

Other behavioral parent training (BPT) for children with disruptive behavior

Children's Mental Health: Disruptive Behavior

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2023. Literature review updated July 2018.

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: Behavioral parent training (BPT) programs target parents of youth with disruptive behavior disorders. BPT programs teach parents self-regulation, behavior management skills, positive reinforcement methods, and communication techniques either individually or in conjunction with their children. BPT programs aim to change parenting behaviors and instruct parents in the use of positive reinforcement methods through individual, group, or family therapies. Interventions occurred either in family homes, or in mental health/community clinics. Interventions in our review varied in both intensity (weekly to bi-weekly meetings) and duration (two months to six months). Typical dosage for BPT is weekly for three months.

Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$1,051	Benefit to cost ratio	\$31.95
Participants	\$539	Benefits minus costs	\$2,699
Others	\$807	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	\$388	benefits greater than the costs	96%
Total benefits	\$2,786		
Net program cost	(\$87)		
Benefits minus cost	\$2,699		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2022). 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	Primary or secondary participant	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		
Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms	7	Primary	13	754	-0.149	0.057	7	-0.082	0.049	10	-0.526	0.001
Internalizing symptoms	7	Primary	6	355	-0.194	0.078	7	-0.194	0.078	9	-0.334	0.009
Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder symptoms	7	Primary	4	158	-0.072	0.119	7	0.000	0.141	8	-0.310	0.035
Parental stress [^]	38	Secondary	3	126	-0.134	0.139	38	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.291	0.038

[^]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
Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms	Criminal justice system	\$28	\$0	\$66	\$14	\$109
Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms	Labor market earnings associated with high school graduation	\$187	\$441	\$240	\$0	\$868
Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms	K-12 grade repetition	\$6	\$0	\$0	\$3	\$9
Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms	K-12 special education	\$360	\$0	\$0	\$180	\$540
Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms	Health care associated with disruptive behavior disorder	\$498	\$141	\$514	\$249	\$1,402
Disruptive behavior disorder symptoms	Costs of higher education	(\$28)	(\$43)	(\$13)	(\$14)	(\$98)
Program cost	Adjustment for deadweight cost of program	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$44)	(\$44)
Totals		\$1,051	\$539	\$807	\$388	\$2,786

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	\$1,008	2015	Present value of net program costs (in 2022 dollars)	(\$87)
Comparison costs	\$868	2010	Cost range (+ or -)	20%

On average, participants received 22 therapeutic hours over three months. Per-participant costs are based on weighted average therapist time, as reported in the included studies. Hourly therapist cost is based on the actuarial estimates of reimbursement for group treatment (Mercer, (2016). Mental health and substance use disorder services data book for the state of Washington). For comparison group costs we use 2010 Washington State DSHS data to estimate the average reimbursement rate for treatment of child and adolescent disruptive behavior disorders.


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

- Behan, J., Fitzpatrick, C., Sharry, J., Carr, A., & Waldron, B. (2001). Evaluation of the Parenting Plus Programme. *The Irish Journal of Psychology, 22*(3-4), 238-256.
- Chacko, A., Gopalan, G., Franco, L., Dean-Assael, K., Jackson, J., Marcus, S., Hoagwood, K., ... McKay, M. (2015). Multiple family group service model for children with disruptive behavior disorders: Child outcomes at post-treatment. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 23*(2), 67-77.
- Coughlin, M., Sharry, J., Fitzpatrick, C., Guerin, S., & Drumm, M. (2009). A controlled clinical evaluation of the parents plus children's programme: A video-based programme for parents of children aged 6 to 11 with behavioural and developmental problems. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 14*(4), 541-558.
- Day, C., Michelson, D., Thomson, S., Penney, C., & Draper, L. (2012). Evaluation of a peer led parenting intervention for disruptive behaviour problems in children: Community based randomised controlled trial. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.), 344*.
- Enebrink, P., Hogstrom, J., Forster, M., & Ghaderi, A. (2012). Internet-based parent management training: A randomized controlled study. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 50*, 240-249.
- Gavita, O.A., David, D., Bujoreanu, S., Tiba, A., & Ionutiu, D.R. (2012). The efficacy of a short cognitive-behavioral parent program in the treatment of externalizing behavior disorders in Romanian foster care children: Building parental emotion-regulation through unconditional self- and child-acceptance strategies. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*(7), 1290-1297.
- Hamilton, S.B., & MacQuiddy, S.L. (1984). Self-administered behavioral parent training: Enhancement of treatment efficacy using a time-out signal seat. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 13*(1), 61-69.
- Kierfeld, F., Ise, E., Hanisch, C., Gortz-Dorten, A., & Dopfner, M. (2013). Effectiveness of telephone-assisted parent-administered behavioural family intervention for preschool children with externalizing problem behaviour: A randomized controlled trial. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 22*(9), 553-565.
- Landy, S., & Menna, R. (2006). An evaluation of a group intervention for parents with aggressive young children: Improvements in child functioning, maternal confidence, parenting knowledge and attitudes. *Early Child Development and Care, 176*(6), 605-620.
- Luk, E.S.L., Staiger, P., Mathai, J., Field, D., & Adler, R. (1998). Comparison of treatments of persistent conduct problems in primary school children: A preliminary evaluation of a modified cognitive-behavioural approach. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 32*(3), 379-386.
- Sayger, T.V., Horne, A.M., Walker, J.M., & Passmore, J.L. (1988). Social learning family therapy with aggressive children: Treatment outcome and maintenance. *Journal of Family Psychology, 1*(3), 261-285.

Sourander, A., McGrath, P. J., Ristkari, T., Cunningham, C., Huttunen, J., Lingley-Pottie, P., Hinkka-Yli-Salomaki, S., ... Unruh, A. (2016). Internet-assisted parent training intervention for disruptive behavior in 4-year-old children: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 73(4), 378.

Zangwill, W.M. (1983). An evaluation of a parent training program. *Child and Family Behavior Therapy*, 5(4), 1-16.

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

Printed on 03-25-2024



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.