



**NATIONAL EVALUATION DATA AND
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER**



**THE VALIDITY OF SELF-REPORTS OF DRUG USE
AT TREATMENT ADMISSION AND AT FOLLOW-UP:
COMPARISONS WITH URINALYSIS AND HAIR
ASSAYS**

November 1995

**NATIONAL EVALUATION DATA AND
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER**



**THE VALIDITY OF SELF-REPORTS OF DRUG USE
AT TREATMENT ADMISSION AND AT FOLLOW-UP:
COMPARISONS WITH URINALYSIS AND HAIR
ASSAYS**

Prepared by

Eric Wish, Ph.D.

Susanna Nemes, Ph.D.

Center for Substance Abuse Research (CESAR)
at University of Maryland, College Park

Jeffrey Hoffman, Ph.D.

Koba Associates

November 1995

This document was supported by the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, Department of Health and Human Services, Caliber/NEDTAC Contract No. 270-94-0001.

CSAT
Center for Substance
Abuse Treatment
SAMHSA

**The Validity of Self-Reports of Drug Use at Treatment Admission
and at Follow-Up: Comparisons with Urinalysis and Hair Assays**

Eric D. Wish, Jeffrey A. Hoffman, and Susanna Nemes

November 1995

Final draft of chapter to be included in *The Validity of
Self-Reports: The Implications for Survey Research*, edited by
Lana Harrison, Ph.D., NIDA Research Monograph, in press.

Center for Substance Abuse Research (CESAR)
University of Maryland
4321 Hartwick Road, Suite 501
College Park, MD 20740
301-403-8329

FOREWORD

Valid information on client drug use at treatment admission and at some point following treatment discharge is absolutely essential to the evaluation of the effectiveness of substance abuse treatment programs. Many evaluation studies have relied almost exclusively on client's self-report of their drug use at intake and follow-up. This paper presents results from a study of clients participating in the Washington, DC Treatment Initiative. The findings challenge the validity of self-report data on drug use and identify factors which influence a respondent's willingness to fully report illicit drug use. Toxicologic measures of drug use (i.e., urinalysis and/or hair assays) are recommended to validate self-report data.

The Washington, DC Treatment Initiative was a jointly funded project by the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT) and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). The Initiative was implemented by Koba Associates and evaluated by the Center for Substance Abuse Research (CESAR), University of Maryland. The National Evaluation Data and Technical Assistance Center (NEDTAC) is supporting the analysis of follow-up interviews of clients who were included in the study.

We wish to thank Charlene S. Lewis, Ph.D., Chief, Program Evaluation Branch (PEB), and Ron Smith, Ph.D., Government Project Officer, PEB, for their insight, guidance, and support in this effort. We also wish to thank Eric Wish, Ph.D., Susanna Nemes, M.A., University of Maryland, CESAR, and Jeffrey Hoffman, Ph.D., Koba Associates, for their preparation of this report.

Sharon Bishop
Project Director
National Evaluation Data and
Technical Assistance Center (NEDTAC)

THE VALIDITY OF SELF-REPORTS OF DRUG USE AT TREATMENT ADMISSION AND AT FOLLOW-UP: COMPARISONS WITH URINALYSIS AND HAIR ASSAYS

Eric D. Wish, Jeffrey A. Hoffman, and Susanna Nemes

ABSTRACT

Studies conducted in the 1970s and early 1980s concluded that persons will provide valid information about their illicit drug use when research interviews are conducted under appropriate conditions. Recent studies of treated and untreated populations using improved urinalysis techniques as well as hair analysis techniques indicate that the validity of respondents' self-reports of recent drug use may be considerably less than previously reported and may differ according to a number of factors. Results are presented from a study of clients participating in the Washington, D.C. Treatment Initiative study who were assessed for drug use by interview, urinalysis, and hair analysis. At intake, almost all clients who tested positive had reported their use of heroin but fewer clients had reported their cocaine use. At post-treatment follow-up, clients under reported both heroin and cocaine use. Findings from treatment outcome studies that fail to validate and adjust their estimates of self-reported recent drug use should be interpreted with considerable caution.

INTRODUCTION

The measurement of drug use by structured research interviews is an established technique in the social sciences. Numerous studies conducted in the 1970s and early 1980s concluded that respondents will provide valid information about their illicit drug use when the interviews are conducted by trained interviewers in a nonthreatening setting and when the respondents feel reasonably secure that their disclosures will not result in adverse consequences (Harrell 1985; Hubbard et al. 1989). Indeed, the federal government spends millions of dollars on surveys of household members and student populations that rely on respondents' willingness to report their illicit drug use accurately (General Accounting Office 1993).

There are three important reasons why conclusions from the early literature supporting the validity of self-reports must be reevaluated. First, most of the validity studies were based primarily on indirect measures of validity, usually assessments of internal consistency or the construct validity of responses. If a respondent's reports of drug use were internally consistent or correlated with other variables in theoretically expected ways (construct validity), the findings were interpreted as supporting the validity of the drug use self-reports. However, an important limitation of such indirect estimates of validity is that a respondent who lied consistently during

the interview would have been judged to be providing valid responses. Thus, a person who under reported both his/her drug use and other deviant behaviors would have exhibited the expected correlation between low drug use and low deviance. (See Magura et al. 1987 for an example of such a spurious relationship.) The same spurious association would be found if respondents were prone to over reporting deviance and drug use.

Even attempts to validate self-reported drug use by comparisons with official record information may lead to what at first glance appears to be evidence of the validity of self-reported drug use information. For example, Wish (1988) found the expected relationship between self-reported drug dependence and the number of prior drug arrests in respondents' criminal justice records in an arrestee cohort in which there was considerable under reporting of recent drug use in comparison with the urine test results.

The second reason why the conclusions of prior validity studies should be reassessed involves the substantial improvements that have been made in the sensitivity of biological measures of recent drug use. The development of objective measures of recent drug use based on biological assays has provided researchers with tools to measure recent drug use directly and to avoid many of the problems described above. However, while urine test results have been used by researchers for almost 25 years to validate self-reports of drug use, the technology has improved so much that it casts doubts on the usefulness of early validity studies (Mieczkowski 1990).

The early urine tests used a process called thin layer chromatography (TLC), a very time-consuming and subjective laboratory test. As tests were perfected and became more sensitive and easier to interpret, it became clear that TLC had greatly under detected the recent use of drugs, especially cocaine and opiates (Wish et al. 1983). Because TLC under detected the use of these drugs, the concordance between self-reported use and the urine tests was inflated in a group of persons who were concealing their drug use. Drug users who reported that they had not used a drug appeared to be telling the truth because the TLC failed to detect the drug. The early urinalysis-based validity studies conducted before the advent of the more sensitive immunoassay screening tests were therefore likely to have overestimated the validity of the self-reports of drug use. Moreover, if hair analyses prove to be a more sensitive measure of drug use than current-day urine tests, the validity research using even today's sensitive urinalyses may also prove to have overestimated the validity of self-reported drug use.

A third reason for questioning the conclusions of prior validity studies is the secular changes that have occurred with regard to attitudes toward illicit drug use. Since the beginning of the cocaine and crack epidemic and related street violence in the early 1980s, and the

emerging AIDS epidemic among injection drug users (IDUs), the public has become more intolerant of drug use (Musto 1991). The earlier studies of the validity of self-reports of drug use were conducted at times when individuals may have been more likely to reveal their drug use in a research interview, which could have led to greater accuracy in self-report measures than is achieved today.

Researchers have begun to reassess the limitations and determinants of self-report measures of drug use using the more sensitive urinalysis and hair analysis (Magura and Kang 1995). The weight of the evidence suggests that the relationship between a respondent's self-reports of drug use and actual drug use behavior is more complex and variable than had been understood. For example, the evidence is overwhelming that persons under the supervision of the criminal justice system greatly underreport their recent use of illicit drugs even when they are interviewed by researchers under conditions of anonymity and confidentiality (Dembo et al. 1990; Wish and Gropper 1990; Mieczkowski et al. 1991). Even arrested youths interviewed six months after their release in the community by experienced research interviewers, under conditions of confidentiality, have been found to conceal their recent drug use (Magura et al. 1995).

It may be expected that persons who are interviewed while they are under the supervision of the criminal justice system or after release may never feel secure enough to disclose their illicit drug use in research interviews. However, studies of noncriminal populations have also found under reporting of recent drug use. Of the patients seeking treatment in a medical clinic who tested positive for cocaine by urinalysis, only 28 percent reported recent use of the drug in the nurse-administered medical intake interview (McNagy and Parker 1992). Marques et al. (1993) studied a sample of infants and their postpartum mothers using interviews and urine and hair analyses. They found that while the cocaine levels in infant hair were correlated with analyses of maternal urine ($r = .28$) and hair ($r = .43$), the maternal self-reports of cocaine use did not correlate ($r = .06$) with the infant hair results. The authors concluded that self-reported drug use information routinely collected by interviewers should be interpreted cautiously.

Cook et al. (1995 and this volume) found that less than one half of the employees of a steel manufacturing plant who tested positive by urine or hair analysis reported their drug use in anonymous research interviews or group-administered questionnaires. The largest amount of under reporting was found for cocaine/crack use. And a study of occupants of shelters and residents of single-occupancy hotels in New York City and State found that only one third of the persons who tested positive for cocaine by hair analysis reported ever using the drug in the telephone research interview, even though all had been informed that they would be tested (Appel 1995). Under reporting of recent drug use in comparison with urinalysis results was also

reported by another study of the homeless in New York City (New York City Commission on the Homeless 1992).

While the evidence suggests that traditional interview studies in which a researcher conducts a one-time interview or periodic interviews with a research subject may be open to under reporting, it has been suggested that more sustained, ethnographic, community-based interview procedures may obtain more valid self-reports of drug use. Weatherby et al. (1994) found that when community outreach workers recruited admitted drug injectors to participate in an AIDS risk assessment study, the urine test results confirmed their self-reported drug use. However, Wish and Mieczkowski (1994) pointed out that because the study's findings came from persons recruited and interviewed because they had previously reported their drug use to the recruiter and had been informed of the impending urine test, the likelihood that the urine tests would detect under reporting in the research interview was diminished. Moreover, Falck et al. (1992) reported considerable under reporting of cocaine and opiate use in their study of a similar sample of not-in-treatment, nonincarcerated IDUs who were not given advance notice of the urine test.

It could be argued that persons in contact with the criminal justice system, the homeless, and employees may have significant reasons for under reporting their drug use, even in confidential research interviews. One might expect, however, that drug abuse treatment clients would find little reason to conceal their drug use, especially at admission to treatment. Assessment and diagnostic tools generally rely upon the person's accurate reporting of recent drug use and associated problems. Moreover, treatment evaluation studies often depend on self-report measures of drug use at intake and at follow-up to assess treatment outcomes. Systematic under reporting of drug use would greatly bias the results of such studies.

The evidence suggests that even drug abuse treatment clients may systematically underreport their drug use. Magura et al. (1987) found that only 35 percent of the persons receiving treatment at methadone programs who tested positive for opiates by an immunoassay urinalysis test (EMIT) reported using the drug in the prior 30 days. Reporting was higher for cocaine (85 percent) and benzodiazepines (61 percent). These results underestimated the level of potential under reporting, however, because persons were classified as having used a drug if they reported current use or use in the past 30 days, rather than use in the past 2 or 3 days, the period to which the urine tests were sensitive.

A comparison of the urinalysis results and self-reported drug use for clients in the Treatment Outcome Prospective Study 24 months after treatment found that only 33 percent of those positive for opiates reported using heroin in the prior three days (Research Triangle

Institute 1994). That study also found that only 40 percent of the cocaine-positive clients reported using the drug in the prior three days.

More recently, a study of clients receiving treatment for cocaine at a subset of Drug Abuse Treatment Outcome Study (DATOS) programs found that only 26 percent of the 109 clients who tested positive for cocaine by urinalysis at follow-up 12 months after treatment reported using the drug in the prior 72 hours. Less than one half (43 percent) of the cocaine-positive clients admitted using the drug in the prior two weeks. Even when the researchers expanded their measure to compare the concordance between any drug-positive urine test and a self-report of the use of any drug in the prior 72 hours, they reported, "but still two-thirds of those who tested positive for any drug did not report use of any drug in the past 72 hours" (Research Triangle Institute 1994, p. 4-10).

Magura et al. (1992) obtained interview, urine, and hair test information to investigate the validity of hair analysis among clients receiving methadone treatment. They found that 81 percent of clients positive for cocaine by urinalysis and 73 percent positive by hair analysis reported using the drug in the confidential research interview. The numbers were smaller for heroin, however-- 57 percent and 64 percent, respectively.

Hinden et al. (1994) found that most of the persons who tested positive by hair analysis for heroin (96 percent) or cocaine (89 percent) at the inception of residential treatment had reported their use of these drugs during the admission interview. However, at the post-treatment interview, only 67 percent of those positive for heroin and 51 percent of those positive for cocaine reported using the drugs. The authors speculated that persons may be less likely to report drug use after treatment or when not in the protected treatment environment.

An experiment to assess the benefit of giving interim methadone maintenance to persons on a waiting list at three methadone treatment programs provided additional information about client under reporting of recent drug use (Sowder et al. 1993). Each of these clients had been randomly assigned to an experimental or control condition. Experimental subjects were provided low doses of methadone and some support services while waiting for admission to the full program; control subjects remained on the waiting list without receiving methadone. A baseline interview was conducted with each subject at entry to the research, and a follow-up interview was conducted about four months later, but before entry to formal treatment. Urine specimens were obtained at the baseline and follow-up interviews.

The study found that at baseline, virtually all of the experimental (97 percent) and control subjects (99 percent) who tested positive for opiates reported using an opiate during the prior 48

hours. However, slightly more than half of those testing positive for cocaine (53 percent and 62 percent, respectively) reported use of the drug in the prior 48 hours. Most of the cocaine positives (over 80 percent) did report using cocaine in the prior 30 days. The authors speculated that at baseline persons who wanted to obtain methadone had an incentive for reporting their recent heroin use. No such incentive was present for reporting cocaine, and to some persons there may have been a disincentive to report use of drugs other than heroin.

While the experimental and control group subjects had similar rates of under reporting at baseline, marked differences were found at follow-up. Eighty percent of the control clients who tested positive for opiates at follow-up reported using the drug in the prior 48 hours, but only 56 percent of the opiate-positive experimental clients reported using the drug ($p < .05$). The results for cocaine were even more disparate, 63 percent vs. 33 percent ($p < .05$). Thus, while all subjects tended to underreport use of each drug at follow-up, the experimental subjects were more likely to conceal their drug use. The researchers suggested that experimental subjects may have had an incentive (e.g., social desirability) to show that the treatment they had participated in had some benefit. Although these findings need to be replicated, they suggest that treatment follow-up studies that rely solely on self-reported drug use to assess outcome run the risk of reporting reductions in drug use among treated versus untreated clients that may largely reflect systematic differences in under reporting. Similar concerns have been raised by Magura and Kang (1995) in their review of studies of the validity of respondent self-reports in drug treatment research studies.

In sum, the recent research literature raises important questions regarding the validity of self-report measures of drug use in studies of drug abuse treatment. At treatment admission, the validity of self-reports of drug use may depend upon the type of drug and the treatment modality. Cocaine use frequently goes unreported; persons seeking methadone treatment may report the recent use of heroin even as they underreport cocaine use. Moreover, persons who have completed some treatment may have special motivation to underreport all recent drug use in the post-treatment period. The remainder of this paper presents findings relevant to some of these issues using information from research interviews, urinalyses, and hair analyses for a subsample of persons participating in the D.C. Treatment Initiative (DCI) study. The next section provides an overview of the DCI study and the validity substudy. The third section presents the results of the validity substudy, following which the implications of the findings and the literature for studies of treatment outcome are discussed.

THE DCI STUDY AND VALIDITY SUBSTUDY

The DCI is an experiment designed to test the efficacy of providing enhanced inpatient or outpatient treatment to clients seeking treatment in the District of Columbia. Persons who sought treatment at the Central Intake Division (CID) run by the D.C. Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration (ADASA) or who were ordered by the court to obtain treatment were eligible to volunteer to participate in the DCI. Persons who volunteered for the study were sent to the DCI Diagnostic Unit, where research staff administered a battery of interviews and psychological measures. The Individual Assessment Profile (IAP), developed for the DCI by researchers at the Research Triangle Institute (Flynn et al. 1992), was administered to all participants before assignment to treatment. The IAP is a structured interview based on the longer DATOS protocol; it asks about many aspects of the client's life, including demographic information, drug use, treatment history, and criminal history. Based upon the results of a clinical assessment, clients were assigned to the appropriate residential therapeutic community or outpatient treatment modality. The research staff then randomly assigned clients to either the enhanced or standard treatment program for their modality. Clients were interviewed periodically after admission and a small subsample were interviewed over the telephone or in person as part of a three-month post-discharge follow-up study. A more extensive follow-up interview is currently being conducted with all persons assigned to one of the two residential therapeutic community programs. (A more complete description of the DCI appears in Hoffman et al. 1995.)

Intake Data Collection

To assess the validity of self-reports of drug use obtained in the IAP interview, a validity study was undertaken with all clients appearing at the Diagnostic Unit between September 29, 1991, and February 18, 1993. The intent was to compare the self-reports of opiate and cocaine use with the test results for a urine specimen collected by the CID staff and a hair sample collected by the Diagnostic Unit staff. Each of these measures is described below.

Self-Reports of Drug Use. This information was obtained from the IAP questions regarding lifetime use, frequency of use, and past month use of heroin, opiates, and cocaine. The IAP was administered by trained research interviewers at the initial in-person interview. All research participants were asked for their informed consent and told that all study data were protected by a Federal Certificate of Confidentiality.

Urine Tests. Specimens were obtained by CID staff as part of the routine medical screening at intake and analyzed by the ADASA laboratory for the presence of opiates and cocaine using standard immunoassay screening tests (e.g., EMIT). The standard NIDA

laboratory cutoff levels were used. Confirmation of positive results was not attempted. Both the urine and hair tests are sensitive to the class of opiate drugs or to a metabolite of cocaine, rather than cocaine itself. For simplicity, throughout this paper reference is made to "cocaine" or opiate test results. The minority of persons who self-reported use of opiates also reported using heroin. Opiate test results are therefore compared with self-reports of heroin in the remainder of this paper.

Hair Tests. At the initial assessment, after completion of the IAP, each client was asked to provide a hair sample for analysis. Clients who provided the hair specimen were given a food voucher for \$10. Research staff cut a sample of hairs as close to the scalp as possible near the crown of the head, using the standard procedures established by the Psychomedics Corporation. The hair samples were sent to Psychomedics for testing for cocaine and opiates using their standard radio immunoassay (RIAH) test procedures (Psychomedics Corporation 1991). The length of the hair was cut to a maximum of 3.9 cm, representing about three months of growth (Saitoh, 1967). Confirmation of positive RIAH results was not conducted.

Post-Discharge Follow-up

Toward the end of the project, an attempt was made to reinterview persons who had been discharged from treatment for at least three months. A comprehensive follow-up study was not possible at the time. Clients were interviewed over the telephone or in person using a modified follow-up version of the IAP. All respondents were asked to provide a hair specimen for analysis, for which they were paid \$10. Persons who had been interviewed over the telephone were asked to go to the research office to provide the hair specimen. No urine specimens were collected. While a larger number of persons completed the post-treatment interview, this paper focuses on the 39 persons who also went to the research office to provide a hair specimen. Hair specimens were cut to a maximum length of 3.9 cm and analyzed as described above. Questions about drug use in the prior 90 days were added to the IAP follow-up interview so the self-report period would correspond to the period to which the hair analysis results were sensitive.

Limitations

A number of limitations should be noted in reviewing the results. First, none of the positive urine or hair test results was confirmed. Research has found that the greatest threat to the validity of these tests is the presence of false negatives. That is, the tests are more likely to fail to detect recent drug use than to erroneously detect drug use in a nonuser (Visher 1991). Once the drug is extracted from the hair, the RIAH test used with the resulting solution is equivalent to that used in urinalysis. Thus, the limitations to the validity of urinalysis apply to

RIAH. In other research using hair analysis (with confirmation) for high-risk populations, the authors have found that in virtually every instance an initial positive result for cocaine or opiates by hair analysis was confirmed by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS), the ultimate standard for identifying drugs.

There is some controversy with regard to the possibility that clients who are exposed to external drug contamination (e.g., drugs smoked by others) may test positive by hair analysis (Mieczkowski 1992). (There has also been some controversy about the impact of melanin concentrations in the hair on drug absorption and the possibility that drug metabolites in sweat may be deposited along the hair and thus complicate estimates of time of use (Harkey and Henderson 1988; Mieczkowski 1993). The laboratory used for the RIAH test analyzes wash kinetics to ensure that external drugs are removed from the hair before drugs are extracted from inside the hair. While some disagree about whether these laboratory techniques completely eliminate external contamination, the concentrations of drugs detected in the hair specimens of the research subjects in this study tend to be much higher than those detected from external contamination. Further, the overwhelming majority of clients in this study who tested positive for cocaine also tested positive for opiates, which increases the likelihood that they had actually used the drugs.

Given the acknowledged high rates of false negative urine (and hair) test results, the authors concluded that these types of toxicologic tests tend to underestimate recent drug use. This does not represent a large limitation, however, because the analyses are principally concerned with whether persons who did test positive also reported using the drugs detected.

A second limitation stems from the availability of hair and urine specimens for only 22 percent of the clients assessed during the time of the validity study. Analyses presented later in this paper show that the group who provided both specimens were likely to be older heroin users, while the remaining respondents tended to be young crack users. Had specimens been obtained from these crack-using youths, the level of under reporting might have exceeded that found among the older heroin users. Thus, the levels of under reporting of drug use presented in this paper could be considerably below what would be expected in a more representative sample of all persons seeking treatment.

A third limitation involves the comparability of the post-discharge follow-up results and those from the intake validity sample. Some of the 39 persons in the follow-up sample were interviewed post-discharge by telephone and some in person. Given the finding that household surveys conducted by telephone produce somewhat lower estimates of recent drug use than in-person interviews (Gfroerer and Hughes 1992), one might expect more under reporting in the

follow-up sample than in the intake sample. However, persons interviewed on the telephone had to make a special trip to the research office to provide a hair specimen. Such compliance with the research procedures may have been related to more accurate disclosure of drug use. Another limitation of the follow-up component is that only eight clients in the discharge follow-up sample were included in the intake validity sample. Analyses presented below show that the 39 persons interviewed post-treatment differed from the persons interviewed at intake primarily with regard to age and heroin use. Clients in the follow-up sample were less likely to report daily heroin use at intake and were younger. Both of these factors could have been associated with greater under reporting of drug use in the follow-up sample. For these reasons, differences in the level of reporting of drug use between the intake validity sample and the discharge sample can only be considered as suggestive pending further replication. The ongoing, larger follow-up study of all inpatient DCI clients will permit a more systematic comparison of the validity of self-reports of drug use at intake and post-discharge.

RESULTS

Intake Validity Sample

During the period of the validity study, 487 persons were processed by the Diagnostic Unit. Table 1 shows that 56 percent provided a urine specimen and 33 percent provided a hair specimen. A hair or urine specimen was obtained from 67 percent of the sample, and both specimens were obtained from 106 persons, or 22 percent of the sample. It was not clear why urine and hair specimens were not obtained for more sample members. However, if a person came to the Diagnostic Unit without going to the CID, a urine specimen would not have been collected. Also, hair specimens could not be obtained from the many persons who had hair styles so short that a sufficient specimen could not be obtained with scissors. An estimate of the percentage of respondents from whom a hair specimen could not be obtained is not available. However, other research indicating that persons are more likely to provide hair than urine samples leads us to believe that many of the missing hair specimens were due to short hair rather than refusal to provide one.

TABLE 1. Percentage of Interviewed Clients Who Provided Urine or Hair Specimen

Provided	N	%
No hair or urine specimen	161	33
Urine specimen only	165	34
Hair specimen only	55	11
Urine and hair specimen	<u>106</u>	<u>22</u>
	487	100%

A bracket groups the percentages for "Urine specimen only" (34%), "Hair specimen only" (11%), and "Urine and hair specimen" (22%), totaling 56%.
 A bracket groups the percentages for "Urine and hair specimen" (22%) and "Urine specimen only" (34%), totaling 56%.
 A bracket groups the percentages for "Urine and hair specimen" (22%) and "Hair specimen only" (11%), totaling 33%.

Since the analyses of the intake validity sample focus exclusively on the minority of persons who provided both urine and hair specimens, potential differences between these persons and the rest of the target sample were examined. Table 2 presents comparisons of the four groups formed according to whether they provided urine or hair specimens (provided neither specimen, hair only, urine only, or both). Three characteristics differentiated the groups. Persons who provided urine only or hair and urine specimens were four to five years older (mean age 38.0 to 39.2 years) and most likely to have reported heroin use in the past year (75 percent to 79 percent). Persons who provided both specimens were least likely to have reported daily use of crack cocaine. Ethnicity, gender, education, prior arrest, prior alcohol or drug treatment, and use of powder cocaine did not differ in the four groups. These findings suggest that the sample of persons who provided both hair and urine specimens were older heroin users, perhaps those seeking methadone treatment. This conclusion is consistent with the fact that the CID is much more likely to obtain urine specimens from persons seeking methadone treatment in order to verify their heroin use.

TABLE 2. Client Characteristics, by Specimens Provided (N = 487 clients)

	Subjects Who Provided			
	No Hair/ Urine (N)	Hair Only (55)	Urine Only (165)	Hair and Urine (106)
Male	73%	43%	75%	59%
Mean age	34.3*	33.5*	38.1*	39.2*
African-American	95%	95%	93%	94%
Less than 12-year education	64%	57%	58%	59%
High school diploma/GED	60%	57%	52%	53%
Ever arrested	75%	71%	84%	85%
Used daily in past year				
Cocaine	28%	27%	26%	33%
Crack	32%**	36%**	27%**	15%**
Heroin	61%*	23%*	75%*	79%*
Prior alcohol/drug treatment	73%	64%	75%	84%

NOTE: Ns vary slightly because of missing information.

*P < .05.

**P < .01.

Hair Versus Urine Tests Results at Intake

The length of the hair specimens varied from .5 cm to 3.9 cm. This means that the window of detection for drug use by RIAH extended from one to three weeks prior to interview to as long as three months prior to interview. (Hair takes about seven days to grow out to the scalp level (Harkey and Henderson 1988). Thus, a cutting at the scalp represents drug use that occurred about one week earlier. For most drugs, therefore, the sensitivity period of hair analysis does not overlap with that of urinalysis.) Given that the urine specimens detect use of opiates and cocaine in the 24 to 72 hours prior to providing the specimen, one would expect that even in a group of chronic users, the hair would detect more users. Ninety-one percent of the clients in the intake validity sample tested positive for opiates by hair and 83 percent by urinalysis, a nonsignificant difference (Table 3). The hair tests did detect much more cocaine use, however-- 93 percent vs. 69 percent ($p < .01$).

TABLE 3. Estimates of Drug Use by Self-Report, Urinalysis, and Hair Analysis at Intake Interview (N = 106 clients who provided urine and hair specimens)

	Self-Report		Urinalysis	Hair
	Ever Used ≥ 5 Times	Used Past 30 Days		
Opiates/Heroin	93%	91%	83%	91%
Cocaine	90%	71%	69%**	93%**

**P < .01.

Both the urine and hair test results indicated considerable multiple drug use by the sample clients. Seventy percent of the persons whose urine tested positive for opiates also had a urine test positive for cocaine. Eighty-five percent of those with a urine test positive for cocaine had a urine test positive for opiates. The numbers were even higher for the hair tests. Almost all persons (97 percent) who tested positive for opiates by RIAH had a cocaine-positive test and 94 percent with a hair test positive for cocaine tested positive for opiates.

Estimates of Cocaine and Heroin Use at Intake

Because the IAP did not include questions regarding drug use in the prior 24 to 72 hours or prior 90 days, direct comparisons of self-reported use and urinalysis and RIAH results during their exact detection periods were not possible. Comparisons were therefore made with respect to self-reported use in the past 30 days or lifetime use of the drug on five or more occasions. The results in Table 3 show fairly similar estimates for heroin/opiate use based on all four measures. The estimates ranged from 83 percent based on the urine tests to 93 percent based on a self-report of ever using five or more times. The estimates were not as similar for cocaine. While 93 percent tested positive for cocaine by hair analysis, only 71 percent indicated using the drug in the prior 30 days. Ninety percent did report ever using cocaine five or more times, however.

The greater reporting of opiate use is clearly shown in Table 4. Between 96 percent and 100 percent of the clients who tested positive for opiates by hair or urinalysis reported use of the drug on at least one of the three self-report measures at intake. The numbers were lower for cocaine, from 75 percent to 95 percent. Only 79 percent of those positive for cocaine by hair analysis and 87 percent of those positive by urinalysis reported using the drug in the past year.

TABLE 4. Percentage of Clients Positive for Opiates or Cocaine by Urine or Hair at Intake Who Reported Using the Detected Drug

Reported Using Detected Drug	(N)	Positive for Opiates by Cocaine by		Positive for	
		Hair (97)	Urine (88)	Hair (99)	Urine (73)
Five or more times in life		97%	100%	91%	95%
In past year		97%	100%	79%	87%
In past 30 days		96%	99%	75%	82%

NOTE: Ns may vary slightly because of missing information.

While there was some under reporting of cocaine use, there was an association between the self-reported frequency of cocaine or heroin use in the prior month and the likelihood that the person tested positive (Table 5). Most persons (87 percent to 100 percent) who reported using


opiates or cocaine on 26 to 30 days in the past month tested positive for the reported drug by hair analysis or urinalysis. The hair tests were much more likely than the urine tests to detect drug use in persons who reported using the drugs less frequently. For example, 30 percent of the persons who reported no opiate use in the prior 30 days tested positive by RIAH compared with 10 percent positive by urinalysis. The differences were smaller (83 percent vs. 49 percent) but in the same direction for persons who reported no cocaine use in the past month.

TABLE 5. Percentage of Clients Who Tested Positive by Hair Analysis or Urinalysis, by Self-Reported Number of Days Using the Drug in the Past Month

	Self-Reported No. of Days Used in Past Month		
	0	1-25	26-30
Tested positive for opiates	(N=10)	(11)	(85)
Urine	10%	73%	93%
Hair	30%	82%	99%
Tested positive for cocaine	(N=35)	(48)	(23)
Urine	49%	75%	87%
Hair	83%	98%	100%

A strong association was also found between the self-reported frequency of drug use and the concentration of drugs found in the hair. The median concentration of opiates in the positive hair specimens was 45 ng/10 mg. However, the average concentration detected varied from 4.4 ng/10 mg for persons who reported no use of heroin in the prior 30 days to 59.8 ng/10 mg for persons who reported daily use (Figure 1). The standard deviations were quite large relative to the means, indicating considerable variation within each group. However, these computations include persons who had concentration levels in their hair that were below the detection thresholds routinely used by the laboratory to designate the presence of drugs. If these negative results had been removed, the standard deviations would have been smaller. The median concentration of cocaine metabolite in positive hair specimens was 115 ng/10 mg. Again, the concentration was greatest (404.4 ng/10 mg) among self-reported daily users (Figure 2).


FIGURE 1
Amount of Opiates Detected in Hair at Intake,
by Self-Reported Use in the Past 30 Days
(N=105 clients)



Self-Reported Heroin Use During Past 30 Days

NOTE: Information was missing for 1 of the 106 clients. *=standard deviation.

FIGURE 2
Amount of Cocaine Detected in Hair at Intake,
by Self-Reported Use in the Past 30 Days
(N=101 clients)



Self-Reported Cocaine Use During Past 30 Days

NOTE: Information was missing for 5 of the 106 clients. *=standard deviation.

Self-Reports and Hair Tests at the Post-Discharge Interview

The post-discharge follow-up study yielded 39 persons who completed the telephone or in-person interview and provided a hair specimen. Eight of these persons had also been included in the intake validity sample. (The remaining 31 persons had been interviewed at intake but not in the same time period as the validity sample.) Table 6 presents characteristics at intake for the intake validity sample and the post-discharge follow-up sample. The follow-up sample differed from the intake validity sample with regard to age and past year use of heroin. They tended to be younger and less likely to have used heroin daily in the year prior to intake. However, the two samples were similar in terms of education, ethnicity, prior arrest, use of crack/cocaine, and prior drug or alcohol treatment. In view of the similarity of the two groups, differences between them in self-reports and hair tests may reflect differences in how people self-report at intake compared with follow-up, rather than differences in the composition of the samples.

TABLE 6. Characteristics of Intake Validity Sample and Follow-up Sample at Intake

Characteristic (from intake interview)	Intake Validity Sample ^a (N = 106)	Follow-up Sample ^b (N = 39)
Male	59%	51%
Mean age	39.2*	36.4*
African-American	94%	90%
Less than 12-year education	59%	58%
High school diploma/GED	53%	66%
Ever arrested	85%	90%
Used daily in past year		
Cocaine	33%	26%
Crack	15%	21%
Heroin	79%**	57%**
Prior alcohol/drug treatment	84%	71%

^aPersons who provided hair and urine specimens.

^bEight follow-up clients were also among the 106 clients in the intake validity study sample.


*P < .05.

**P < .01.

The follow-up interview included questions about drug use in the past 90 days that would permit direct comparison with the window of sensitivity of the hair analyses. (Hair specimens had again been cut to a maximum of 3.9 cm, and 72 percent of the sample had hair specimens at this length, representing drug use in the prior 7 to 90 days. The findings indicated considerable differences in estimates of drug use from self-reports and the hair tests. While 62 percent of the follow-up sample tested positive for opiates by RIAH, only 36 percent reported using opiates in the past 90 days. Similar differences were found with respect to cocaine--80 percent positive by RIAH, 41 percent by self-report. Only about half of the persons who tested positive by hair analysis for opiates (46 percent) or cocaine (52 percent) reported using the drug in the prior 90 days. While not exactly comparable, these numbers are considerably below similar analyses of self-reports and hair tests at intake, reported in Table 4. At intake, 96 percent of the persons with a hair test positive for opiates and 82 percent of those positive for cocaine reported using the drug in the past month.

To determine whether the degree of self-reporting at follow-up was related to the level of use, the follow-up sample was divided into high or low levels of drug detected in the hair. Persons above the median concentration (31.2 ng/10 mg for opiates and 105.0 ng/10 mg for cocaine) were classified as heavier users of that drug. While the sample sizes were small, the results show that persons who had the larger concentrations of a drug in their hair were significantly more likely to have reported use of the drug in the prior 90 days (Figure 3). Approximately three quarters (73 percent) of the persons with the higher concentration of drugs in their hair reported using the detected drug in the past 90 days, compared with one third or fewer of the persons with less of the drug in their hair.

FIGURE 3
Percentage of Persons Testing Positive for Opiates or Cocaine at Follow-up Who Reported Using the Detected Drug in the Past 90 Days, by Amount of Drug Detected in Hair



NOTE: Clients were grouped according to whether they fell above or below the median concentration of drug detected among all tested follow-up clients. Median concentrations were 31.2 ng/10 mg for opiates and 105.0 ng/10 mg for cocaine.

*P<.05.

**P<.01.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study have considerable implications for drug abuse treatment research and for clinical practice. Each of the main themes is discussed below.

1. *The validity of client self-reports of drug use may differ by drug.* The overwhelming majority of clients tested positive for opiates by urinalysis or hair analysis at intake, and virtually all of these persons reported use of heroin in the prior 30 days. Their readiness to report recent heroin use is, perhaps, not surprising in view of the analyses suggesting that the sample of persons who provided urine and hair specimens included many persons who were seeking methadone treatment. The finding that clients who tested positive for cocaine at intake were less likely to report recent use of cocaine is consistent with the findings of Sowder et al. (1993) and with the possibility that heroin users seeking methadone treatment may perceive a disincentive for reporting cocaine use. These findings suggest that discussions of the validity of drug use among drug treatment clients must be framed in the context of the specific drug used.

2. *Multiple drug use may go undiagnosed by self-report measures.* The fact that 97 percent of the clients who tested positive for opiates by RIAH also tested positive for cocaine has important implications for research as well as clinical management. If clients are relatively less likely to report their recent cocaine use at treatment intake, clinical or research interviews that rely purely upon self-reports might underdiagnose multiple drug use. In this study, more than 90 percent of the cocaine-positive clients (by either hair or urinalysis) did report use of cocaine five or more times in their lifetime, even though they denied use in the past month or year. By asking less threatening questions about lifetime drug use it might be possible to identify clients at risk for current multiple drug use who should receive additional testing or study.

3. *Hair analysis detected more cocaine use than did urinalysis.* This finding is consistent with extensive research showing that RIAH's greater window of sensitivity (up to 90 days in this study) leads to the identification of more cocaine users than does urinalysis. Hair analysis did not detect more heroin users in this sample, which contained 79 percent self-reported daily heroin users. With such frequent heroin use, most users can be identified by the 24 to 72 hour sensitivity period of urinalysis.

4. *While some clients underreport drug use, their disclosures of extensive drug use may still have substantial validity.* Clients who reported daily use of heroin or cocaine were more likely to test positive for these drugs by urinalysis or RIAH. Self-reported daily users also had the highest concentrations of the reported drug in their hair. These findings suggest that when clients do report extensive drug use the information is likely to be valid. These findings are

consistent with Wish (1988), who found that in a sample of persons under reporting their recent drug use, those who did report drug dependence had higher rates of drug-related arrests and expected associations with other correlates of serious drug use.

5. *Hair analysis may offer some diagnostic utility.* The finding that daily users of heroin and cocaine had the highest concentrations of drug detected in their hair raises the possibility that hair analysis may be useful in identifying persons with the most serious drug abuse problems. As hair analysis techniques are improved, research should be conducted to determine the relationship between quantitative hair test results and clinical and research diagnoses.

6. *The validity of self-reports of recent drug use may be less at follow-up than at intake.* Clients who tested positive for cocaine or heroin were much less likely to self-report use of these drugs at post-discharge follow-up than at intake. These findings are consistent with those reported for treated (experimental) clients in a program designed to provide methadone to clients while they were waiting to enter the full treatment program (Sowder et al. 1993). The findings are also consistent with the under reporting at treatment follow-up reported by Hinden et al. (1994) and the Research Triangle Institute (1994). While it is possible that the under reporting found in this study at follow-up occurred because some of the follow-up interviews were conducted over the telephone and only a small number of persons were followed up, much of the under reporting may be the result of the respondents' intention to conceal their current drug use from the researchers. If this is the case, treatment evaluations that compare self-reports of drug use at intake and follow-up may show reductions in drug use largely as an artifact of the greater under reporting at follow-up. Until this issue is settled, treatment outcome evaluations that measure drug use solely by self-reports should be interpreted with caution.

7. *Under reporting may be less of a problem among the most serious substance abusers.* The fact that about 70 percent of the persons with higher concentrations of cocaine or opiates in their hair reported their recent drug use suggests that under reporting may present less of a problem when the goal is to identify the most severe users. Persons with the greatest drug abuse problems may be most likely to admit their problem in a research or clinical interview. This finding warrants further study and replication by others.

CONCLUSION

The findings reported here contribute to those of other studies that have questioned the validity of self-reports of recent drug use among drug abuse treatment clients. For years researchers have discussed the more obvious determinants of a respondent's willingness to report drug use, including response style, interviewer characteristics, social desirability, and the nature

of the interview setting. Researchers must now become sensitive to a host of other factors that may influence a respondent's willingness to report recent illicit drug use, such as type of drug; whether the person is assigned to a treatment or comparison group; whether the interview occurred at intake, in treatment, or post-discharge; and the severity of the respondent's drug use. Researchers should consider these factors in designing and interpreting treatment outcome studies. Most important is to include toxicologic measures of drug use in all treatment outcome research in order to validate respondents' self-reports of recent drug use and adjust them for under reporting. In the absence of such adjustments, estimates of treatment overcome based on self-reports should be interpreted with caution.

AUTHORS

Eric D. Wish, Ph.D.

Director, Center for

Substance Abuse Research

University of Maryland at College Park

4321 Hartwick Road, Suite 501

College Park, MD 20740

Jeffrey A. Hoffman, Ph.D.

Vice President for Operations

Koba Associates, Inc.

1156 15th Street, NW, Suite 200

Washington, DC 20005

Susanna Nemes, M.A.

Research Associate

Center for Substance Abuse Research

University of Maryland at College Park

4321 Hartwick Road, Suite 501

College Park, MD 20740

REFERENCES

- Appel, P.W. "Substance Abuse Among Adults in Transient Housing in New York State: Validation of Self-Report by Use of Hair Analysis." New York State Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services and Research Institute on Addictions, 1995.
- Cook, R.F.; Bernstein, A.D.; Arrington, T.L.; Andrews, C.M.; and Marshall, G.A. Methods for assessing drug use prevalence in the workplace: A comparison of self-report, urinalysis and hair analysis. *Int J Addict* 30(4):403-426, 1995.
- Dembo, R; Williams, L.; Wish, E.D.; and Schmeidler, J. *Urine Testing of Detained Juveniles to Identify High-Risk Youth*. National Institute of Justice Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1990.
- Falck, R.; Siegel, H.A.; Forney, M.A.; Wang, J.; and Carlson, R.G. The validity of injection drug users' self-reported use of opiates and cocaine. *J Drug Issues* 22(4):823-832, 1992.
- Flynn, P.M.; Hubbard, R.L.; Forsyth, B.H.; Fountain, D.L.; Smith, T.K.; and Hoffman, J.A. "The Individual Assessment Profile (IAP): Standardizing the Assessment of Substance Abusers." Presented at the 100th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, August 15. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC, 1992.
- General Accounting Office. *Drug Use Measurement*. Washington, DC: General Accounting Office, 1993.
- Gfroerer, J.C., and Hughes, A. Collecting data on illicit drug use by phone. In Turner, C.F.; Lessler, J.T.; and Gfroerer, J.C., eds. *Survey Measurement of Drug Use: Methodological Studies*. DHHS Pub. No. (ADM) 92-1929. Washington, DC: Supt. of Docs., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1992, pp. 277-295.
- Harkey, M.R., and Henderson, G.L. *Hair Analysis for Drugs of Abuse: A Critical Review of the Technology*. Submitted to California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, Winters, CA: Henderson-Harkey, Inc., 1988.

- Harrell, A.V. Validation of self-report: The research record. In Rouse, B.A.; Kozel, N.J.; and Richards, L.G., eds. *Self-Report Methods of Estimating Drug Use: Meeting Current Challenges to Validity*. National Institute on Drug Abuse Research Monograph 57. DHHS Pub. No. (ADM) 85-1402. Washington, DC: Supt. of Docs., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1985, pp. 12-21.
- Hinden, R., McCusker, J.; Vickers-Lahti, M.; Bigelow, C.; Garfield, F.; and Lewis, B. Radioimmunoassay of hair for determination of cocaine, heroin and marijuana exposure: Comparison with self-report. *Int J Addict* 29(6):771-789, 1994.
- Hoffman, J.A.; Schneider, S.J.; Koman III, J.J.; Flynn, P.M.; Luckey, J.W.; Cooley, P.C.; Wish, E.D.; and Diesenhaus, H.I. The centralized intake model for drug abuse treatment: The role of computerized data management. *Computers in Human Behavior* II(2):215-222, 1995.
- Hubbard, R.; Marsden, M.E.; Rachal, J.V.; Harwood, H.J.; Cavanaugh, E.R.; and Ginzburg, H.M. *Drug Abuse Treatment: A National Study of Effectiveness*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989.
- Magura, S., and Kang, S.Y. *Validity of Self-Reported Drug Use in High Risk Populations: A Meta-Analytic Review*. New York: National Development and Research Institute, Inc., 1995.
- Magura, S.; Goldsmith, D.; Casriel, C.; Goldstein, P.J.; and Lipton, D.S. The validity of methadone clients' self reported drug use. *Int J Addict* 22(8):727-749, 1987.
- Magura, S.; Freeman, R.; Siddiqi, Q.; and Lipton, D.S. The validity of hair analysis for detecting cocaine and heroin use among addicts. *Int J Addict* 27(1):54-69, 1992.
- Magura, S.; Kang S.Y.; and Shapiro, J.L. Measuring cocaine use by hair analysis among criminally-involved youth. *J Drug Issues* 25(4):683-701, 1995.
- Marques, P.R.; Tippetts, A.S.; and Branch, D.G. Cocaine in the hair of mother-infant pairs: Quantitative analysis and correlations with urine measures and self-report. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse* 19(2):159-175, 1993.
- McNagy, S.E., and Parker, R.M. High prevalence of recent cocaine use and the unreliability of patient self-report in an inner-city walk-in clinic. *JAMA* 267(8):1106-1108, 1992.

- Mieczkowski, T. The accuracy of self-reported drug use: An evaluation and analysis of new data. In Weisheit, R., ed. *Drugs, Crime and the Criminal Justice System*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 1990, pp. 275-302.
- Mieczkowski, T. New approaches in drug testing: A review of hair analysis. Wish, E.D., ed. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 521: *Drug Abuse: Linking Policy and Research*, 1992, pp. 132-150.
- Mieczkowski, T. An evaluation of patterns of racial bias in hair assays for cocaine: Black and white arrestees compared. *Forensic Sci Int* 63:85-98, 1993.
- Mieczkowski, T.; Barzelay, D.; Gropper, B.; and Wish, E.D. Concordance of three measures of cocaine use in an arrestee population: Hair, urine and self-report. *J Psychoactive Drugs* 23(3):241-246, 1991.
- Musto, D. Opium, cocaine and marijuana in American history. *Sci Am* July, 1991, pp. 40-47.
- New York City Commission on the Homeless. *The Way Home, A New Direction in Social Policy*. New York: New York City Commission on the Homeless, 1992.
- Psychomedics Corporation. *Policies and Procedures Manual*. Santa Monica, CA: Psychomedics Corporation, 1991.
- Research Triangle Institute. "Early Retrospective Study of Cocaine Treatment Outcomes, Overview and Findings." Draft technical report no. 1, vol. I, submitted to the National Institute on Drug Abuse. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC, 1994.
- Saitoh, M.; Uzuka, M.; and Sakamoto, M. Rate of hair growth. *Adv. Biol. Skin: Hair Growth* 9:183-194, 1967.
- Sowder, B.J.; Beschner, G.M.; Ergh, T.; Wish, A.; Wish, E.D.; Zhang, Y.; and Sowder, J. "Waiting List Community Intervention Project." Summary report submitted to the National Institute on Drug Abuse. NOVA Research Corporation, Bethesda, MD, 1993.
- Visher, C., and McFadden, K. *A Comparison of Urinalysis Technologies for Drug Testing in Criminal Justice*. National Institute of Justice Research in Action. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1991.

- Weatherby, N.L.; Needle, R.; Cesari, H.; Booth, R.; McCoy, C.B.; Watters, J.K.; Williams, M.; and Chitwood, D.D. Validity of self-reported drug use among injection drug users and crack cocaine users recruited through street outreach. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 17(4):347-355, 1994.
- Wish, E.D., and Mieczkowski, T. Comment on Weatherby et al. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 17(4):356-357, 1994.
- Wish, E.D., and Gropper, B.A. Drug testing by the criminal justice system: Method, research and applications. In Wilson, J.Q., and Tonry, M., eds. *Drugs and Crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990, pp. 321-339.
- Wish, E.D. Identifying drug-abusing criminals. In Leukefeld, C.G., and Tims, F.M., eds. *Compulsory Treatment of Drug Abuse: Research and Clinical Practice*, National Institute on Drug Abuse Research Monograph 86. DHHS Pub. No. (ADM) 88-1578. Washington, DC: Supt. of Docs., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1988, pp. 139-159.
- Wish, E.D.; Johnson, B.; Strug, D.; Chedekel, M.; and Lipton, D.S. "Are Urine Tests Good Indicators of the Validity of Self-Reports of Drug Use? It Depends on the Test." Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc., New York, 1983.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper was supported in part by grant U18 DA07082 from the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment.

The perspective offered in this document is solely that of the author(s) and does not reflect the policies or views of the Federal government, or any of its Departments or Agencies.