

Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention of College Students (BASICS): A Harm Reduction Approach

Substance Use Disorders: Early Intervention

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2019. Literature review updated May 2014.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [Technical Documentation](#).

Program Description: College students recruited or referred are screened for "hazardous" drinking (not alcohol dependence.) Those reporting high rates of consumption receive one to two brief motivational sessions that include comparison of the students' alcohol consumption relative to their peers. Interventions are typically delivered by graduate students or counselors.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$287	Benefit to cost ratio	\$12.49
Participants	\$622	Benefits minus costs	\$885
Others	\$62	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	(\$9)	benefits greater than the costs	66 %
Total benefits	\$962		
Net program cost	(\$77)		
Benefits minus cost	\$885		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2018). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	Treatment age	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis						Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)	
				First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated			ES	p-value
				ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age		
Cannabis use [^]	19	1	118	0.000	0.205	19	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.000	1.000
Problem alcohol use	19	20	3296	-0.166	0.031	19	-0.023	0.047	21	-0.166	0.001
Regular smoking	19	1	118	0.000	0.205	19	0.000	0.308	21	0.000	1.000

[^]WSIPP's benefit-cost model does not monetize this outcome.

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Affected outcome:	Resulting benefits: ¹	Benefits accrue to:				
		Taxpayers	Participants	Others ²	Indirect ³	Total
Problem alcohol use	Criminal justice system	\$0	\$0	\$29	\$0	\$29
Problem alcohol use	Labor market earnings associated with problem alcohol use	\$261	\$612	\$0	\$0	\$873
Problem alcohol use	Property loss associated with problem alcohol use	\$0	\$3	\$5	\$0	\$8
Problem alcohol use	Health care associated with problem alcohol use	\$25	\$5	\$28	\$13	\$70
Problem alcohol use	Mortality associated with problem alcohol	\$1	\$2	\$0	\$17	\$20
Program cost	Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$39)	(\$39)
Totals		\$287	\$622	\$62	(\$9)	\$962

¹In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

²"Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

³"Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

	Annual cost	Year dollars	Summary
Program costs	\$72	2014	Present value of net program costs (in 2018 dollars) Cost range (+ or -)
Comparison costs	\$0	2014	
			(\$77) 20 %

The average duration of the intervention in these studies was 1.5 hours. We assume the following: (1) 36% of screened students are eligible and agree to the intervention (per Carey et al., 2006); (2) screening takes 30 minutes to administer the screen, score, and identify those with hazardous drinking; and (3) graduate students or counselors receive \$25 per hour (2014 dollars) to administer the screening and intervention.


The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

Benefits Minus Costs Over Time (Cumulative Discounted Dollars)




The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in discounted dollars. If the dollars are negative (bars below \$0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach \$0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above \$0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

Benefits by Perspective Over Time (Cumulative Discounted Dollars)



The graph above illustrates the breakdown of the estimated cumulative benefits (not including program costs) per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. These cash flows provide a breakdown of the classification of dollars over time into four perspectives: taxpayer, participant, others, and indirect. "Taxpayers" includes expected savings to government and expected increases in tax revenue. "Participants" includes expected increases in earnings and expenditures for items such as health care and college tuition. "Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance. "Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the changes in the value of a statistical life and changes in the deadweight costs of taxation. If a section of the bar is below the \$0 line, the program is creating a negative benefit, meaning a loss of value from that perspective.



The graph above focuses on the subset of estimated cumulative benefits that accrue to taxpayers. The cash flows are divided into the source of the value.

Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

- Borsari, B., & Carey, K.B. (2000). Effects of a brief motivational intervention with college student drinkers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(4), 728-733.
- Carey, K.B., Carey, M.P., Maisto, S.A., & Henson, J.M. (2006). Brief motivational interventions for heavy college drinkers: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 74*(5), 943-54.
- Chiauzzi, E., Green, T.C., Lord, S., Thum, C., & Goldstein, M. (2005). My Student Body: A High-Risk Drinking Prevention Web Site for College Students. *Journal of American College Health, 53*(6), 263.
- Collins, S.E., Carey, K.B., & Sliwinski, M.J. (2002). Mailed personalized normative feedback as a brief intervention for at-risk college drinkers. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 63*(5), 559-567.
- DiFulvio, G.T., Linowski, S.A., Mazziotti, J.S., & Puleo, E. (2012). Effectiveness of the brief alcohol and screening intervention for college students (BASICS) program with a mandated population. *Journal of American College Health, 60*(4), 269-280.
- Dimeff, L.A. (1997). *Brief intervention for heavy and hazardous college drinkers in a student primary health care setting* (Doctoral dissertation). UMI No. 9819231.
- Hansson, H., Rundberg, J., Zetterlind, U., Johnsson, K.O., & Berglund, M. (2006). An intervention program for university students who have parents with alcohol problems: a randomized controlled trial. *Alcohol and Alcoholism (Oxford, Oxfordshire), 41*(6), 655-663.
- Juarez, P., Walters, S.T., Daugherty, M., & Radi, C. (2006). A randomized trial of motivational interviewing and feedback with heavy drinking college students. *Journal of Drug Education, 36*(3), 233-246.
- Kulesza, M., McVay, M.A., Larimer, M.E., & Copeland, A.L. (2013). A randomized clinical trial comparing the efficacy of two active conditions of a brief intervention for heavy college drinkers. *Addictive Behaviors, 38*(4), 2094-101.
- Larimer, M.E., Turner, A.P., Anderson, B.K., Fader, J.S., Kilmer, J.R., Palmer, R.S., & Cronce, J.M. (2001). Evaluating a brief alcohol intervention with fraternities. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 62*(3), 370-380.
- Marlatt, G.A., J.S. Baer, D.R. Kivlahan, L.A. Dimeff, M.E. Larimer, L.A. Quigley, J.M. Somers, and E. Williams. (1998). Screening and Brief Intervention for High-Risk College Student Drinkers: Results From a 2-Year Follow-Up Assessment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*, 604-615.
- Murphy, J.G., Duchnick, J.J., Vuchinich, R.E., Davison, J.W., Karg, R.S., Olson, A.M., . . . Coffey, T.T. (2001). Relative efficacy of a brief motivational intervention for college student drinkers. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 15*(4), 373-379.

- Neighbors, C., Larimer, M.E., & Weis, M.A. (2004). Targeting misperceptions of descriptive drinking norms: Efficacy of a computer-delivered personalized normative feedback interventions. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*(3), 434-447.
- Schaus, J.F., Sole, M.L., McCoy, T.P., Mullett, N., & O'Brien, M.C. (2009). Alcohol screening and brief intervention in a college student health center: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, Suppl. 16*, 131-141.
- Turrisi, R., Larimer, M.E., Mallett, K.A., Kilmer, J.R., Ray, A.E., Mastroleo, N.R., . . . Montoya, H. (2009) A randomized clinical trial evaluating a combined alcohol intervention for high-risk college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 70*(4), -67.
- White, H.R., Morgan, T.J., Pugh, L.A., Celinska, K., Labouvie, E.W., & Pandina, R.J. (2006). Evaluating two brief substance-use interventions for mandated college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 67*(2) 309-17.

For further information, contact:
(360) 664-9800, institute@wsipp.wa.gov

Printed on 05-16-2021



Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.