

Counseling & Psychological Services • San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive • San Diego, CA 92182-4730
www.echeckuptogo.com

Comparing Online Alcohol Prevention Education Programs A NASPA Panel (2011) & Independent Research Review (2012)

During the 2012 NASPA Alcohol & Other Drug Abuse Prevention & Intervention Conference, presentations sponsored by SAMHSA and given by Dr. Jessica Cronce reviewed the research-base and utility of SDSU's eCHECKUP TO GO programs. These presentations reiterate and reinforce similar conclusions drawn from the NASPA plenary session panel moderated by Dr. Jason Kilmer at the 2011 NASPA Alcohol & Other Drug Abuse Prevention & Intervention Conference.

Comparisons & Conclusions

Our summary of the comparisons made and conclusions drawn at these two NASPA conferences follows below:

- Independent meta-analysis of published random control trials (RCT's) confirmed that the eCHECKUP TO GO is a program that both "works" and continues to meet the criteria for a NIAAA Tier 1 recommended approach.
- Published data showed "overwhelming support" for brief motivational interventions and consistent "evidence supporting the eCHECKUP TO GO program (e-CHUG)."
- With fourteen (14) independent outcome studies (8 Published and 6 accepted and presented at professional conferences), the eCHECKUP TO GO has been subjected to the greatest number of independent outcome evaluations.
- Reviews of published RCT's show the eCHECKUP TO GO's positive effects can last longer than other online programs.
- The eCHECKUP TO GO is among the least expensive programs available to campuses.

An annual subscription fee of \$975 provides unlimited use of a program tailored to each campus and local community.

The complete 2012 NASPA presentations can be viewed by visiting the NASPA Conference Archives at www.naspa.org



The eCHECKUP TO GO (e-CHUG) compared to AlcoholEdu

The eCHECKUP TO GO is often compared to AlcoholEdu, offered by EverFi Inc. Presentations at both the 2011 & 2012 NASPA Alcohol & Other Drug Abuse Prevention & Intervention Conferences, provided the following comparisions:

- Published RCTs of eCHECKUP TO GO have demonstrated consistently positive outcomes.
- AlcoholEdu has shown mixed and negative outcomes. With 3 out of the 5 published studies showing negative or questionable results, an independent reviewer concluded that the AlcoholEdu may not meet the NIAAA criteria for a Tier 1 recommended approach.
- Reviews of published RCT's show the eCHECKUP TO GO's positive effects can last up to one year; AlcoholEdu's positive effects have lasted up to one month.

The one published study making a direct comparison between SDSU's eCHECKUP TO GO and the AlcoholEdu program (Hustad, Barnett, Borsari & Jackson, 2012) was also reviewed and discussed at both the 2011 and 2012 NASPA conferences.

The study's lead author, Dr. John Hustad and an independent reviewer (Dr. Jessica Cronce) both conclude:

- There were **no significant differences** between AlcoholEdu and the eCHECKUP TO GO across **all 7 outcome measures**.
- There were **no significant differences** between AlcoholEdu and the eCHECKUP TO GO across **all 8 Negative Consequences sub-scales**.
- There were no significant differences found between the control group and either program on seven of the eight "Negative Consequences" sub-scale measures (viz., Risk Behaviors, Blackout Drinking, Impaired Control, Self- Care, Social-Interpersonal or Academic/occupational).
- AlcoholEdu and the eCHECKUP TO GO only differed on one of the eight "Negative alcohol-related consequences" sub-scales (Self-perception).
- Compared to the control group, AlcoholEdu showed significant reductions in "Negative alcohol-related consequences" (p=.05).
- Compared to the control group, The eCHECKUP TO GO showed "marginally significant" reductions (p=.09) in "Negative alcohol-related consequences."

With the permission of the study's lead author, Dr. John Hustad, a summary table of all outcomes is reprinted on the next page.





Summary of results from Web-based alcohol prevention for incoming college students: A randomized controlled trial, (Hustad, et al., 2010).

Seven outcome measures:

Outcome measure	AlcoholEdu v. controls	e-CHUG v. controls	e-CHUG v. AlcoholEdu
Typical week drinking	Significant reduction	Significant reduction	No significant difference
Frequency of heavy episodic drinking	Significant reduction	Significant reduction	No significant difference
Number of drinks consumed on a typical day	Significant reduction	Significant reduction	No significant difference
Number of drinks on a peak day of drinking	Significant reduction	Significant reduction	No significant difference
Estimated typical BAC	Significant reduction	Significant reduction	No significant difference
Estimated Peak BAC	Significant reduction	Significant reduction	No significant difference
Negative alcohol-related consequences	Significant reduction	"Marginally significant" p = .09)	No significant difference

The eight (8) "Negative alcohol-related consequences" sub-scales:

Outcome measure	AlcoholEdu v. controls	e-CHUG v. controls	e-CHUG v. AlcoholEdu
Social-interpersonal	Significant reduction	Significant reduction	No significant difference
Impaired control	Significant reduction	Significant reduction	No significant difference
Self-perception	Significant reduction	No significant difference	No significant difference
Self-care	No significant difference	No significant difference	No significant difference
Risk Behaviors	No significant difference	No significant difference	No significant difference
Academic/occupational	No significant difference	No significant difference	No significant difference
Physical Dependence	No significant difference	No significant difference	No significant difference
Blackout Drinking	No significant difference	No significant difference	No significant difference

References

Cronce, J. (2012, 01). *Individual-focused college student drinking prevention: What works, what might and what doesn't.* Presentation delivered at NASPA alcohol & other drug abuse prevention & intervention conference, Atlanta, GA.

Cronce, J. (2012, 01). *Individual-focused college student drinking prevention: Revisiting the 2002 NIAAA Task Force Report.* Presentation delivered at NASPA alcohol & other drug abuse prevention & intervention conference, Atlanta, GA.

Hustad, J. T. P., Barnett, N. P., Borsari, B., & Jackson, K. M. (2010). Web-based alcohol prevention for incoming college students: A randomized controlled trial. *Addictive Behaviors*, *35*, 183-189. The complete article can be viewed online at ScienceDirect.com

Kilmer, J. (2011, 01). *Spotlight Panel: Choosing an online alcohol education program*. Panel delivered at NASPA alcohol & other drug abuse prevention & intervention conference, Miami, FL.

