

Drug Testing

Published: 01/09/2008 - 16:59

1.

"Drug testing of any kind, including for cause or suspicion, was not a significant predictor of marijuana use. These results remained for all samples, even after controlling for student demographic characteristics."

Source:

Yamaguchi, Ryoko, Lloyd D. Johnston & Patrick M. O'Malley, "Relationship Between Student Illicit Drug Use and School Drug-Testing Policies," *Journal of School Health*, April 2003, Vol. 73, No. 4, p. 163.

2.

"No DAT [Drug and Alcohol Testing] deterrent effects were evident for past month use during any of four follow-up periods. Prior-year drug use was reduced in two of four follow-up self-reports, and a combination of drug and alcohol use was reduced at two assessments as well. Overall, drug testing was accompanied by an increase in some risk factors for future substance use. More research is needed before DAT is considered an effective deterrent for school-based athletes."

Source:

Linn Goldberg, MD, Diane L. Elliot, MD, David P. MacKinnon, PhD, Esther L. Moe, PhD, Kerry S. Kuehl, M.D., DrPH, Myeongsun Yoon, MA, Aaron Taylor, MA, and Jason Williams, MA, "Outcomes of a Prospective Trial of Student-Athlete Drug Testing: The Student Athlete Testing Using Random Notification (SATURN) Study," *Journal of Adolescent Health* 41 (2007), p. 421.

3.

"Similar to results for marijuana use, drug testing of any kind and drug testing for cause and suspicion were not significant predictors for use of other illicit drugs among students in grades eight, 10, and 12. Within the high school subsamples, use of illicit drugs among high school male athletes and current marijuana users was not significantly different based on drug testing at the school. Even after controlling for student demographic characteristics, drug testing was not a significant predictor for other illicit drug use in any of the samples."

Source:

Yamaguchi, Ryoko, Lloyd D. Johnston & Patrick M. O'Malley, "Relationship Between Student Illicit Drug Use and School Drug-Testing Policies," *Journal of School Health*, April 2003, Vol. 73, No. 4, p. 163.

4.

"Drug testing of athletes was not a significant predictor of marijuana use by male athletes in high school."

Source:

Yamaguchi, Ryoko, Lloyd D. Johnston & Patrick M. O'Malley, "Relationship Between Student Illicit Drug Use and School Drug-Testing Policies," *Journal of School Health*, April 2003, Vol. 73, No. 4, p. 163.

5.

"In the HLM (Hierarchical Linear Modeling) analyses for students in grades eight, 10, and 12, drug testing (of any kind) was not a significant predictor of student marijuana use in the past 12 months. Neither was drug testing for cause or suspicion."

Source:

Yamaguchi, Ryoko, Lloyd D. Johnston & Patrick M. O'Malley, "Relationship Between Student Illicit Drug Use and School Drug-Testing Policies," *Journal of School Health*, April 2003, Vol. 73, No. 4, p. 163.

6.

"The deterrent effect of drug and alcohol testing was present for the index of past year illicit drug use and combined drug and alcohol use, each at two follow-up time points. If DAT were to have an impact, the expected deterrent effect likely would be that the policy would alter recent (e.g., past month) use of drugs or drugs and alcohol, since student-athletes were under the threat of testing during that time period, but not during the summer months. However, no differences were noted at any of the four follow-up time points for past month indices of use of drugs or use of drugs and alcohol. With 16 opportunities overall to demonstrate a substance-use deterrent effect during 2 years and four follow-up assessments (Table 3), only four effects were significant. The significant effects for past year drug use and alcohol and drug use were not independent, as both scales included drug use."

Source:

Linn Goldberg, MD, Diane L. Elliot, MD, David P. MacKinnon, PhD, Esther L. Moe, PhD, Kerry S. Kuehl, M.D., DrPH, Myeongsun Yoon, MA, Aaron Taylor, MA, and Jason Williams, MA, "Outcomes of a Prospective Trial of Student-Athlete Drug Testing: The Student Athlete Testing Using Random Notification (SATURN) Study," *Journal of Adolescent Health* 41 (2007), p. 426.

7.

"The 2006 Drug Testing Index showed that positivity for amphetamines (positive test results for amphetamine and methamphetamine as a percent of all tests for the substance) declined 20 percent to hit to a new low level among federally mandated, safety-sensitive workers – 0.28 percent, down from 0.35 percent in 2005. Among the general workforce, positivity for amphetamines declined 12.5 percent – from 0.48 percent in 2005 to 0.42 percent in 2006. In addition, the number of positive tests for marijuana, as a percent of the total number of tests for the drug, was down 6.3 percent among the U.S. general workforce compared to 2005 – to 2.38 percent from 2.54 percent. The 2006 Drug Testing Index summarizes the results of more than nine million workplace drug tests performed by Quest Diagnostics between January and December 2006.

"Overall, the testing data indicated that drug use by employees and applicants fell to the lowest level since Quest Diagnostics began publishing the Drug Testing Index in 1988. Of all urine workplace drug tests performed by Quest Diagnostics during 2006 for the combined U.S. workforce, 3.8 percent had positive results, compared to 4.1 percent in 2005 and 13.6 percent in 1988."

Source:

Quest Diagnostics, News Release: "Drug Use Hits New Low Among US Workers in 2006, According to Quest Diagnostics' Drug Testing Index," March 7, 2007, p. 1.

8.

The American Management Association has conducted surveys of workplace surveillance and medical testing.

In 1991, drug testing of some kind was conducted by 63% of companies surveyed, growing to 81% in 1996, falling to 66% in 2000 and then to 62% in 2004.

Drug testing of new hires was conducted by 48% of companies in 1991, growing to 68% in 1996, falling to 61% in 2000 and then to 54.5% in 2004.

Drug testing of current employees was conducted by 52% of companies surveyed in 1991, rising to 70% in 1996, falling to 47% in 2000 and then to 44.3% in 2004.

Source:

American Management Association, AMA 2004 Workplace Testing Survey: Medical Testing (New York, NY: American Management Association, 2004), p. 2; A 2000 AMA Survey: Workplace Testing: Medical Testing: Summary of Key Findings (New York, NY: American Management Association, 2000), p. 3.

9.

The American Management Association in its 2000 survey on workplace surveillance and medical testing found the following percentages of companies which conduct drug tests:

Companies Which Drug Test Employees

Business Category
Testing of New Hires
Testing of All Employees

Financial Services
35.8%
18.8%

Business & Professional Services
36.0%
18.4%

Other Services
60.3%
34.7%

Wholesale & Retail

63.0%

36.8%

Manufacturing

78.5%

42.2%

Source:

American Management Association, A 2000 AMA Survey: Workplace Testing: Medical Testing: Summary of Key Findings (New York, NY: American Management Association, 2000), p. 1.

10.

"Few employers have used impairment testing, and information concerning that experience is very limited and extremely difficult to obtain. The available information, however, indicates that impairment testing is not just a better answer on paper, but in practice as well. Employers who have used impairment testing consistently found that it reduced accidents and was accepted by employees. Moreover, these employers consistently found that it was superior to urine testing in achieving both of these objectives."

Source:

National Workrights Institute, "Impairment Testing: Does It Work?" (Princeton, NJ: NWI, undated), from the web at http://www.workrights.org/issue_drugtest/dt_impairment_testing.html , last accessed March 17, 2004.

11.

Companies which use Factor 1000, an impairment testing system, find that drug and alcohol use are not the most common reasons for accidents; rather, severe fatigue and illness are more common.

Source:

Hamilton, "A Video Game That Tells if Employees Are Fit To Work," Businessweek, (June 3, 1991).

12.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics noted a high turnover in drug testing plans after a large survey of 145,000 businesses. It found that "overall about 1 of 3 establishments that reported having a drug testing program in 1988 said they did not have one in 1990." 46% of the companies with under 50 employees dropped drug testing programs.

Source:

Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Anti-Drug Programs in the Workplace: Are They Here to Stay?" Monthly Labor Review, Washington D.C.: US Bureau of Labor Statistics (April 1991), pp. 26-28.

13.

In a study of high tech industries, researchers found that "drug testing programs do not succeed in improving productivity. Surprisingly, companies adopting drug testing programs are found to exhibit lower levels of productivity than their counterparts that do not... Both pre-employment and random testing of workers are found to be associated with lower levels of productivity."

Source:

Shepard, Edward M., and Thomas J. Clifton, Drug Testing and Labor Productivity: Estimates Applying a Production Function Model, Institute of Industrial Relations, Research Paper No. 18, Le Moyne University, Syracuse, NY (1998), p. 1.

14.

It was estimated that in the mid-1990s the United States spent \$1 billion annually to drug test about 20 million workers.

Source:

Shepard, Edward M., and Thomas J. Clifton, Drug Testing and Labor Productivity: Estimates Applying a Production Function Model, Institute of Industrial Relations, Research Paper No. 18, Le Moyne University, Syracuse, NY (1998), p. 8.

15.

One reason drug testing is not used by some employers is the cost. One electronics manufacturer estimated that the cost of finding each positive result was \$20,000. After testing 10,000 employees he only found 49 positive results. A congressional committee estimated that the cost of each positive in government testing was \$77,000 because the positive rate was only 0.5%.

Source:

"Workplace Substance Abuse Testing, Drug Testing: Cost and Effect," Cornell/Smithers Report, Utica, New York: Cornell University (January 1992).

16.

According to a study funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and published by the Southern Economic Journal in 2001, "Nonchronic drug use was not statistically related to either of the labor supply measures, indicating that light or casual drug use did not lead to negative effects on the labor supply."

Source:

French, Michael T., M. Christopher Roebuck, and Pierre Kebreau Alexandre, "Illicit Drug Use, Employment, and Labor Force Participation," Southern Economic Journal Southern Economic Association: Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, 2001!, 68 2!, p. 366.

17.

"In conclusion, this study found that chronic drug use was significantly related to employment status for men and women. On the other hand, male chronic drug users were less likely to participate in the labor force, but no significant relationship existed between chronic drug use and labor force participation for females. Perhaps the most important finding of this study, however, was the lack of any significant relationships between nonchronic drug use, employment, and labor force participation. An implication of this finding is that employers and policy makers should focus on problematic drug users in the same way that they focus on problematic alcohol users."

Source:

French, Michael T., M. Christopher Roebuck, and Pierre Kebreau Alexandre, "Illicit Drug Use, Employment, and Labor Force Participation," Southern Economic Journal Southern Economic Association: Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, 2001!, 68 2!, p. 366.

18.

Researchers on a grant from NIDA found that school drug testing has no impact on student drug use. According to the researchers, "Does drug testing prevent or inhibit student drug use? Members of the Supreme Court appear to believe it does. However, among the eighth-, 10th-, and 12-grade students surveyed in this study, school drug testing was not associated with either the prevalence or the frequency of student marijuana use, or of other illicit drug use. Nor was drug testing of athletes associated with lower-than-average marijuana and other illicit drug use by high school male athletes. Even among those who identified themselves as fairly experienced marijuana users, drug testing also was not associated with either the prevalence or the frequency of marijuana or other illicit drug use."

Source:

Yamaguchi, Ryoko, Lloyd D. Johnston & Patrick M. O'Malley, Relationship Between Student Illicit Drug Use and School Drug-Testing Policies," *Journal of School Health*, April 2003, Vol. 73, No. 4, p. 164.

19.

According to the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, "Drug testing of students is more prevalent in schools where drugs are used, kept or sold than in schools that are drug free. While only 23 percent of drug-free schools drug test students, 38 percent of non-drug-free schools conduct some type of drug testing. "Drug testing is not associated with either significantly lower risk scores or lower estimates of student body drug use. The average risk score of teens attending a school that is not drug free but has drug testing is 1.69; the average risk score of students at non-drug-free schools without drug testing is 1.50. The estimate of students using illegal drugs averages 40 percent for non-drug-free schools with testing and 34 percent at non-drug-free schools without testing."

Source:

QEV Analytics, "National Survey of American Attitudes on Substance Abuse VIII: Teens and Parents" (New York, NY: National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, August 2003), pp. 20-21.

20.

"Illegal drugs are widely used among the arrestee population. Two thirds of all arrestees tested positive for at least one substance in their system at the time of arrest and 15 percent or more in all sites test positive for more than one substance. The most common substances in all but three sites are marijuana, cocaine, opiates and methamphetamine."

Source:

Office of National Drug Control Policy. ADAM II Annual Report (Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program). Washington DC: Office of the President. p. 37.

<http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/publications/pdf/adam2008.pdf>

1 [2](#) [next >](#) [last >>](#)