Cognitive Behavioral Therapy
(high and moderate risk adult offenders)

Program description:
Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) emphasizes individual accountability and teaches offenders that cognitive deficits, distortions, and flawed thinking processes cause criminal behavior. For this broad grouping of studies, CBT was delivered to adults in either an institutional or community setting and included a variety of "brand name" programs (Moral Reconation Therapy, Reasoning and Rehabilitation, and Thinking 4 a Change). We excluded studies from this analysis that evaluated CBT delivered specifically as sex offender treatment. We investigated additional policy questions about CBT using multivariate regression analysis for the 38 effect sizes and found some variation in effectiveness across this broad grouping of programs. Although not statistically significant (p=0.178), results slightly favor brand name CBT programs. We also found there is no difference in effectiveness for programs delivered in prison versus in the community (p=0.947).

Typical age of primary program participant: 28
Typical age of secondary program participant: N/A

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes Measured</th>
<th>Primary or Secondary Participant</th>
<th>No. of Effect Sizes</th>
<th>Unadjusted Effect Sizes (Random Effects Model)</th>
<th>Adjusted Effect Sizes and Standard Errors Used in the Benefit-Cost Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES    SE p-value</td>
<td>First time ES is estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES    SE Age</td>
<td>Second time ES is estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-0.14 0.05 0.00</td>
<td>-0.13 0.05 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefit-Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Summary Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Tax-payers</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,308</td>
<td>$6,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Benefits</th>
<th>Benefits to:</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Tax-payers</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>In-direct</th>
<th>Total Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Primary Participant</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,308</td>
<td>$6,217</td>
<td>$1,170</td>
<td>$9,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Program Costs</th>
<th>Comparison Costs</th>
<th>Summary Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Cost</td>
<td>Program Duration</td>
<td>Year Dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$412</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Estimate provided by the Washington State Department of Corrections.
The multiplicative adjustments for these studies are based on our empirical knowledge of the research in a topic area. We performed a multivariate regression analysis of 96 effect sizes from evaluations of adult and juvenile justice programs. The analysis examined the relative magnitude of effect sizes for studies rated a 1, 2, 3, or 4 for research design quality, in comparison with a 5 (see Technical Appendix B for a description of these ratings). We weighted the model using the random effects inverse variance weights for each effect size. The results indicated that research designs 1, 2, and 3 should have an adjustment greater than 1 and research design 4 should have an adjustment of approximately 1. Using a conservative approach, we set all the multipliers to 1.

In this analysis, we also found that effect sizes were statistically significantly higher when the program developer was involved in the research evaluation. Similar findings, although not statistically significant, indicated that studies using weak outcome measures (such as technical violations) were higher.

### Studies Used in the Meta-Analysis


Studies Used in the Meta-Analysis


