

Financial cost of social exclusion: follow up study of antisocial children into adulthood

Stephen Scott, Martin Knapp, Juliet Henderson, Barbara Maughan

Abstract

Objectives To compare the cumulative costs of public services used through to adulthood by individuals with three levels of antisocial behaviour in childhood.

Design Costs applied to data of 10 year old children from the inner London longitudinal study selectively followed up to adulthood.

Setting Inner London borough.

Participants 142 individuals divided into three groups in childhood: no problems, conduct problems, and conduct disorder.

Main outcome measures Costs in 1998 prices for public services (excluding private, voluntary agency, indirect, and personal costs) used over and above basic universal provision.

Results By age 28, costs for individuals with conduct disorder were 10.0 times higher than for those with no problems (95% confidence interval of bootstrap ratio 3.6 to 20.9) and 3.5 (1.7 to 6.2) times higher than for those with conduct problems. Mean individual total costs were £70 019 for the conduct disorder group (bootstrap mean difference from no problem group £62 898; £22 692 to £117 896) and £24 324 (£16 707; £6594 to £28 149) for the conduct problem group, compared with £7423 for the no problem group. In all groups crime incurred the greatest cost, followed by extra educational provision, foster and residential care, and state benefits; health costs were smaller. Parental social class had a relatively small effect on antisocial behaviour, and although substantial independent contributions came from being male, having a low reading age, and attending more than two primary schools, conduct disorder still predicted the greatest cost.

Conclusions Antisocial behaviour in childhood is a major predictor of how much an individual will cost society. The cost is high and falls on many agencies, yet few agencies contribute to prevention, which could be cost effective.

Introduction

The term "conduct disorder" refers to a persistent and pervasive pattern of antisocial behaviour in childhood or adolescence.¹ Typical behaviours include disobedience, tantrums, fighting, destructiveness, lying, and stealing. Conduct disorder is the commonest psychiatric disorder in childhood, with a prevalence of 7% in boys and 3% in girls²; it is also the commonest reason for referral of children and adolescents to mental health services.³

Conduct disorder is strongly associated with social and educational disadvantage. It occurs four times more often in families with unskilled occupations than in professional families²; reading difficulties are common, and many children leave school without qualifications or are permanently excluded.^{4,5} The antisocial behaviour tends to persist—40% of 8 year

olds with conduct disorder are repeatedly convicted of crimes such as theft, vandalism, and assault in adolescence.⁶ The misuse of drugs and alcohol is widespread. In adulthood these individuals continue offending and have erratic employment patterns in unskilled jobs, violent relationships with partners, and few friends.⁵ They do not participate in mainstream society and remain socially excluded.

Few direct studies have looked at the economic costs of conduct disorder or its consequences.⁷ Related studies suggest that costs are high. In the United States the cost for crimes committed by a typical juvenile delinquent (under 18) was estimated at \$80 000–\$325 000 (£56 000–£232 000).⁸ Between ages 19–24 a typical adult criminal costs a further \$1.2m. Victim costs were by the far the greatest part of this total. Rescuing a high risk youth from this typical life path was estimated to save \$1.7m–2.3m.⁸

In the United Kingdom, identifying young offenders costs the police £1200 and successful prosecution a further £2500. A week in a local authority secure unit costs £3450.⁹ Our own pilot study, of children aged 4–8 referred with conduct disorder, found that the mean extra cost was £15 282 a year (range £5411–£40 896). Of this, 31% was borne by families, 31% by education services, 16% by the NHS, 15% by state benefit agencies, 6% by social services, and less than 1% by the voluntary sector.¹⁰

In the United Kingdom there has been growing recognition of the costs of antisocial behaviour and social exclusion originating in childhood. Unless there are adequate specialised services for the mental health needs of children, the economic and social costs will be considerable later on.^{11,12} The Audit Commission has called for better information on resources spent on children's mental health and has recommended that agencies commission children's services jointly.³ We aimed to determine the costs to the public sector incurred to age 28 in dealing with children with different levels of antisocial behaviour and to examine childhood predictors of long term cost.

Participants and methods

Inner London longitudinal study

We applied costs to data from the inner London longitudinal study, an epidemiological study of psychiatric problems and attainment in people from a disadvantaged inner London borough.¹³ The study began in 1970 when the children were 10 and tracked their progress to their late 20s. All 10 year olds (n=2281) attending state primary schools in the borough were screened using the Rutter teacher questionnaire.¹⁴ Two subsamples were selected for intensive study: a random 1 in 12 sample of the total population and a 1 in 2 sample of children who had screened positive for emotional and behavioural problems. Children were tested individually with the Neale reading test.¹⁵

Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London, London SE5 8AF
Stephen Scott
senior lecturer
Juliet Henderson
researcher

Centre for the Economics of Mental Health, Institute of Psychiatry
Martin Knapp
professor

MRC Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry Research Centre, Institute of Psychiatry
Barbara Maughan
MRC external scientific staff

Correspondence to: S Scott
s.scott@iop.kcl.ac.uk

BMJ 2001;323:191–4

bmj.com

The full version of this article appears on the BMJ's website

Table 1 Arithmetic mean of total costs of services (in £ at 1998 prices) used by individuals to age 28 according to group at age 10

Domains	No problems			Conduct problems			Conduct disorder		
	All (n=65)	Females (n=30)	Males (n=35)	All (n=61)	Females (n=23)	Males (n=38)	All (n=16)	Females (n=2)	Males (n=14)
Education	1508	1107	1 851	7 524	6 377	8 219	12 478	7243	13 226
Health	247	219	270	1 237	881	1 453	2 178	994	2 347
Foster and residential care	1320	0	2 451	3 412	6 625	1 468	7 647	0	8 740
Relationships	97	122	75	156	211	122	63	0	73
Benefits	1710	821	2 471	3 391	3 293	3 450	2 832	0	3 237
Crime	2541	53	4 674	8 604	5 627	10 406	44 821	0	51 224
Total cost	7423	2322	11 792	24 324	23 014	25 118	70 019	8237	78 847

The participants were divided into three sub-groups: no behavioural or emotional problems on screening or parental interview; high scores on screening, with a predominance of antisocial problems but no disorder on parental interview; and high scores on screening, with a diagnosis of conduct disorder on parental interview. At follow up in 1986-8 data were available on 65 of 80 (81%), 61 of 73 (84%), and 16 of 22 (73%) participants, respectively. The participants' mean age was 27.7 (SD 1.27) years.

Investigator based follow up interviews included measures of housing; educational history; psychosocial functioning as an adult, including work and marital history¹⁶; psychiatric history as an adult and service contacts¹⁷; and alcohol problems.¹⁸ Estimation of service use was based on these retrospective accounts.¹⁹ Official criminal records were searched.

Costing methods

We calculated costs for each individual across six domains: foster and residential care in childhood, special educational provision, state benefits received in adulthood, breakdown of relationship (domestic violence and divorce), health, and crime. We allocated costs for every service reported as used above the basic provision prevailing at the time, whether or not utilisation seemed to arise from antisocial behaviour. For example, extra remedial teaching was costed but basic schooling was not. Further examples of services used and costs applied are given in the full version on the *BMJ's* website. We applied 1998 price levels for services. We took unit costs from national sources for health and social care services, criminal justice, and benefit receipts.²⁰⁻²² We calculated other costs from first principles using agencies' data, ensuring that their coverage (for example, of travel, supervision, and overheads) was consistent with the national sources.

No costs were allocated for use of social services, voluntary organisations, primary health care, lost employment, divorce (other than public legal costs), undetected crime,⁵ the costs to victims of crime,⁸ parents' or partners' use of services arising from the participant's behaviour, indirect costs to families, or psychological impact. For some events the dataset did not include frequency,

so only one episode was costed. Abortion and domestic violence were only costed for index female participants, not partners of male participants.

Analysis strategy

As the data for costs were highly skewed, we used bootstrap estimation to derive 95% confidence intervals of differences and ratios between groups. We used bootstrap multiple regression to determine childhood predictors of total cost.²³

Results

Costs of each domain—Table 1 shows the mean individual costs for each domain; the total individual cost ranged from £0 to £379 292. Crime was the costliest domain in all the groups and constituted almost two thirds of the total cost in the conduct disorder group.

Cost differences between groups—The conduct disorder group cost 10 times more than the no problems group and the conduct problem group over three times more (table 2).

Personal characteristics and educational attainment in childhood in relation to cost—Other childhood characteristics were also associated with variations in cost. Being male led to higher costs. Being from a family of lower socioeconomic status, having a low reading age, and attending more than two primary schools led to significantly higher costs with *t* tests but just missed significance with bootstrap tests.

Childhood predictors of total cost—After allowance for personal characteristics and educational variables in childhood, multiple regression analysis showed that conduct disorder predicted most cost (table 3). Conduct problems, sex, reading age, and number of primary schools attended made substantial independent contributions and parental socioeconomic status a smaller contribution.

Discussion

Antisocial behaviour at age 10 was a powerful predictor of the total cost of public services used by age

Table 2 Mean differences and ratios between total individual costs (in £ at 1998 prices) by age 28 according to group membership at age 10

Group	Mean difference	<i>t</i> test	
		(significance)	Bootstrap mean difference (95% CI)
Conduct disorder versus no problem	62 597	4.31 (P<0.001)	62 898 (22 692 to 117 896)
Conduct problem versus no problem	16 903	5.2 (P<0.001)	16 707 (6 594 to 28 149)
Conduct disorder versus conduct problem	45 695	3.07 (P=0.003)	46 193 (3 830 to 102 510)

Bootstrap estimation using 2000 repetitions, bias corrected.

Table 3 Factors at age 10 predicting total cost (in £ at 1998 prices) by age 28, determined by multiple linear regression analysis

Variable	Regression coefficient	Standardised regression coefficient β	t test (significance)	Bootstrap regression coefficient (95% CI)
Sex	12 406	0.29	12.2 (P<0.001)	12 076 (6 022 to 20 808)
Parental social class*	3 092	0.14	6.0 (P<0.001)	3 035 (408 to 6 458)
Reading age†	6 730	0.19	7.2 (P<0.001)	6 829 (1 757 to 12 076)
No of primary schools attended	14 902	0.21	9.08 (P<0.001)	15 226 (1 818 to 34 049)
Conduct problems	13 090	0.18	7.8 (P<0.001)	12 987 (3 263 to 25 449)
Conduct disorder	31 372	0.23	10.3 (P<0.001)	31 253 (7 803 to 65 334)
Residual constant	7 422		2.8 (P=0.003)	7 905 (-5 696 to 21 035)

Ordinary least squares regression adjusted $R^2=0.26$. Bootstrap regression with 2000 repetitions, bias corrected.

*Registrar general's social classes I, II, and III non-manual; III skilled manual; IV and V, unknown.

†Neale reading comprehension above 130 months, 90-130, below 90.

28. This remained true after allowance for being male, a poor reader, and being raised in a family of lower socioeconomic status. Total costs increased steeply with increasing antisocial behaviour: individuals with conduct problems as rated by a teacher cost over three times as much and individuals with conduct disorder cost 10 times as much as those without.

Limitations

Several aspects of service usage were not costed, and indirect costs were not assessed. Including these might have increased the total cost several-fold and be a better reflection of the "true" cost. Therefore the ratio of costs between groups and domains is an important measure.

The borough studied was relatively socially deprived, with high levels of antisocial behaviour¹³; however, rates of antisocial behaviour in youths in the United Kingdom have since risen to comparable levels.⁵

Implications

Antisocial behaviour in childhood often leads to lifelong social exclusion.⁵ It imposes considerable costs in childhood¹⁰ and high public expenditure and personal distress by adulthood. The impact on public spending is substantial. In our sample 3% of the population was classified with conduct disorder and a further 9% with conduct problems, values that are typical for the United Kingdom and United States.⁵ This 12% of the population accounted for around half of the public expenditure assessed.

There are effective interventions for antisocial behaviour in children, but they are seldom routinely available. Parent training programmes have been shown to have large effects in the United States,²¹ and our own study showed they can be equally effective in the United Kingdom.²⁵ Typical programmes cost £600 per child and are likely to save money in the longer term.²⁵⁻²⁶ Complementing a family based approach, there are effective behaviour management and social skills programmes for primary schools.²⁷ In contrast, interventions for serious antisocial behaviour in teenagers are much less effective.⁵ Therefore there is a case for implementing effective early interventions with families and with children at school.

The current UK government has launched several initiatives to reduce antisocial behaviour and social exclusion in high risk areas. The "surestart" programme targets children aged 0-3 years with "one stop shop" services for their parents. The "on-track" programme aims to prevent antisocial behaviour in 4-12 year olds and avoid crime later on. The "health action zones" have goals such as reducing exclusions in school, drug misuse, and early pregnancy. They are,

What is already known on this topic

Children who show substantial antisocial behaviour have poor social functioning as adults and are at high risk of social exclusion

Costs are available for particular items of public service such as receiving remedial education or appearing in court

What this study adds

Costs of antisocial behaviour incurred by individuals from childhood to adulthood were 10 times greater for those who were seriously antisocial in childhood than for those who were not

The costs fell on a wide range of agencies

Reduction of antisocial behaviour in childhood could result in large cost savings

however, confined to specific areas, often do not use proved interventions, and are short term.

Organisational barriers prevent effective service organisation. Many agencies are simply not aware that antisocial behaviour in childhood leads to high costs for them. Among agencies working with children (health, education, social services, and voluntary agencies) none is primarily responsible for antisocial behaviour, and few consistently use evidence based interventions. Health commissioners have little direct financial incentive to prioritise effective intervention because their service bears little of the long term cost. Mental health services for children in the United Kingdom lack the resources to oversee widespread implementation of effective interventions; spending was £9 per child in 1997-8.³ A well coordinated multi-agency approach that used interventions of proved effectiveness could considerably reduce the costs of antisocial children when they are grown up.

We thank Jack Astin for statistical analysis. MK is also professor at the London School of Economics Health and Social Care, London School of Economics. JH is also researcher at the Centre for the Economics of Mental Health, Institute of Psychiatry.

Funding: Mental Health Foundation; SS held a Wellcome training fellowship for part of the project.

Competing interests: None declared.

- 1 Scott S. Aggressive behaviour in childhood. *BMJ* 1998;316:202-6.
- 2 Meltzer H, Gatward R, Goodman R, Ford T. *The mental health of children and adolescents in Great Britain*. London: Office for National Statistics, 2000.
- 3 Audit Commission. *Children in mind*. London: Audit Commission, 1999.

- 4 Maughan B, Pickles A, Hagell A, Rutter M, Yule W. Reading problems and antisocial behaviour: developmental trends in comorbidity. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1996;37:405-18.
- 5 Rutter M, Giller H, Hagell A. *Antisocial behavior by young people*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- 6 Farrington DP. The development of offending and antisocial behaviour from childhood: key findings from the Cambridge study in delinquent development. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1995;36:929-64.
- 7 Knapp MRJ. Economic evaluations and interventions for children and adolescents with mental health problems. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1997;38:3-25.
- 8 Cohen MA. The monetary value of saving a high risk youth. *J Quant Criminol* 1998;14:5-33.
- 9 Audit Commission. *Mis-spent youth*. London: Audit Commission, 1997.
- 10 Knapp M, Scott S, Davies J. The cost of antisocial behaviour in younger children. *Clin Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1999;4:457-73.
- 11 House of Commons Health Committee. *Child and adolescent mental health services*. London: Stationery Office, 1997.
- 12 Mental Health Foundation. *Bright futures: promoting children and young people's mental health*. London: Mental Health Foundation, 1999.
- 13 Maughan B. Growing up in the inner city: findings from the inner London longitudinal study. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* 1989;3:195-215.
- 14 Rutter M. A children's behaviour questionnaire for completion by teachers: preliminary findings. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1967;8:1-11.
- 15 Neale MD. *Neale analysis of reading ability manual*. London: Macmillan, 1958.
- 16 Hill J, Harrington R, Fudge H, Rutter M. Adult personality functioning assessment (APFA): an investigator-based standardised interview. *Br J Psychiatry* 1989;155:24-35.
- 17 McGuffin P, Katz R, Aldrich, J. Past and present state examination: the assessment of "lifetime ever" psychopathology. *Psychol Med* 1986;16:461-5.
- 18 Endicott J, Spitzer RLA. Diagnostic interviews: the schedule for affective disorders and schizophrenia. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1978;35:837-44.
- 19 Rutter M, Maughan B, Pickles A, Simonoff E. Retrospective recall recalled. In: Cairns RB, Bergman LR, Kagan J, eds. *Methods and models for studying the individual*. London: Sage, 1998.
- 20 Netten A, Dennett J, Knight J. *Unit costs of health and social care*. Canterbury: Personal Social Services Research Unit, 1998.
- 21 Home Office. *Information on the criminal justice system in England and Wales*. Digest 2. London: HMSO, 1993.
- 22 Healey A, Knapp M, Astin J, Gossop M, Marsden J, Stewart D, et al. Economic burden of drug dependency: social costs incurred by drug users at intake to the national treatment outcome research study. *Br J Psychiatry* 1998;173:160-5.
- 23 Thompson SG, Barber JA. How should cost data in pragmatic randomised trials be analysed? *BMJ* 2000;320:1197-200.
- 24 Kazdin AE. Parent management training: evidence, outcomes, and issues. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1997;36:10-8.
- 25 Scott S, Spender Q, Doolan M, Jacobs B, Aspland H. Multicentre controlled trial of parenting groups for childhood antisocial behaviour in clinical practice. *BMJ* 2001;323:194-8.
- 26 Greenwood PW, Model KE, Rydell CP, Chiesa J. *Diverting children from a life of crime: measuring costs and benefits*. Santa Monica: Rand, 1996.
- 27 Durlak JA. *School-based prevention programmes for children and adolescents*. London: Sage, 1997.

(Accepted 25 April 2001)

Multicentre controlled trial of parenting groups for childhood antisocial behaviour in clinical practice

Stephen Scott, Quentin Spender, Moira Doolan, Brian Jacobs, Helen Aspland

Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London, London SE5 8AF

Stephen Scott
senior lecturer in child and adolescent psychiatry

Moira Doolan
research family therapist

Helen Aspland
psychologist

St George's Hospital, Medical School, London SW17 0RE

Quentin Spender
senior lecturer in child and adolescent psychiatry

Maudsley Hospital, London SE5 8AZ
Brian Jacobs
consultant child and adolescent psychiatrist

Correspondence to:
S Scott
s.scott@iop.kcl.ac.uk

BMJ 2001;323:194-8



The full version of this article appears on the BMJ's website

Abstract

Objective To see whether a behaviourally based group parenting programme, delivered in regular clinical practice, is an effective treatment for antisocial behaviour in children.

Design Controlled trial with permuted block design with allocation by date of referral.

Setting Four local child and adolescent mental health services.

Participants 141 children aged 3-8 years referred with antisocial behaviour and allocated to parenting groups (90) or waiting list control (51).

Intervention Webster-Stratton basic videotape programme administered to parents of six to eight children over 13-16 weeks. This programme emphasises engagement with parental emotions, rehearsal of behavioural strategies, and parental understanding of its scientific rationale.

Main outcome measures Semistructured parent interview and questionnaires about antisocial behaviour in children administered 5-7 months after entering trial; direct observation of parent-child interaction.

Results Referred children were highly antisocial (above the 97th centile on interview measure). Children in the intervention group showed a large reduction in antisocial behaviour; those in the waiting list group did not change (effect size between groups 1.06 SD (95% confidence interval 0.71 to 1.41), $P < 0.001$). Parents in the intervention group increased the proportion of praise to ineffective commands they gave their children threefold, while control parents reduced it by a third (effect size

between groups 0.76 (0.16 to 1.36), $P = 0.018$). If the 31 children lost to follow up were included in an intention to treat analysis the effect size on antisocial behaviour was reduced by 16%.

Conclusions Parenting groups effectively reduce serious antisocial behaviour in children in real life conditions. Follow up is needed to see if the children's poor prognosis is improved and criminality prevented.

Introduction

Aggression and fighting are part of normal child development and can help children to assert and defend themselves. Persistent, poorly controlled antisocial behaviour, however, is socially handicapping and often leads to poor adjustment in adults.¹ It occurs in 5% of children,² and its prevalence is rising.³ The children live with high levels of criticism and hostility from their parents and are often rejected by their peers.³ Truancy is common, most leave school with no qualifications, and over a third become recurrent juvenile offenders.⁴ In adulthood, offending usually continues, relationships are limited and unsatisfactory, and the employment pattern is poor. The long term public cost from childhood for individuals with this behaviour is up to ten times higher than for controls and involves many agencies.⁵ Antisocial behaviour accounts for 30-40% of referrals to child mental health services.⁶

Harsh, inconsistent parenting is strongly associated with antisocial behaviour in children,⁴ but whether this is a cause or consequence or is due to a common genetic predisposition has been less clear.³ The pioneering work of Patterson and colleagues showed