suggested that “sports teams can be effective vehicles to promote healthy lifestyles and to deter drug use and other harmful behaviors” (Elliot, Goldberg, Moe, DeFrancesco, Durham, & Hix-Small, 2004, p. 1048). ATLAS and ATHENA are two prevention programs directly aimed at student athletes.

Another prevention program that has been used recently is called Student Athlete Testing Using Random Notification (SATURN). This program is designed to combat drug and alcohol use among student athletes by implementing random drug testing procedures. A study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of SATURN as a deterrent to alcohol and drug use among high school athletes. The study found that the drug and alcohol testing was not a significant deterrent of drug and alcohol use in any of the follow up periods (Goldberg L., et al., 2007, p. 421). The study concluded that more research must be done on the topic of random drug testing of student athletes before testing can be confirmed to be a deterrent to drug and alcohol use (Goldberg L., et al., 2007, p. 421). Drug and alcohol use by adolescents is not a new development and it begs the question do students believe that drug and alcohol use and abuse will continue no matter what policy or prevention program is implemented?

Student Perceptions on

Alcohol

Each year the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse conducts a back-to-school survey that tracks the attitudes of teens and parents. In 2009 they surveyed 1,000 teenagers ages 12 to 17 and 452 parents through telephone interviews. The study found that

only 32 percent of teenagers had ever drunk alcohol (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, p. 9). Another study of teenage alcohol consumption, conducted using questionnaires in schools, by the Center for Disease Control (CDC) found that 75 percent of high school students had ever drunk alcohol (Eaton, et al., 2008, p. 1). In another national study, conducted using questionnaires in schools, the PRIDE Survey reported that 56.5 percent of Senior High students had drunk alcohol at least once within the last year (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 2). According to a study published in the Pediatrics Journal that analyzed drinking behaviors from a 2003 National Health Risk Behavior Survey, 44.9 percent of high school students reported drinking alcohol within the past 30 days (Miller, Naimi, Brewer, & Jones, 2007, p. 1). The PRIDE Survey found that 31.1 percent of Senior High students surveyed had drunk alcohol within the past month (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 24). The National Survey of American Attitudes found that only 13 percent of students had drunk alcohol over the same time period, while 14 percent did not know or provided no response (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, p. 10).

Students were asked about how easy it is to obtain alcohol and 49.9 percent of 9th graders stated that it is fairly easy to very easy to get (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 225). This percentage increased significantly to 68.2 percent of 12th graders (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, p. 225). When students were asked whether using beer; coolers, breezers, etc.; and liquor are harmful to their health 14.2, 17.4, and 12.2 percent respectively, believe there is no harm (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 183). In the Monitoring the Future Survey, it was found that 39 percent of respondents believe that heavy daily drinking does not entail great risk (Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2008, p. 338). Furthermore, a survey of high school seniors showed that 78 percent disapproved of

people 18 and older having “one or two drinks nearly every day” compared to 69 percent who disapproved of “having five or more drinks once or twice a weekend” (Peele, 2007, p. 77). While alcohol is the most widely used substance by teenagers, tobacco products are highly prevalent.

Tobacco Products

The National Survey of American Attitudes found that 13 percent of teenagers have smoked or chewed tobacco. On the contrary, the PRIDE Survey found that 35.9 percent of Senior High students and 14.1 percent of Junior High students have used any form of tobacco including cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, and cigars within the last year (International Survey Associates, 2009, pp. 23-24). The National Survey of American Attitudes found that 19 percent of students who have used tobacco products have used them in the last 5-30 days, while 8 percent have used them once or twice. The PRIDE Survey showed that of all tobacco users, 7.1 percent of Junior High students and 24 percent of High School students have used tobacco products in the last 30 days (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 20). From the CDC report, 20 percent of high school students had smoked cigarettes in the last 30 days (Eaton, et al., 2008, p. 2).

When students were asked how easy it is to obtain tobacco products, 43.3 percent of 9th graders and 73.2 percent of 12th graders responded that it is fairly easy or very easy (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 225). Of the students who smoke cigarettes, 30 percent say they obtain cigarettes from friends, 8 percent receive them from parents or relatives, and 10 percent get them from the store (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, p. 12). When students were asked if they viewed cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, and cigars as harmful, 9.6,

11.1, and, 11.1 percent responded that they are not harmful, respectively. Campaigns against tobacco and illicit drug use have curbed their influence amongst teens; however, they are still used. Perhaps the most used of any illicit substance is marijuana.

Marijuana

Marijuana is the most commonly used illicit drug in the United States (Center for Disease Control, 2009). According to the PRIDE Survey, 26 percent of senior high students have used the drug within the last year (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 24). Some of the reasons mentioned for using marijuana noted in the National Survey of American Attitudes were “to fit in/look cool, to assuage guilt, peer pressure, for fun, and to get high” (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, p. 12). When students were asked if they thought marijuana is harmful to their health, 15.2 percent of respondents stated that it is not harmful (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 184).

The National Survey of American Attitudes also found a correlation between alcohol use and the use of marijuana. They found that students who had tried alcohol were eighteen times more likely to have tried marijuana, and more than three times likelier to have friends who use marijuana (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, pp. ii-iii). The study goes on to state that nearly 27 percent of teens said that marijuana is easier to buy than cigarettes, beer or prescription drugs, and 5.7 million teens said that they can get marijuana in an hour (QEV Analytics, Ltd. , 2009, p. 3). Lastly, teens surveyed who said that the use of marijuana by someone their age isn’t a big deal are nearly twice as likely to use the drug as those who believe it’s use is a big deal (QEV Analytics, Ltd. , 2009, p. 3). The use of marijuana by high school students is much higher than the use of other illicit drugs.

Illicit and Prescription Drugs

While marijuana is the most widely used illicit drug, there is still a considerable amount of illicit drug use in the United States. In the PRIDE Survey, it was found that 29.3 percent of high school students have used any type of illicit drug, including marijuana, within the last year (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 24). Within the last month it was found that 18.9 percent of students surveyed had used an illicit drug, compared to 22.8 percent of 12th graders (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 22). According to the Monitoring the Future Study, it was found that nearly half of all 12th graders in 2008 reported any type of illicit drug use, and by twelfth grade, one in four students had tried an illicit drug other than marijuana (Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2008, pp. 80-81).

The National Survey of American Attitudes found there is a direct correlation between teens that get drunk monthly and illicit drugs; specifically, that those students who get drunk monthly are twice as likely to know someone their age who uses meth, ecstasy, or other drugs like cocaine, heroin or LSD (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, p. 2). Compared to the peak periods of illicit drug use in the mid-to-late 1990s, the use has dropped by approximately ten percent amongst high school seniors; however, with this decrease there has been a dramatic increase in the use prescription drugs, specifically nonmedical use of sedatives (Friedman, 2006, p. 1448).

Friedman, in 2005, found that a total of 7.2 percent of high school seniors have reported using sedatives for nonmedical use, which is up from 2.8 percent reported in 1992 (Friedman, 2006, p. 1448). Furthermore, a 2006 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, approximately 6 percent of youths aged 12-17 had tried a prescription drug for recreation

within the last month (The Nemours Foundation, 2010). The PRIDE Survey found that 12.5 percent of high school students had used over-the-counter drugs to get high, while 7.5 percent had used them within the last 30 days (International Survey Associates, 2009, pp. 198-199). In one study, it was reported that the use of oxycodone had increased 1.5 percent from 2002-2005 to 5.5 percent (Friedman, 2006, p. 1448) and pain relievers, like Vicodin and Oxycontin are the most abused prescription drugs by teens (National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, 2010).

In the National Survey on American Attitudes, it was found that nearly one in five teens can obtain prescription drugs within an hour (QEV Analytics, Ltd. , 2009, p. 3). Of the teens that abuse prescription painkillers, one in five believe that it is okay to abuse painkillers because they aren't illegal substances; one in three believe that there is less shame in using painkillers than illicit drugs; and one in five believe that parents do not care as much if their child is caught abusing painkillers (National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, 2010). Painkillers are reasonably easy for teenagers to acquire because of their daily prevalence (National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, 2010). One location where painkillers can be obtained is in school.

Drugs and Alcohol in Schools

The National Survey of American Attitudes states that 64 percent of high school students say that drugs are used, kept or sold on school grounds (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, p. 15). The survey then notes that students who say that drugs are present on their school grounds are three times more likely to be able to get marijuana in an hour as well as twice as likely to be able to obtain the substance within a day (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, p. 15). The

PRIDE Survey questioned high school students about whether their school sets clear rules for drug use at school and 5.9, 7.1, and 14.2 percent of students surveyed responded that their school never, seldom, and sometimes set clear rules for drug use, respectively (International Survey Associates, 2009, p. 164). When students were asked where they most frequently used certain substances, 3.2, 6.3, and 2.9 percent of respondents replied that they use alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana at school, respectively (International Survey Associates, 2009, pp. 192-193). Interestingly, when parents were asked about student drug and alcohol use at school in the National Survey of American Attitudes, nearly 60 percent believe that it is unrealistic that a school can be made drug free, and 45 percent believe that there is nothing parents can do to help create a drug free environment at school (QEV Analytics, Ltd., 2009, p. 16).

Perceived Challenges to Implementing Drug and Alcohol Prevention Programs

Prevention Programs

There are many concerns and challenges that face administrators when deciding what type of drug and alcohol prevention program should be implemented in the school. These challenges include choosing the proper program to implement, identifying barriers to implementing the program, as well as motivating teachers' attitudes towards the program.

When choosing a drug and alcohol prevention program, the curriculum should be relevant to the students. Research has been conducted that shows that interactive, experiential activities for youth are more effective than didactic lecture approaches (Steiker, 2008, p. 52). Furthermore, a program with a set curriculum that incorporates activities that are relevant, attractive, and easy with clear goals and procedures creates ease in program adoption

(Mihalic, Fagan, & Argamaso, 2008, p. 3). Administrators must decide whether they should broaden the definition of curriculum to include treatment referral and after-treatment care for students who are substance dependent (Summerfield, 1991). Research has also suggested that there needs to be an adequate number of supplies for the program (Tricker & Davis, 1987, p. 292). There also must be enough time available during the school day for the program. Sufficient time to properly administer the prevention program is a challenge that must be addressed by both administrators as well as teachers (Tricker & Davis, 1987, p. 15).

In high schools, teachers already have a limited time to teach students the required core subject matter, and with the addition of a drug and alcohol prevention program, additional time will be necessary and this is a concern of both administrators and teachers. Therefore, it is imperative that a program implemented is time effective and has the support of the key participants. It has been found that “the degree of impact from drug education is essentially a function of the quality of teaching, involving the degree of teacher commitment and the length of time allowed for instruction” (Tricker & Davis, 1988, p. 184). Furthermore, it has been shown that the success or failure of a program lies with the teacher (Mihalic, Fagan, & Argamaso, 2008, p. 3). Since teacher participation and commitment is essential, teachers must have intensive training in order to facilitate a successful drug and alcohol prevention program (Mihalic, Fagan, & Argamaso, 2008, p. 3). Administrators must identify the barriers for implementing the prevention programs at their schools. Once these barriers are identified, actions must be taken to overcome the barriers in order to promote drug and alcohol prevention amongst students.

Randomized Testing

Randomized drug testing of students in schools has been a hot-button issue. It has already reached the Supreme Court, twice. It can be a polarizing issue, but the intention is for it to be a deterrent to using drugs and alcohol, so what are the challenges and concerns when implementing a drug testing program? Randomized drug testing in public high schools in the United States is restricted to only students who participate in extracurricular activities (U.S. Supreme Court Media (OYEZ), 2010). This means that testing is not entirely random amongst all students, just those who would like to participate in sports or activities whose schools participate in random drug testing procedures. It is estimated that only 12 percent of schools across the nation participate in drug testing (Clayton, 2007). One high school assistant principal believes that students who participate in extracurricular activities are leaders of the school, and, if they are drug tested and do not use substances, will send a signal to the rest of the student body (Bottrell, 2008). Some studies have argued the contrary, that random drug testing will discourage extracurricular participation and lead to an increase in overall drug use (Taylor, 1997).

The cost of random drug tests can often be high depending on the test being used. According to a 2006 study, urine tests can cost anywhere from 10 to 50 dollars a test; hair tests cost 60-75 dollars apiece; and sweat and saliva tests run 10 to 50 dollars each (Kern, Gunja, Cox, Rosenbaum, Appel, & Verma, 2006, p. 44). The cost of drug testing approximately 500 students at an average of 42 dollars per test can cost about 21,000 dollars (Kern, Gunja, Cox, Rosenbaum, Appel, & Verma, 2006, p. 45). Administrators must also decide whether an outside testing agency will administer the drug tests or if it will be done in-house. By outsourcing testing administration to an outside agency would increase costs

accrued, but by having staff members administer the test it will be an extra duty for faculty members. The varying costs of drug testing students can be a challenge for cash-strapped school budgets and can often be an important factor when implementing a drug testing program.

Results

The following results provide information that is presented quantitatively for students. Faculty member responses are represented in a qualitative format.

Research Question #1 - Currently, what strategies do public high schools use to deter drug and alcohol use and abuse among students, and are there more deterrents for athletes versus non-athletes?

At the high school, in this case study, the deterrents used to prevent drug and alcohol use and abuse among high school students were principally negative, although additional education on the topics of drug and alcohol was present. Students, who are caught in possession of drugs, alcohol, drug paraphernalia, or tobacco, will face appropriate disciplinary action, which could include suspension; additional educational programs; and parental notification of violations and action taken by the school. The school employs a behavior matrix in order to serve as a guide for disciplinary action for violations of district policies.

Students who are caught possessing marijuana, alcohol, or other drugs face a ten day suspension from school where up to five days can be bought back through meetings with a drug and alcohol counselor. The student is also subject to a drug and alcohol assessment and a functional behavioral assessment. Other options include the student support team and the district effective behavior support. The student is also subject to arrest or citation by the city law enforcement for possession. If a student is under the influence, the city and county can only cite/arrest for alcohol intoxication. The police cannot cite students for being under the influence of marijuana in the area.

The consequences of first-time possession differ somewhat for student athletes. The student athlete is still subject to the consequences that non-student athletes are subject to; however, the first incident results in a three week suspension from athletic activities. The student athlete will also have to meet with a school substance abuse counselor or other appropriate specialist. Successful completion of the requirements directed to the athlete by the counselor will be evaluated by the Athletic Coordinator. Furthermore, if the offense occurs at the end of one season, the remaining no compete time will be carried over to the next sport season the student athlete participates in. If the student athlete self-reports or seeks treatment, there may be no disciplinary consequences if the student athlete meets with a school substance abuse counselor or another specialist and follows the counselor's recommendations as well as having no subsequent incidents involving licit and/or illicit substances.

For a second incident of possession of marijuana, alcohol, and/or other drugs or under the influence, students face possible expulsion, and placement in an alternative education program. Student athletes face the same penalties, as well as mandatory meetings with the school substance abuse counselor and a six week suspension from athletic participation. The behavior matrix for non-athletes does not have recommendations for a third offense; however, student athletes who reoffend a third time face full suspension for the rest of their high school career.

The first offense for students caught using tobacco products are subject to a possible citation from city or county law enforcement. The student can either complete an alternative to suspension assignment or face a one day suspension. Student athletes are subject to these consequences as well as a three week suspension from athletic activities. The second offense

for students results in a possible citation and the completion of four smoking awareness classes, and a two day suspension. Student athletes face a six week suspension from their activity. A third tobacco offense requires the completion of four smoking awareness classes, possible citation, and a three day suspension. Student athletes face an additional six week suspension from participation in athletics.

A student who is caught in possession of drug paraphernalia that does not have drug residue can face a ten day suspension with a five day buy back option for seeing a drug and alcohol counselor. A student athlete will be subject to additional suspension from athletic participation for three weeks. Students who are caught in possession of drug paraphernalia that has drug residue are subject to arrest or citation. The student will also be suspended for ten days, five of which can be bought back by seeing a drug and alcohol counselor. An alternative education placement can be suggested for a student's second offense and based on the student's history. A student athlete will be suspended for three weeks from athletic participation. If a student is caught distributing drugs and/or alcohol, the student will be arrested, expelled, and placed in an alternative education program.

Research Question #2 – Do students believe that drug use and abuse will continue no matter what policy is implemented?

The student survey consisted of six statements that related to the students' views on substance use and abuse. The first was: *The drug and alcohol prevention program at your school deters students from using and abusing drugs and alcohol.* Nearly 53 percent of students disagreed with this statement, 14 percent agreed, and approximately 33 percent were undecided. A breakdown of students' opinions can be seen in Table 2.1. There were minimal differences of opinion when comparing athletes versus non-athletes. Interestingly, when broken down by gender, only 7 percent of males agreed, compared to approximately 22 percent of females.

Table 2.1 The drug and alcohol prevention program at your school deters students from using and abusing drugs and alcohol.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	21.21	16.67	17.24	18.52	19.30
Somewhat Disagree	33.33	33.33	41.38	25.93	33.33
Undecided	30.30	37.50	34.48	33.33	33.33
Somewhat Agree	12.12	12.50	6.90	18.52	12.28
Strongly Agree	3.03	0.00	0.00	3.70	1.75

The second statement prompted students: *No matter what drug and alcohol prevention program is implemented, students will still use drugs and alcohol.* Nearly 90 percent of students agreed with this statement, approximately 4 percent disagreed, while the rest were undecided. Table 2.2 shows student reactions.

Table 2.2 No matter what drug and alcohol prevention program is implemented, students will still use drugs and alcohol.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Somewhat Disagree	0.00	8.33	3.45	3.70	3.51
Undecided	6.06	8.33	6.90	7.41	7.02
Somewhat Agree	51.52	33.33	44.83	44.44	43.86
Strongly Agree	42.42	50.00	44.83	44.44	45.61

When students surveyed responded to: *The drug and alcohol prevention program is helpful for students who are deciding whether or not to use drugs and alcohol*, 42 percent agreed, 33 percent disagreed, and approximately 25 percent were undecided. Table 2.3 shows student opinions. There were minimal differences of opinion between responses from athletes versus non-athletes. However, when broken down by gender, 24 percent of males disagreed, nearly 52 percent agreed, and 24 percent were undecided. Approximately 41 percent of female respondents disagreed, with only 33 percent agreeing, and nearly 26 percent were undecided.

Table 2.3 The drug and alcohol prevention program is helpful for students who are deciding whether or not to use drugs and alcohol.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	6.06	4.17	3.45	3.70	5.26
Somewhat Disagree	27.27	29.17	20.69	37.04	28.07
Undecided	24.24	25.00	24.14	25.93	24.56
Somewhat Agree	33.33	29.17	41.38	22.22	31.58
Strongly Agree	9.09	12.50	10.34	11.11	10.53

Students were then prompted: *Drug and alcohol policies implemented by the school's administration will deter students from using and abusing drugs and alcohol*. Approximately 54 percent of students disagreed, while only 25 percent agreed, and 21 percent were

undecided. Responses can be seen in Table 2.4. When comparing athletes versus non-athletes, 63 percent of athletes disagreed with this statement, while only 42 percent of non-athletes concurred. This comparison is similar to the distribution of opinions among males versus females. Nearly 60 percent of males disagreed, compared to 48 percent of females.

Table 2.4 Drug and alcohol policies implemented by the school’s administration will deter students from using and abusing drugs and alcohol.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	30.30	16.67	27.59	18.52	24.56
Somewhat Disagree	33.33	25.00	31.03	29.63	29.82
Undecided	18.18	25.00	17.24	25.93	21.05
Somewhat Agree	18.18	33.33	24.14	25.93	24.56
Strongly Agree	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

In response to: *Administrators and policy makers do not understand the pressures of being an adolescent so they could not create an adequate drug and alcohol prevention program*, almost half of the students surveyed disagreed with this statement, while nearly 18 percent agreed, and 35 percent were undecided. Differences in opinions can be seen in Table 2.5. One student wrote on the survey, “They do understand, but nothing will stop adolescents from experimenting.” There were minimal differences of opinion between athletes and non-athletes. However, more males disagreed (55 percent) with this statement than did females (40 percent), and only 7 percent of males agreed compared to 26 percent of females.

Table 2.5 Administrators and policy makers do not understand the pressures of being an adolescent so they could not create an adequate drug and alcohol prevention program.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	21.21	12.50	24.14	11.11	17.54
Somewhat Disagree	27.27	33.33	31.03	29.63	29.82
Undecided	33.33	37.50	37.93	33.33	35.09
Somewhat Agree	9.09	16.67	3.45	18.52	12.28
Strongly Agree	9.09	0.00	3.45	7.41	5.26

The last statement that students responded to that referred to Research Question #2 was: *Drug and alcohol policies implemented by the administration do not affect me.* About 56 percent of students agreed with this statement, while 23 percent disagreed and 21 percent were undecided. Table 2.6 shows the student opinions. Interestingly, only 15 percent of student athletes disagreed with this statement compared to 33 percent of non-athletes. Fifty-five percent of athletes noted that they agree with this statement, and 58 percent of non-athletes agreed. There was a much larger number of student athletes who were undecided compared to non-athletes (30 percent versus 8 percent). Also, 62 percent of males agreed with this statement compared to only 48 percent of females, while 21 percent of males and 26 percent of females disagreed. Seventeen percent of males and 26 percent of females were undecided.

Table 2.6 Drug and alcohol policies implemented by the administration do not affect me.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	6.06	8.33	10.34	3.70	7.02
Somewhat Disagree	9.09	25.00	10.34	22.22	15.79
Undecided	30.30	8.33	17.24	25.93	21.05
Somewhat Agree	21.21	29.17	27.59	22.22	24.56
Strongly Agree	33.33	29.17	34.48	25.93	31.58

Three additional statements were posed to determine students' views of a drug and alcohol prevention program at school. The first read: *A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse helps prevent drug and alcohol use and abuse.* Nearly 51 percent of students agreed with this statement, while 28 percent disagreed, and 21 percent were undecided. Results can be seen in Table 2.7. More non-athletes than athletes disagreed with this statement, 38 percent and 21 percent, respectively. Fifty-five percent of student athletes agreed with this statement, compared to 46 percent of non-athletes. When broken down by gender, approximately 55 percent of males agreed with the statement, while only 48 percent of females agreed. More females disagreed with this statement compared to males, 41 percent and 17 percent, respectively. However, a much larger portion of males were undecided, nearly 28 percent, compared to only 11 percent of females.

Table 2.7 A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse helps prevent drug and alcohol use and abuse.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	9.09	4.17	10.34	3.70	7.02
Somewhat Disagree	12.12	33.33	6.90	37.04	21.05
Undecided	24.24	16.67	27.59	11.11	21.05
Somewhat Agree	45.45	41.67	44.83	44.44	43.86
Strongly Agree	9.09	4.17	10.34	3.70	7.02

For the statement: *A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse should be held once per year,* thirty-five percent of students disagreed with this statement, 40 percent agreed, and 25 percent were undecided. Table 2.8 illustrates student responses. Almost half (49 percent) of all student athletes surveyed agreed, while only 29 percent of non-student athletes agreed. Thirty-eight percent of non-athletes disagreed with this statement, compared to 33 percent of athletes. Interestingly, 33 percent of non-athletes

were undecided, compared to only 18 percent of athletes. Females were split on the topic. Thirty-seven percent agreed and disagreed, while 26 percent were undecided. Approximately 45 percent of males agreed, while 35 percent disagreed, and 20 percent were undecided.

Table 2.8 A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse should be held once per year.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	15.15	16.67	13.79	18.52	15.79
Somewhat Disagree	18.18	20.83	20.69	18.52	19.30
Undecided	18.18	33.33	20.69	25.93	24.56
Somewhat Agree	27.27	20.83	20.69	29.63	24.56
Strongly Agree	21.21	8.33	24.14	7.41	15.79

The last statement regarding prevention programs read: *A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse should be offered as a mandatory class for graduation.* Fifty-four percent of students disagreed with this statement, 35 percent agreed, while 11 percent were undecided. A breakdown of opinions can be seen in Table 2.9. A larger number of non-athletes disagreed with this statement compared to athletes: 63 percent and 49 percent, respectively. Forty-two percent of athletes agreed with the statement compared to 25 percent of non-athletes, and 9 percent of athletes and 13 percent of non-athletes were undecided. There were minimal differences of opinions between genders.

Table 2.9 A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse should be offered as a mandatory class for graduation.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	24.24	45.83	34.48	33.33	33.33
Somewhat Disagree	24.24	16.67	24.14	18.52	21.05
Undecided	9.09	12.50	6.90	11.11	10.53
Somewhat Agree	24.24	12.50	20.69	18.52	19.30
Strongly Agree	18.18	12.50	13.79	18.52	15.79

Research Question #3 – What concerns do administrators, coaches, students, and student athletes have related to random drug testing for high school athletes?

Faculty

When administrators and faculty members were questioned about their concerns for random drug testing most had several concerns. One staff member explained that the community would not approve of drug testing and that many parents believe that being an athlete is a right, not a privilege.

Another staff member noted that the costs would be too high. The individual then referred to the State of Texas implementing random drug testing and noted how very few students failed drug tests. This faculty member also questioned whether the costs actually justify what educators are trying to accomplish. The staff member then questioned if random drug testing is actually a deterrent to student drug and alcohol use and abuse. The person stated examples of drug testing programs such as the Olympics, where testing is conducted year round, as well as Major League Baseball and the National Football League. The staff member conjectured that these testing systems always catch a few players, but they promote an idea of *beating the system*.

Another staff member had a similar opinion. The individual stated that random drug testing creates a *Police State* and exemplifies an *Us versus Them* mentality for students. An additional staff member noted that a drug testing policy creates a culture where the adults are *out to get the students*. Another staff member had analogous ideas on the topic: the person would like to believe that in this country there is a presumption of innocence and that “testing leans towards an environment that has a presumption of guilt.” Two other staff members also believe that drug testing creates a punitive culture around drug use. They believe that the

students' sole worry will be not getting caught. Furthermore, drug testing will keep students from being honest with adults and will lead to a perspective that adults do not want to help. Faculty members also spoke of additional concerns.

Two staff members questioned how testing is ensured to be random, and another staff member believes that it is possible to target kids based on prejudices. It was also proposed that targeting only athletes sends a message of double-standards. This staff member said that only testing athletes is not necessarily fair if the whole student population does not have to be tested. Another faculty member agreed, noting that if student athletes are tested, then everyone should be tested, even staff members.

Students

Students were also asked about their views of random drug testing. Five statements in the student survey related to this topic. In response to the first statement: *Students who participate in extra-curricular activities and athletics should be randomly drug tested*, forty-six percent of students surveyed disagreed with this statement, while 28 percent agreed, and 26 percent were undecided. Results can be seen in Table 3.1. Approximately 49 percent of athletes disagreed, 36 percent agreed, and 15 percent were undecided, compared to 42 percent of non-athletes who disagreed, 16 percent agreed, while 42 percent were undecided. More males disagreed with this statement than did females, 52 percent and 37 percent, respectively. Thirty-one percent of males agreed as well as 26 percent of females. Seventeen percent of males and 37 percent of females were undecided.

Table 3.1 Students who participate in extra-curricular activities and athletics should be randomly drug tested.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	24.24	20.83	27.59	14.81	22.81
Somewhat Disagree	24.24	20.83	24.14	22.22	22.81
Undecided	15.15	41.67	17.24	37.04	26.32
Somewhat Agree	21.21	8.33	17.24	14.81	15.79
Strongly Agree	15.15	8.33	13.79	11.11	12.28

Students then responded to: *Random drug testing in athletics is necessary but not in other extra-curricular activities*. Fifty-four percent of students disagreed, 23 percent agreed, while 23 percent were undecided. Table 3.2 shows the results from this question. Fifty-eight percent of non-athletes disagreed, compared to 52 percent of athletes. Only 17 percent of non-athletes agreed, and 25 percent were undecided. Twenty-seven percent of athletes agreed, and 21 percent were undecided. Close to 60 percent of females disagreed with this statement, compared to 48 percent of males. More males agreed with this statement than did females: 28 percent and 19 percent, respectively. Approximately the same proportion of females and males were undecided.

Table 3.2 Random drug testing in athletics is necessary but not in other extra-curricular activities.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	39.39	20.83	34.48	25.93	31.58
Somewhat Disagree	12.12	37.50	13.79	33.33	22.81
Undecided	21.21	25.00	24.14	22.22	22.81
Somewhat Agree	21.21	12.50	24.14	11.11	17.54
Strongly Agree	6.06	4.17	3.45	7.41	5.26

The following statement read: *Random drug testing is an invasion of a student's privacy and is a waste of government funds*. Twenty-one percent of students disagreed with

this statement, 54 percent agreed, and 25 percent were undecided. Results can be seen in Table 3.3. When comparing non-athlete responses to athlete responses, only 8 percent of non-athletes disagreed compared to 30 percent of athletes. Sixty-seven percent of non-athletes agreed compared to only 45 percent of athletes, and 25 percent of non-athletes and athletes were undecided. The only difference between gender responses was that 28 percent of males disagreed compared to 15 percent of females, and the number of females who were undecided was nearly twice the number of males.

Table 3.3 Random drug testing is an invasion of a student’s privacy and is a waste of government funds.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	12.12	4.17	13.79	3.70	8.77
Somewhat Disagree	18.18	4.17	13.79	11.11	12.28
Undecided	24.24	25.00	17.24	33.33	24.56
Somewhat Agree	24.24	37.50	20.69	37.04	29.82
Strongly Agree	21.21	29.17	34.48	14.81	24.56

Another statement read: *If students were forced to participate in random drug testing, many students would stop participating in extra-curricular activities and athletics.* Only 7 percent of students disagreed with this statement, while 77 percent agreed, and 16 percent were undecided. Table 3.4 shows the distribution. When student athletes were asked this question, 12 percent disagreed, 70 percent agreed, and 18 percent were undecided. When non-student athletes were asked this question no one disagreed, 88 percent agreed, and 13 percent were undecided. When differentiated by gender, the percent of males and females who agreed and disagreed were similar, while the number of undecided females was twice that of males.

Table 3.4 If students were forced to participate in random drug testing, many students would stop participating in extra-curricular activities and athletics.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	3.03	0.00	3.45	0.00	1.75
Somewhat Disagree	9.09	0.00	6.90	3.70	5.26
Undecided	18.18	12.50	10.34	22.22	15.79
Somewhat Agree	39.39	50.00	48.28	40.74	43.86
Strongly Agree	30.30	37.50	31.03	33.33	33.33

The last statement students responded to was: *I would not participate in extra-curricular activities and athletics if I had to submit to a random drug test in order to participate.* Approximately 63 percent of students disagreed, 30 percent agreed, and 7 percent were undecided. Distribution of responses can be seen in Table 3.5. Seventy-three percent of athletes disagreed with this statement, while 24 percent were agreed and 3 percent were undecided. Fifty percent of non-athletes disagreed with this statement, 38 percent agreed, and 12 percent were undecided. There were minimal differences of opinion between males' and females' responses.

Table 3.5 I would not participate in extra-curricular activities and athletics if I had to submit to a random drug test in order to participate.

<i>Reaction</i>	<i>Athletes</i>	<i>Non-Athletes</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>Percentage of Students</i>
Strongly Disagree	63.64	29.17	55.17	44.44	49.12
Somewhat Disagree	9.09	20.83	10.34	18.52	14.04
Undecided	3.03	12.50	3.45	11.11	7.02
Somewhat Agree	12.12	12.50	48.28	11.11	12.28
Strongly Agree	12.12	25.00	20.69	14.81	17.54

Research Question #4 – What challenges do administrators perceive when implementing drug and alcohol prevention programs and policies?

Staff members were asked about the perceived challenges to implementing drug and alcohol prevention programs and policies. One staff member explained that it is difficult to agree on what a policy should be and to consistently enforce it. This faculty member referred to the present dress code at the school and how it is not routinely enforced. Several faculty members referred to the lack of resources in the school as challenges to implementing drug and alcohol prevention programs such as police involvement, funding, drug and alcohol counseling services, parental involvement, and total faculty involvement.

The lack of a student resource officer (SRO) was the most prominent concern from the group of staff members interviewed. Numerous faculty members mentioned how they used to have an SRO on campus, but had since been removed from the budget. The officer was able to create a link between the school and the local police force. This SRO was able to create relationships with students that provided a consistent message to the students about consequences to drug and alcohol use and abuse. One faculty member also noted that an SRO would be able to help with counseling students with drug and alcohol issues.

One staff member spoke about the expenses of implementing drug and alcohol prevention programs and policies. This faculty member was concerned about the lack of drug and alcohol counselors on staff. The staff member also noted that it would be preferable to have experts or supervisors to oversee the implementation. Furthermore, staff members were concerned that there is a sense of complacency in the community around the use of drugs like marijuana. One staff member mentioned that there is a train of thought that believes drug and alcohol use is not that serious. Similarly, another staff member mentioned that there is a

notion that marijuana use is not the worst thing that for kids to do. Even while there is a sense of complacency, faculty members believe that there needs to be a clear and consistent message delivered to students about drug and alcohol use and abuse.

Faculty members believe that there needs to be a clear policy concerning drug and alcohol use and abuse that is routinely enforced throughout the community. One staff member noted that there needs to be total staff buy-in when incorporating a drug and alcohol prevention program and policy.

Research Question #5 – What policies have been incorporated at the school to lower the rates of drug and alcohol use and abuse by adolescents and to what degree do administrators, teachers/coaches, students and student athletes feel that the policies have been successful in their mission?

As a state run school that is vying for federal funding, the school must conform to the rules and regulations set forth in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Under Title IV, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, Federal assistance is provided to

1. States for grants to local educational agencies and consortia of such agencies to establish, operate, and improve local programs of school drug and violence prevention and early intervention;
2. States for grants to, and contracts with, community-based organizations and public and private entities for programs of drug and violence prevention and early intervention, including community-wide drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities;
3. States for development, training, technical assistance, and coordination activities; and
4. public and private entities to provide technical assistance; conduct training, demonstrations, and evaluation; and to provide supplementary services and community-wide drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities for the prevention of drug use and violence among students and youth. (U.S. Department of Education, 2004)

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act requires that schools can use the designated funds to develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive programs and activities that are coordinated with other school or community based programs and must

- foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement;
- be consistent with the principles of effectiveness described by: the program must be based on an assessment of objective data regarding the incidence of violence and illegal drug use in the elementary schools and secondary schools and communities to be served, including an objective analysis of the current conditions and consequences regarding violence and illegal drug use, including delinquency and serious discipline problems, among students who attend such schools (including private school students who participate in the drug and violence prevention program) that is based on ongoing local assessment or evaluation activities;

- be designed to —
 - i. prevent or reduce violence; the use, possession and distribution of illegal drugs; and delinquency; and
 - ii. create a well disciplined environment conducive to learning, which includes consultation between teachers, principals, and other school personnel to identify early warning signs of drug use and violence and to provide behavioral interventions as part of classroom management efforts; and
- include activities to —
 - i. promote the involvement of parents in the activity or program;
 - ii. promote coordination with community groups and coalitions, and government agencies; and
 - iii. distribute information about the local educational agency's needs, goals, and programs under this subpart. (U.S. Department of Education, 2004)

Furthermore, the district policies must reflect and correspond to those outlined in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act. The district policy states that:

The possession or use of tobacco, alcohol, dangerous drugs, or drug paraphernalia in any form by staff, students, and others of any age on or about the school premises is prohibited. This prohibition applies during the regular school day and/or at any district-related activity, regardless of time or location and while being transported on district-provided transportation.

The district policy also states that an aggressive intervention program has been implemented to eliminate drug, alcohol, and tobacco use throughout the district. According to the district, the program includes age-appropriate drug, alcohol, and tobacco curriculum will be taught annually to all students. These policies apply to all students and staff in the district; however, there is an additional policy for students who decide to take part in athletics.

The policy for students who participate in athletics is in effect twenty-four hours a day and states:

If it is determined by a school official that an athlete was in possession or used either alcohol, all forms of tobacco, performance enhancing drugs, or controlled substances, the student will face consequences in addition to normal school disciplinary procedures.

Any athlete who finds himself/herself in the company of persons who illegally possess, use, transmit, or are under the influence of alcohol, performance enhancing drugs or a controlled substance (i.e. frequenting of areas, places, or sites where drugs, and/or alcohol are present) is expected to leave within a reasonable period of time. Failure to do so will result in discipline as if they were in violation of the policy.

Faculty

Faculty members were asked several questions concerning their opinions on the drug and alcohol policies that are currently employed at the school. Faculty members were first asked what drug and alcohol policies are currently used in the school. All faculty members talked about the district policy and the consequences of violating the policy. When staff members were asked if the policies have been effective, there were mixed responses. One of the staff members mentioned that the policies work to get troubled students out of the school, but that it does not work in the long run. This individual also stated that “Drug and alcohol use is a symptom and we need to get to the bottom of the problem.” Another faculty member asserted that more needs to be done since there has been an increase in substance use among freshmen. On the other hand, one faculty member noted that the policies currently in place are “better than nothing.” Faculty members were then asked about prior teaching/administrative experiences and how the policies at other schools compared to the policies at their current school.

Several faculty members had not actually been employed in any other school district. One faculty member who had been employed in another location reported that there had been drug dogs who conducted random searches of the entire school. The staff member reminisced that the students and teachers could not leave the classroom while the dog was in the building. Furthermore, this individual noted that using a drug dog was a complicated situation that turned up only one drug dealer in five years. Another staff member

remembered working in a district that employed an SRO. This staff member believes that having an SRO was probably a deterrent, but more so to students who are only recreational users. Another staff member mentioned having an SRO in a previous school and believes that it was more effective because of the availability of juvenile services through the SRO.

Faculty members were then asked: What type of policy would be most effective at deterring student drug and alcohol use? Nearly all faculty members mentioned that only having a drug and alcohol policy would not be the most effective method of preventing students from using and abusing drugs and alcohol. One policy change that one faculty member believes would help with the problem of drug and alcohol use and abuse is a closed campus. Currently, students are able to leave during lunch time and off-blocks. A closed campus would mean that students would not be free to leave the school premises until the school day is through. Another staff member offered that there should be tougher consequences for coming to school under the influence. This staff member believes that students should be expelled after their second offense. The general sense from staff members is that only having a policy is not enough.

Most faculty members agreed that there should be consequences to using drugs and alcohol; however, several had ideas for prevention of drug and alcohol use and abuse that were not policy oriented. One idea that came from several staff members was that students need to feel connected to their school and that students need authentic positive alternatives to drugs and alcohol. Others noted that it is important for parents to realize the seriousness of drug and alcohol use and abuse. Another mentioned that it seems taboo for parents to talk frankly with their children about drugs and alcohol, since parents want their kids to trust them so they don't want to break that, but it is important for parents to have that

conversation. Faculty members also believed that it is important for students to know how to respond to peer pressure by making educated choices.

Faculty members were then asked their definition of a successful drug and alcohol policy. Most staff members agreed that success would be less incidences of drug and alcohol use and abuse; having all students aware of the consequences of drug and alcohol use and abuse early in adolescence; and having students making more informed decisions about drugs and alcohol with full understanding. One faculty member noted that “success would be no use, but until then there’s work to do.”

Students

In the student survey, there were two statements and one open-ended question that directly related to how students feel about school drug and alcohol policies. The first was: *Drug and alcohol policies implemented by the school’s administration will deter students from using and abusing drugs and alcohol.* This statement was also addressed in Research Question #2. It was found that approximately 54 percent of students disagreed, while only 25 percent agreed, and 21 percent were undecided. Responses can be seen in Table 2.4. When comparing athletes versus non-athletes, 63 percent of athletes disagreed with this statement, while only 42 percent of non-athletes concurred. This comparison is similar to the distribution of opinions among males versus females. Nearly 60 percent of males disagreed, compared to 48 percent of females.

The second stated: *Drug and alcohol policies implemented by the administration do not affect me.* About 56 percent of students agreed with this statement, while 23 percent disagreed and 21 percent were undecided. Table 2.6 (Research Question #2) shows the

student opinions. Interestingly, only 15 percent of student athletes disagreed with this statement compared to 33 percent of non-athletes. Fifty-five percent of athletes noted that they agree with this statement, and 58 percent of non-athletes agreed. The number of student athletes who are undecided is much larger compared to non-athletes (30 percent versus 8 percent). Also, 62 percent of males agreed with this statement compared to only 48 percent of females, while 20 percent of males and 26 percent of females disagreed. Seventeen percent of males and 26 percent of females were undecided.

When students responded to the open-ended question it asked: *Please give a few characteristics that a student-centered drug and alcohol prevention policy would entail.* Student responses were varied and gave more characteristics for a prevention program rather than a policy. Some of the responses that students gave were:

- Talk less about prevention, because we all know kids are gonna do it no matter what! And more about safe ways to do it. Ie: designate a driver vs. don't drink, have someone watching you vs. don't do drugs. Save use vs. Total Abstinence
- The prevention thing should be available to students who seek it out, but making anything mandatory is just an invasion of privacy and very officious. More likely to push students into drinking and drug use than deter them from it.
- Not to be cynical or to be rude- simply honest, most people our age have been taught about the side-effects of drugs. We've been shown the horribly diseased lung. They know it's bad, a lot simply don't care. I know people that do drugs - I don't like most of 'em. Just do what most schools have done - provide information because only pre-informed people can make good decisions. Oh yeah - actually enforce the rules. That helps too.

- Make health classes more blunt in the drug area and show how people end up after drug use. Have OSU students (like what happened in middle school) come talk to us about their past experiences with drugs and send the negative message toward drug use. Crack down harder on drug use at school with larger punishments. Use more surveys to see what certain drugs are being abused and where students abuse them. Have the "one and done rule" for athletes. Have counselors help students who they suspect abuse drugs.
- Give speeches to the students about drugs & alcohol. Make an open and friendly environment for students to talk to counselors
- Random drug testing should be applied to those not doing well in school, not to participants of sports etc activities. As far as drug use goes, you can tell who in your school does drugs and the best thing you can do is to not associate with them. They can only bring you down. Most of the people who fall in that group are there because they don't have social network in which they feel secure. We need to be less segregated w/in our school in order to prevent drug abuse.
- Pictures. Facts. Examples - bring in past drug abusers. Question/Answer session
- No sugar coating, but no lying. Tell them the affects of drugs and alcohol (Including the heavy stuff, like heroin). Be more specific on details of marijuana (in general and in comparison to cigarettes). Provide ways to help (but also ways to stop, Ex. Discreet access to nicotine patches).

Discussion

When students and administrators were asked if they think there is drug and alcohol use at their school, 100 percent of students surveyed agreed there is drug and alcohol use to some extent. All faculty members interviewed agreed with this statement, but there was more variation in regard to the degree of use. Two staff members agreed that drug and alcohol use is a problem, but it is “not rampant,” while another faculty member estimated that approximately 20-25 percent of students had used alcohol at least once. Another individual also believed that the percentage of students who experiment with alcohol or drugs would probably not be in the single digits. When students were asked in a survey administered by a health teacher about which substances were the biggest concern on campus, alcohol and marijuana tied for first place, followed closely by tobacco, with prescription drugs and mushrooms rounding out the top five.

When asked whether drug and alcohol abuse is present at the school, 93 percent of students agreed; 7 percent were undecided. Amongst faculty members, most agreed that there are probably some students who do abuse drugs or alcohol, but it is not common. One staff member noted that there is probably some abuse and that abuse of drugs and alcohol is a problem for adolescents who are in a tough situation and are trying to escape by self-medicating. One staff member suggested that they would not distinguish between use and abuse amongst underage students. When students are caught using drugs or alcohol, typically there will be consequences, but it is possible to attempt to prevent students from taking part in substance use.

Currently, the most widely used form of drug and alcohol use and abuse prevention is policy based (Skiba, 2000, pp. 2-3). These policies hinge on the concept of Zero Tolerance,

where every infraction is punished with equal weight (Skiba, 2000, p. 2). Schools have begun to modify the intensity of Zero Tolerance by implementing more of a sliding scale, but the deterrents to drug and alcohol use, such as suspension and expulsion, are still punitive. Several studies have shown that this way of using negative consequences is ultimately a detriment to the end goal of promoting drug- and alcohol-free children (Skiba, 2000, p. 14). Alcohol and drug dependency has been shown to be a public health issue, where it is a symptom of a deeper set of problems occurring within the individual.

The objective of Zero Tolerance Policies is to protect the students who follow the rules and are at school to learn. However, in practice, when students are caught using drugs and/or alcohol at school, typically the harshest consequence, and often most convenient for the school district, is expulsion. This way of dealing with students who are calling out for help is not beneficial for anyone involved. Expelling these students and saying that they no longer have the right to an education allows the school district to sweep the problem under the rug, so to speak. These students, unless they are able to obtain effective treatment, risk becoming uneducated addicts who can create larger problems for communities.

In this study, staff members and students alike expressed the view that drug and alcohol prevention policies are not the most effective way of deterring drug and alcohol use and abuse. Staff members noted that school needs to be the carrot, not the stick. When schools provide a positive environment that students care about, it is easier for them to invest their energy into activities that can replace the use and/or abuse of drugs and alcohol. With the current system in place, a simple majority of students felt that the policies regarding drug and alcohol use and abuse did not apply to them. Is this because they do not use drugs and alcohol or because they feel that the policy does not matter? Significantly more males believe

that these policies do not affect them, while less than half of females surveyed displayed the same notion. If policies that employ negative consequences are not working efficiently, then why are they still in place?

Drug and alcohol use and abuse is a complex issue without clear boundaries to determine *right* or *wrong* behaviors and consequences. Yet, surprisingly, policies are implemented that are designed to think of the problem in such absolute terms. A troubling indicator of the ineffectiveness of these policies was found in this study. A simple majority of students believe that students are not deterred by current drug and alcohol policies. Furthermore, a considerable percentage of students were undecided, and very few actually felt that the policies were effective deterrents. Even more disconcerting was that a great majority of students felt that no matter what prevention program schools adopted, students would still use and abuse drugs and alcohol. This belief could be due in part to the current ineffective policies as well as the fact that a simple majority of students believe that the drug and alcohol prevention program at their school does not help deter students from using drugs and alcohol. Interestingly, almost a simple majority of students felt that a school program that explains the risks of drugs and alcohol would be helpful to preventing drug and alcohol use and abuse. It seems as though students do not strongly oppose the idea of learning about the risks associated with drugs and alcohol, but they believe that use will continue nonetheless.

There were minimal differences of opinion between athletes and non-athletes on the topics of drug and alcohol policies and prevention programs. More differences occurred when differentiating data based on gender. For example, a relatively minimal percentage of males believe that the current prevention program at the school deters drug and alcohol use and abuse; however, a simple majority believes that a drug and alcohol prevention program

will help them decide whether to use drugs and/or alcohol. On the other hand, almost a quarter of females believe that the current prevention program deters students from using drugs and/or alcohol, but a slightly larger percentage believe that a prevention program helps students decide whether to use drugs and/or alcohol. More notably, a simple majority of males and almost a simple majority of females believe that a school program that explains the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse will help prevent their occurrence. By contrast, significantly more males than females believe that a prevention policy will not deter drug and alcohol use and that the policy does not affect them.

Another significant finding was that a great majority of students believe that no matter what drug and alcohol prevention program is implemented, students will still use drugs and alcohol. However, students believe that the administrators and policy makers understand the pressures of being an adolescent and, therefore, that an adequate drug and alcohol prevention program can be created. It is surprising that students do not dismiss prevention programs as punitive but rather seem to understand the reasons for them: to protect them from the consequences of actions that are detrimental to their longevity.

Student responses to the idea of random drug testing of participants in extra-curricular activities were more mixed than expected. Less than half of the students surveyed believe that students should not be randomly drug tested. Furthermore, merely about half of all student athletes surveyed believe that participants should not be randomly drug tested, whereas the energetic debate about the topic would lead one to expect a strong representation of beliefs either for or against such policies. To gather only a slim majority of students disagreeing with the implementation of drug testing is unexpected. The proportion of students who are undecided on the issue was also surprising for the same reason. It was also

interesting that students disagreed more strongly to the idea of only drug testing student athletes rather than all participants in extra-curricular activities. Similarly, only a simple majority agreed that random drug tests are an invasion of privacy and a waste of money.

Even more intriguing was that slightly less than half of all student athletes surveyed believed that only student athletes should be drug tested, compared to nearly two-thirds of non-athletes. One would assume that student athletes, or students, who participate in extracurricular activities, would disagree more vehemently with the idea of random drug testing, yet this was not the case. Does their acceptance of the policy result from the fact that drug testing is already extensive in college athletics and professional sports? Of further interest was that slightly more than three-quarters of students agreed that many students would stop participating in extracurricular activities if required to take a random drug test in order to participate; however, two-thirds of students responded that they would not stop participating in extra-curricular activities if they had to submit to a drug test. Furthermore, a great majority of athletes said they would not stop participating in athletics due to the implementation of random drug testing; however, only half of non-athletes said that they would continue to participate in extra-curricular activities if they had to be drug tested. Faculty responses to the idea of randomly drug testing students were fairly similar to those of students.

Overall, faculty members were not completely opposed to the philosophy behind randomly drug testing students who participate in extra-curricular activities, but they would prefer not to see such policy implemented at the school. The majority of the faculty members believe that the school has an overall climate that is intrinsic to positive learning. They further believe that they are able to create and maintain healthy relationships with students

and believe that having random drug tests would infringe upon this relationship.

Furthermore, several staff members believe that using a random drug testing policy would cause the culture around drug use to become more punitive. However, the policies and deterrents regarding drug use already in place at the school are punitive with negative consequences. New programs and policies that do not focus on punitive deterrents often take large sums of money for planning, training, and implementation, and this is one of the key concerns that administrators state when deciding on employing a new prevention program or policy.

Schools already face budget shortcomings, and changing a broken prevention program and/or policy that some think is better than nothing would have one assume that a new prevention program and/or policy is not high on the to-do list. Yet, according to Abraham Maslow, a student would not be able to actively engage in a school if the most basic needs are not satisfied first (Huitt, 2007). By recognizing that emotionally and physically healthy students are better able to thrive in a learning and developmental environment, the issue of funding the position of a drug and alcohol counselor would seem like a good investment. Besides, these individuals are trained to recognize substance use and abuse as well as to relate to students. They would provide a strong connection to prevention materials, local and outside resources for addiction, as well as a liaison between the school's administration, local law enforcement, and social services.

Another investment that has been cut from the school was a school resource officer (SRO). This person acted as a liaison between the school and local law enforcement. This individual allows the school to take care of the schooling and leaves the criminal activities to the police. However, by having a SRO and a specialized drug and alcohol counselor working

together to diminish the occurrences of substance use and abuse, the cost of employing these individuals will be greatly outweighed by the reduction of drug and alcohol use and abuse. In order for the school to first consider making these positions available, it would have to admit to the community that there is a problem with drugs and alcohol.

When speaking with faculty members, most acknowledged that there drug and alcohol use and abuse among students, but it is not a prevalent problem. Specifically, some faculty members addressed the fact that marijuana is an issue in the community, but that it has been deemed to be a non-issue by some parents who feel that it is not the worst possible thing for kids to be taking part in. This belief of not addressing small problems before they can become larger issues is not a successful way of dealing with the problem of substance use and abuse. The National Survey of American Attitudes found that nearly a simple majority of parents feel that there is nothing that they can do to help create a drug-free environment at school. However, by providing students and parents with comprehensive education on topics of drug and alcohol use and abuse, it is more likely that informed decisions, by both parents and children, will be made concerning the future use of drugs and/or alcohol. By involving parents, administrators, and the students in the discussion of how to effectively prevent drug and alcohol use and abuse, the end result will truly be an aggressive, effective drug and alcohol prevention program and policy.

Currently, the district website states that there is an aggressive prevention program in place in the schools, but it is not easily identifiable. Staff members note that counseling is required for students who are caught, but some believe that it is not taken seriously. If neither students nor faculty are taking counseling seriously, then there needs to be an adjustment made because drug and alcohol use and abuse is not a lighthearted issue. Furthermore, the

goal of a drug and alcohol prevention program and policy is jeopardized by an apathetic attitude that assumes broken prevention policies and programs are seen as better than nothing. This view creates the idea that a drug free environment is unattainable and that nothing further should be done about it. This should not be the case, for it should be the shared understanding of all staff members to see that it is achievable. When trying to attain a drug free school, there should be genuine, positive alternatives for students to participate in that act as deterrents to drug and alcohol use. This is not to say that there should not be consequences for partaking in drug and alcohol use and/or abuse, but that unquestioned, uniform use of suspension and expulsion is not the best ways to handle a complex issue.

One idea that surfaced from the faculty interviews was implementing a closed campus policy, until a student has earned the right for it to be open. This would mean that a student must stay on campus at all times until the school day is through, unless that student has shown that they have the developmental and reasoning capabilities to be able to handle going off campus during free time. This approach would be somewhat difficult to enforce because the students who have the intention to leave would probably do so; however, it would be a deterrent to those students who might not have the intention of using but are pulled into it either by peer pressure or out of boredom. It would be interesting to see whether substance use and abuse decreased with this policy. While this policy was drafted by a faculty member, it is necessary to seek student input in policy creation. Therefore, students were asked to express their ideas about what a prevention policy would entail, but most students responded with ideas for a prevention program: not rules, to guide behavior, but activities and suggestions for further reflection. Consistently, students reported that other students will use drugs and alcohol no matter what prevention program or policy is in place; however, many

wanted to be more educated on the topic. Several mentioned learning more about the possible safe use of drugs and alcohol versus the not using at all. Furthermore, students mentioned that they would like to hear first-hand accounts about how drug and alcohol use and/or abuse affected a person's life, in addition to the facts about drugs and alcohol they learn in health class. These speakers could be college students or people in the community. Sharing their stories would allow students to see more viewpoints on drug and alcohol use. By educating students on all sides of the issue at hand and giving students legitimate references where they can learn more about drugs and alcohol, they would be able to develop a more nuanced understanding of the issues involved in choosing to engage in or refrain from using alcohol and drugs. Creating educated students who are able to make informed decisions will undoubtedly enable students to affect the rate of drug and alcohol use.

Conclusions

All in all, the issue of drug and alcohol use and abuse is a complex issue that requires input from all parties involved, including school faculty and staff, as well as parents and students. The policies and prevention programs that are implemented must be age-appropriate and provide positive alternatives to drug and alcohol use. The most significant findings from this study are as follows:

- Overall, students felt that no matter what prevention program schools adopted, students would still use and abuse drugs and alcohol.
- Overall, students do not dismiss prevention programs as punitive but rather seem to understand the reasons for them, which are to protect them from the consequences of actions that are detrimental to their health.

- Nearly about half of all student athletes surveyed believe that participants should not be randomly drug tested, whereas the energetic debate about the topic would lead one to expect a strong representation of beliefs either for or against such policies. To gather only a slim majority of students disagreeing with the implementation of drug testing is unexpected.
- In order to implement any changes within a school with regard to a drug and alcohol prevention program and/or policy, the school has to admit to the community that there is a problem with drugs and alcohol.
- The school should maintain a closed campus, until individual students have earned the right for it to be open to them.
- Schools must provide a positive environment that students care about, so that it is easier for students to invest their energy into genuine, positive alternatives that can replace the desire to use and/or abuse of drugs and alcohol.
- Overall, students would like to hear first-hand accounts about how drug and alcohol use and/or abuse affected a person's life, in addition to the facts about drugs and alcohol they learn in health class.
- All students who are emotionally and physically healthy are better able to thrive in learning and developmental environment, so the issue of funding the position of a drug and alcohol counselor would seem like a good investment.
- The cost of employing a school resource officer and a specialized drug and alcohol counselor to work together to reduce the occurrences of substance use and abuse would be significantly mitigated by the impact generated by maintaining a school environment of frank, clear education, minimized use of drugs and alcohol, and

appropriate punishment.

Recommendations

Future studies of high school drug and alcohol prevention programs should focus on:

- What qualifies as an effective drug and alcohol prevention program, specifically research should be conducted by parties unaffiliated with the program
- Rates of drug and alcohol use and abuse in schools with closed campuses versus schools with open campuses
- The correlation between student drug use and parental involvement
- The effectiveness of parent and student drug and alcohol prevention programs
- The effectiveness of alternative consequences to suspensions and expulsions, such as in-kind restitution; Saturday School; community service; and appropriate in-school suspension that provides academic tutoring and instruction on skill-building behaviors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aarons, G. A., Brown, S. A., Coe, M. T., Myers, M. G., Garland, A. F., Ezzet-Lofstrom, R., et al. (1998). Adolescent Alcohol and Drug Abuse and Health. *Journal of Adolescent Health* , 412-421.
- Barrington, K. (2008). Voluntary, Randomized, Student Drug-Testing: Impact in a Rural, Low-Income Community. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education* , 47-66.
- Bottrell, K. (2008, December 16). *Marijuana Policy Project*. Retrieved May 10, 2010, from School Board Examines Drug Testing Policies: <http://www.mpp.org/states/wyoming/news/school-board-examines-drug-testing-policies.htm>
- Center for Disease Control. (2009, March 23). *CDC- National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion*. Retrieved May 10, 2010, from Alcohol & Drug Use - DASH/Healthy Youth: <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/alcoholdrug/index.htm>
- Clayton, V. (2007, September 21). *MSNBC.com*. Retrieved May 13, 2010, from Growing Up Healthy: Debate Over Drug Testing: http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/20631668/ns/health-kids_and_parenting//
- Eaton, D. K., Kann, L., Kinchen, S., Shanklin, S., Ross, J., Hawkins, J., et al. (2008). *Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance*. Berkeley: CDC Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion Research.
- Elliot, D. L., Goldberg, L., Moe, E. L., DeFrancesco, C. A., Durham, M. B., & Hix-Small, H. (2004). Preventing Substance Use and Disordered Eating: Initial Outcomes of the ATHENA (Athletes Targeting Healthy Exercise and Nutrition Alternatives) Program. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine* , 1043-1049.
- Every 15 Minutes. (2010). *Every 15 Minutes*. Retrieved April 25, 2010, from Every 15 Minutes - Someone dies from an Alcohol Related Collision: <http://www.every15minutes.com/aboutus/>
- Faggiano, F., Vigna-Taglianti, F. D., Versino, E., Zambon, A., Borraccino, A., & Lemma, P. (2008). School-Based Prevention for Illicit Drug Use: A Systematic Review. *Preventive Medicine* , 385-396.
- Friedman, R. A. (2006). The Changing Face of Teenage Drug Abuse - The Trend Toward Prescription Drugs. *The New England Journal of Medicine* , 1448-1450.
- Goldberg, L., Elliot, D., Clarke, G., MacKinnon, D. P., Moe, E., Zoref, L., et al. (1996). Effects of a Multidimensional Anabolic Steroid Prevention Program: The Adolescents

Training and Learning to Avoid Steroids (ATLAS) Program. *The Journal of the American Medical Association* , 1555-1562.

Goldberg, L., MacKinnon, D. P., Elliot, D. L., Moe, E. L., Clarke, G., & Cheong, J. (2000). The Adolescents Training and Learning to Avoid Steroids Program: Preventing Drug Use and Promoting Health Behaviors. *Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine* , 332-338.

Huitt, W. (2007). *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Retrieved May 25, 2010, from Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/topics/regsys/maslow.html>

Institute for Behavior and Health. (2010). *Prevention Not Punishment: Random Student Drug Testing*. Retrieved April 24, 2010, from Prevention Not Punishment: Random Student Drug Testing - FAQ: <http://www.preventionnotpunishment.org/faqs.html>

International Survey Associates. (2009). *Pride Surveys: Questionnaire Report for Grades 6 to 12 - 2008-2009 National Summary*. Bowling Green: International Survey Associates.

Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2008). *Monitoring the Future: National Survey Results on Drug Use, 1975-2008, Volume I Secondary School Students*. Bethesda: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Join Together. (2004, March 29). *Join Together*. Retrieved April 25, 2010, from New Online Alcohol Prevention Program Targets High School Students: <http://www.jointogether.org/news/headlines/inthenews/2004/new-online-alcohol-prevention.html>

Jones, S. E., Fisher, C. J., Greene, B. Z., Hertz, M. F., & Pritzl, J. (2007). Healthy and Safe School Environment, Part I: Results From the School Health Policies and Programs Study 2006. *Journal of School Health* , 522-543.

Kern, J., Gunja, F., Cox, A., Rosenbaum, M., Appel, J., & Verma, A. (2006). *Making Sense of Student Drug Testing: Why Educators Are Saying No*. New York: American Civil Liberties Union and The Drug Policy Alliance.

McCollum, S. (2004, September). Zero Tolerance: Safer Schools or Unfair Rules? *Literary Cavalcade* , pp. 20-21.

Mihalic, S. F., Fagan, A. A., & Argamaso, S. (2008). Implementing the LifeSkills Training drug prevention program: factors related to implementation fidelity. *Implementation Science* .

Miller, J. W., Naimi, T. S., Brewer, R. D., & Jones, S. E. (2007). Binge Drinking and Associated Health Risk Behaviors Among High School Students. *Pediatrics* , 76-85.

National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention. (2010). *Publications*. Retrieved May 10, 2010, from Prescription Drug Abuse by Adolescents:

<http://www.promoteprevent.org/publications/prevention-briefs/prescription-drug-abuse-adolescents>

National Institute on Drug Abuse. (2003). *Preventing Drug Use among Children and Adolescents*. Bethesda: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Oregon Health and Science University. (2008). *Health Promotion and Sports Medicine*. Retrieved May 3, 2010, from Health Promotion and Sports Medicine - ATHENA - Center for Health Promotion Research:

<http://www.ohsu.edu/ohsuedu/academic/som/medicine/hpsm/athena.cfm>

Peele, S. (2007). Reducing Harms from Youth Drinking. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education* , 67-87.

QEV Analytics, Ltd. . (2009). *National Survey of American Attitudes on Substance Abuse XIV: Teens and Parents*. New York City: The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University.

Skiba, R. J. (2000). *Zero Tolerance, Zero Evidence: An Analysis of School Disciplinary Policy*. Indianapolis: Indiana Education Policy Center.

Steiker, L. K. (2008). Making Drug and Alcohol Prevention Relevant: Adapting Evidence-based Curricula to Unique Adolescent Cultures. *Community Health* , 52-60.

Students Against Destructive Decisions. (2010). *SADD*. Retrieved April 25, 2010, from SADD - Mission and Policy: <http://www.sadd.org/mission.htm>

Summerfield, L. M. (1991). *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved May 5, 2010, from Drug and Alcohol Prevention Education. ERIC Digest: <http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-9219/drug.htm>

Taylor, R. (1997). Compensating Behavior and the Drug Testing of High School Athletes. *The Cato Journal* .

The Mendez Foundation. (2010). *Mendez Foundation*. Retrieved April 25, 2010, from Evaluation Results - The Mendez Foundation: <http://www.mendezfoundation.org/resources/evaluation/index.php>

The Nemours Foundation. (2010). *Teens Health*. Retrieved May 10, 2010, from Prescription Drug Abuse: http://kidshealth.org/teen/drug_alcohol/drugs/prescription_drug_abuse.html

Tricker, R., & Davis, L. G. (1988). Implementing Drug Education in Schools: An Analysis of the Costs and Teacher Perceptions. *Journal of School Health* , 181-185.

Tricker, R., & Davis, L. G. (1987). Implementing School Drug and Alcohol Curricula: A Descriptive Evaluation. *Journal of Remedial Education and Counseling* , 281-293.

U.S. Department of Education. (2004, 9 15). *ED.gov*. Retrieved May 22, 2010, from Title IV - 21st Century Schools: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg51.html>

U.S. Supreme Court Media (OYEZ). (2010). *U.S. Supreme Court Media (OYEZ)*. Retrieved April 24, 2010, from Board of Education v. Earls, U.S. Supreme Court Case Summary and Oral Argument: http://www.oyez.org/cases/2000-2009/2001/2001_01_332

Yamaguchi, R., Johnston, L. D., & O'Malley, P. M. (2003). Relationship Between Student Illicit Drug Use and School Drug-Testing Policies. *Journal of School Health* , 159-164.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

STUDENT SURVEY

Please take a moment to answer the following questions.

Age: _____ **Grade (circle one):** 10 11 12 **Sex (circle one):** M F

Do you participate in school sports (circle one): Yes No

If so, which ones (circle all that apply):

Alpine Baseball Basketball Golf Lacrosse Soccer Tennis Equestrian
Skiing

Cross Football Cross Volleyball Swimming Track Wrestling Softball
Country Country
Skiing

Use the scale below to answer the following questions about drug and alcohol use at your high school.

*(5) Strongly Agree (4) Somewhat Agree (3) Undecided (2) Somewhat Disagree
(1) Strongly Disagree*

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. There are students at your school who use drugs or alcohol. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. There are students at your school who abuse drugs or alcohol. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. The drug and alcohol prevention program at your school deters students from using and abusing drugs and alcohol. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. No matter what drug and alcohol prevention program is implemented, students will still use drugs and alcohol. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. The drug and alcohol prevention program is helpful for students who are deciding whether or not to use drugs or alcohol. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 6. Drug and alcohol policies already in place at your school deter students from using and abusing drugs or alcohol. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

- | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Administrators and policy makers do not understand the pressures of being an adolescent so they could not create an adequate drug and alcohol prevention program. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 8. Drug and alcohol policies implemented by the administration do not affect me. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse helps prevent drug and alcohol use and abuse. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 10. A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse should be held once per year. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 11. A school program that details the risks of drug and alcohol use and abuse should be offered as a mandatory class for graduation. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 12. Students who participate in extra-curricular activities and athletics should be randomly drug tested. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 13. Random drug testing in athletics is necessary but not in other extra-curricular activities. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. Random drug testing is an invasion of a student's privacy and is a waste of government funds. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 15. If students were forced to participate in random drug testing, many students would stop participating in extra-curricular activities and athletics. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16. I would not participate in extra-curricular activities and athletics if I had to submit to a random drug test in order to participate. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 17. In the space provided, please give a few characteristics that a student-centered drug and alcohol prevention policy would entail. | | | | | |

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

ADMINISTRATION AND STAFF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Is drug and alcohol use a problem at your school?
2. Is drug and alcohol abuse a problem at your school?
3. What policies have been implemented at your school in order to curb drug and alcohol use?
4. To what extent have these policies been effective?
5. Have you been in other school districts that used different policies?
6. To what extent were those policies were effective?
7. Are the policies concerning drug and alcohol use different for student athletes different than non-student athletes?
8. What type of policy would be most effective at deterring student drug and alcohol use?
9. What are the major challenges when trying to implement a drug and alcohol prevention policy?
10. What concerns do you have as a/an administrator, coach, or AD have about random drug testing?
11. Should students who participate in extra-curricular activities and athletics be randomly drug tested?
12. If so, why? If not, why?
13. What do you perceive as a successful drug and alcohol prevention program?
14. What is your definition of success?
15. What elements does a successful drug and alcohol prevention policy have?