Washington State Institute for Public Policy

Benefit-Cost Results

Cognitive-behavioral coping-skills therapy for alcohol or drug use disorders

Substance Use Disorders: Treatment for Adults

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2019. Literature review updated September 2016.

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: Cognitive-behavioral coping-skills therapy is a manualized, standalone treatment for alcohol and/or drug abuse or dependence. This intervention emphasizes identifying high-risk situations that could lead to relapse such as social situations, depression, etc. and developing skills to cope with those situations. Clients engage in problem solving, role playing, and homework practice. The intervention is often provided in an individual therapy format but can be conducted in groups as well. Treatment in the included studies occurred over an average of three months.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:			
Taxpayers	$1,269	Benefit to cost ratio	$23.09
Participants	$2,173	Benefits minus costs	$6,172
Others	$386	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	$2,623	benefits greater than the costs	55 %
Total benefits	$6,451		
Net program cost	($279)		
Benefits minus cost	$6,172		

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	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age	ES	p-value
Alcohol use disorder	36	7	190	-0.229	0.122	36	0.000	0.187	39	-0.229	0.060
Employment^^	36	2	44	0.363	0.291	36	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.363	0.673
Illicit drug use disorder	36	6	312	-0.218	0.095	36	0.000	0.187	39	-0.218	0.021
Post-traumatic stress^^	36	1	34	-0.269	0.247	36	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.269	0.276

^^WSIPP does not include this outcome when conducting benefit-cost analysis for this program.

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
Alcohol use disorder	Criminal justice system	$1	$0	$2	$0	$3
Alcohol use disorder	Labor market earnings associated with alcohol abuse or dependence	$785	$1,844	$0	$0	$2,629
Alcohol use disorder	Property loss associated with alcohol abuse or dependence	$0	$2	$5	$0	$7
Illicit drug use disorder	Health care associated with illicit drug abuse or dependence	$369	$57	$379	$185	$990
Illicit drug use disorder	Mortality associated with illicit drugs	$115	$269	$0	$2,578	$2,962
Program cost	Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	$0	$0	$0	($140)	($140)
Totals		$1,269	$2,173	$386	$2,623	$6,451

[1]In 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	$842	2013	Present value of net program costs (in 2018 dollars)	($279)
Comparison costs	$584	2013	Cost range (+ or -)	10 %

The per-participant cost of treatment is the weighted average estimate for studies included in the analysis. We calculated this average estimate using Washington's Medicaid hourly reimbursement rates for individual and group outpatient therapy multiplied by the weighted average of total hours of outpatient individual and group therapy across the studies (averaging 18 total hours). Comparison group costs are computed in a similar manner based on treatment received in the studies (individual or group treatment as usual or no treatment).

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.



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

Ball, S.A., Todd, M., Tennen, H., Armeli, S., Mohr, C., Affleck, G., & Kranzler, H.R. (2007). Brief motivational enhancement and coping skills interventions for heavy drinking. *Addictive Behaviors, 32*(6), 1105-1118.

Balldin, J., Berglund, M., Borg, S., Magnsson, M., Bendtsen, P., Franck, J., . . . Willander, A. (2003). A 6-month controlled naltrexone study: combined effect with cognitive behavioral therapy in outpatient treatment of alcohol dependence. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research, 27*(7), 1142-1149.

Carroll, K.M., Rounsaville, B.J., Gordon, L.T., Nich, C., Jatlow, P.M. & Bisighini, R.M. (1994). Psychotherapy and Pharmacotherapy for Ambulatory Cocaine Abusers. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 51*(3), 177-187.

Carroll, K., Nich, C., Ball, S., Mccance, E., & Rounsavile, B. (1998). Treatment of cocaine and alcohol dependence with psychotherapy and disulfiram. *Addiction, 93*(5), 713-727.

Chaney, E.F., M.R. O'Leary, and A.G. Marlatt. (1978). Skill Training With Alcoholics. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*(5), 1092-1104.

Hawkins, J.D., Catalano, R.F., Gillmore, M.R. & Wells, E.A. (1989). Skills Training for Drug Abusers: Generalization, Maintenance, and Effects on Drug Use. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*(4), 559-563.

Hien, D.A., Cohen, L.R., Miele, G.M., Litt, L.C., Capstick, C. 2004. Promising treatments for women with comorbid PTSD and substance use disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 161*(8), 1426-1432.

Kadden, R.M., Cooney, N.L., Getter, H., & Litt, M.D. (1989). Matching alcoholics to coping skills or interactional therapies: Posttreatment results. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*(6), 698-704.

Monti, P., Rohsenow, D., Michalec, E., Martin, R., & Abrams, D. (1997). Brief coping skills treatment for cocaine abuse: substance use outcomes at three months. *Addiction, 92*(12), 1717-1728.

O'Malley, S.S., Jaffe, A.J., Chang, G., Schottenfeld, R.S., Meyer, R.E., & Rounsaville, B. (1992). Naltrexone and coping skills therapy for alcohol dependence: A controlled study. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 49*(11), 881-887.

Sanchez-Craig, M., & Walker, K. (1982). Teaching coping skills to chronic alcoholics in a coeducational halfway house: I. Assessment of programme effects. *British Journal of Addiction, 77*(1), 35-50.

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 Insititute 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.