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Aims

- Briefly discuss some of the background to the EQUIP Treatment Programme.
- Discuss the EQUIP Treatment Programme in greater detail.
Equipping Youth to Help One Another

- Has its roots within Anger Replacement Training.
- Draws on models from developmental psychology
  - Moral developmental theory
  - Cognitive perspective taking
  - Social role taking opportunities
  - Cognitive development
- Gibbs (2014) sociomoral model.
Two levels and four stages of moral development

- Level 1: Immature
  - Stage 1: Unilateral and Physicalistic
  - Stage 2: Exchanging and Instrumental

- Level 2: Mature
  - Stage 3: Mature and Prosocial
  - Stage 4: Systemic and Standard

Gibbs (2014) - Sociomoral development
Meta-analytic work has shown that there is a strong relationship between moral development and criminal offending (e.g. $d = .76$; Stams et al. 2006).

There is also a literature linking intelligence and criminal offending (e.g. Farrington, 1906; Moffitt, 1993; Moffitt et al. 1981).

Moral development is dependent upon social role taking opportunities, and associated development within the cognitive domain.

Are people with intellectual disabilities more likely to engage in criminal offending?

Does this relate to moral development?

Can we address any associated issues within psychological therapies?
Why does moral development relate to criminal offending behaviour?

- Gibbs (2003; 2010; 2014) has discussed the relationship between moral development stage and distorted cognitions:
  - Moral development broadly indexes or captures schema. In other words, the general information processing style used across contexts. This can be biased.
  - Some moral developmental stages are associated with egocentricity.
  - This has an associated relationship with behaviour.

- Palmer (2003) discussed the relationships between moral development and a variety of social and psychological variables:
  - Peer influence
  - Parental influence
  - Social information processing
  - Other social and environmental variables (e.g. socioeconomic status, education)
  - The importance of distorted cognitions.
Figure 1. (a) A hypothesised moderating relationship for intelligence between moral reasoning and illegal behaviour such that the relationship between illegal behaviour and moral reasoning is linear. (b) A hypothesised moderating relationship for intelligence between moral reasoning and illegal behaviour where the relationship between moral reasoning and illegal behaviour takes an inverted U-shape.
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Figure 6 - 2: Means (SEM) and Adjusted Means (SEM) for Total SRM-SF.
Figure 6.1: Means (SEM) across the Sociomoral Reflection Measure-Short Form for all groups.
The EQUIP Treatment Programme

- This programme is not offence specific.
  
  - Manualised multicomponent treatment programme grounded within “positive peer culture”.

  - Developed in the United States and has its roots within both aggression replacement training and positive peer culture.

  - Intensive.
    - Four sessions per week as a minimum, but there is scope to vary this as needed.

  - Specific adaptations for people with intellectual disabilities.
    - Focus on cognitive mediation training.
    - Simplifications of concepts and homework.
    - Cultural changes.
• Four different types of sessions:
  
  - “Equipment” meetings – anger management (cognitive restructuring, relaxation training, imagery), social skills training (active role play), social decision making.
  
  - “Mutual Help” meetings – active problem solving using the techniques learned during equipment meetings.
Responsible Adult Culture

- Potter et al., 2015.
• Simple concepts
  - “Clown in the Ring”
  - Planet A or B?
  - TOP guy!
  - 12 problems and 4 thinking errors

• Each session builds on the previous.
• Can roll, and should be integral within the suite of treatment programmes.
• First line intervention which can be used as the springboard into other offence focused groups.
Example Potential Problems

“AGGRAVATES OTHERS” PROBLEM

You threaten and hassle other people
You bully other people
You tease other people
You try to “get back” at other people
Example Potential Problems

“TRICKS OTHERS” PROBLEM
You get others to do bad things for you
You get others to do your “dirty work”
You manipulate others
You pretend you had nothing to do with it when others get caught and you blame the other person
Example Potential Problems

“DRUG AND ALCOHOL” PROBLEM

You abuse alcohol and drugs
You are afraid to face life without using drugs or alcohol
You think that drug and alcohol abuse are not bad
You blame the drugs or alcohol when you do something wrong
Four thinking errors

**Being Self Centred**

“I can do what I want!”
“No one can tell me what to do!”

“I just want to have a good time, what’s so bad about that?!”
“I didn’t really hurt him or her anyway!”

**Thinking the Worst**

“Why bother? It never works out for me!”
“I never do anything right!”

“Why bother? It never works out for me!”
“He was asking for it!”

**Minimising and Mislabelling**

“I got mixed up with the wrong crowd!”

“I didn’t really hurt him or her anyway!”

“I never do anything right!”

“Why bother? It never works out for me!”

“Why bother? It never works out for me!”

“I got mixed up with the wrong crowd!”

“He was asking for it!”
Mutual Help Meetings

• Problem-solving
  ▪ Facilitators are called “coaches”.
  ▪ Coaches do not “join” the group. Encouraging participants to own the group, take responsibility for working on their problems, and general a positive peer culture.
  ▪ The meeting starts with a brief review of the previous meeting. Coach may prompt about skills to practice or revisit.
  ▪ Each member briefly reports a problem they have had and they wish to discuss, with reference to the 12 problems and consider any thinking errors they may have had – briefly!
  ▪ The group decides collaboratively which problems to discuss, and work together to use their skills, and the skills they have been taught to seek a resolution.
Anger Management

- Evaluating and Relabelling Anger
- Anatomy of Anger
- Monitoring and Correcting Thinking Errors
- More Anger Reducers
- Thinking Ahead to Consequences
- Using I Statements for Constructive Consequences
- Self-Evaluation
- Reversing
- More Consequences for Others and Correcting Distorted Self-Views
- Victimiser and Grand Review
Social Skills

- Expressing a Complaint Constructively
- Caring for Someone who is Sad or Upset
- Dealing Constructively with Negative Peer Pressure
- Keeping out of Fights
- Helping Others
- Preparing for a Stressful Conversation
- Dealing Constructively with Someone Angry at You
- Expressing Care and Appreciation
- Dealing Constructively with Someone Accusing You of Something
- Responding Constructively to Failure
Social Decision Making

- Martian’s Adviser’s Problem
- Mark’s Problem Situation and Mark’s Problem Situation
- Jim’s Problem Situation
- Richard’s Problem Situation
- Sarah’s Problem Situation
- George’s Problem Situation and Leon’s Problem Situation
- Dave’s Problem Situation
- Mike’s Problem Situation
- Sam’s Problem Situation
- Arthur’s Problem Situation
- Tony’s Problem Situation
Social Decision Making (Moral Development)

“Leon has been in a secure unit for a while and then he tried to escape. As a result, all of his leave was cancelled and he was moved to a different unit. It took Leon one year to earn the trust of the staff again. He now thinks it is stupid to try to escape. However, Bob, who is also in the secure unit, tells Leon that he is planning to escape that night. “I’ve got it all figured out,” Bob says. “I’ll hit the staff on the head and take their keys.” Bob asks Leon to come along. Leon tries to talk Bob out of it, but Bob won’t listen.

Should Leon tell the staff about Bob’s plan to escape?

What if Bob is a pretty violent kind of guy, and Leon thinks that Bob might seriously injure or maybe even kill the staff member? Then what should Leon do?

What is the staff member is mean and everyone hates him? Then what should Leon do?

Is it right to ever tell on someone?

Let’s change the situation! Let’s say that member of staff happens to be Leon’s uncle. Then what should Leon do?

Let’s change the situation! Let’s say that Bob is Leon’s brother. What should Leon do?

Which is most important? Not telling on your friend/not letting people get hurt/ minding your own business
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### Sociomoral Reflection Measure - Short Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-treatment M (SD)</th>
<th>Post-treatment M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract (M)</strong></td>
<td>283.43 (27.25)</td>
<td>309.52 (37.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truth</strong></td>
<td>250.00 (28.89)</td>
<td>300.00 (64.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliation (M)</strong></td>
<td>264.29 (43.96)</td>
<td>296.43 (50.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life (M)</strong></td>
<td>253.57 (56.70)</td>
<td>303.57* (22.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property</strong></td>
<td>216.67 (40.83)</td>
<td>285.71* (55.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law</strong></td>
<td>207.14 (93.22)</td>
<td>314.29* (55.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Justice</strong></td>
<td>228.57 (26.73)</td>
<td>307.14* (67.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>252.86 (26.73)</td>
<td>300.00** (33.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How I Think Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-treatment M (SD)</th>
<th>Post-treatment M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anomalous Responding</strong></td>
<td>3.29 (0.82)</td>
<td>3.12 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Centred</strong></td>
<td>2.10 (0.84)</td>
<td>1.43* (0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blaming Others</strong></td>
<td>2.61 (1.50)</td>
<td>1.54 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimising Mislabling</strong></td>
<td>2.00 (0.83)</td>
<td>1.38* (0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assuming the Worst</strong></td>
<td>2.09 (0.84)</td>
<td>1.55* (0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opposition-Defiance</strong></td>
<td>2.39 (0.95)</td>
<td>1.63* (0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Aggression</strong></td>
<td>2.30 (1.60)</td>
<td>1.34* (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lying</strong></td>
<td>2.64 (0.81)</td>
<td>1.57** (0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stealing</strong></td>
<td>1.64 (0.72)</td>
<td>1.40 (0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overt Scale</strong></td>
<td>2.34 (1.24)</td>
<td>1.49* (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covert Scale</strong></td>
<td>2.14 (0.69)</td>
<td>1.49* (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>2.22 (0.93)</td>
<td>1.48* (0.55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Problem Solving Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-treatment M (SD)</th>
<th>Post-treatment M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Identification</strong></td>
<td>3.86 (0.41)</td>
<td>4.20 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation of Solutions</strong></td>
<td>2.17 (0.85)</td>
<td>2.23 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solution Selection</strong></td>
<td>3.00 (0.35)</td>
<td>3.31* (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Solutions</strong></td>
<td>4.29 (0.78)</td>
<td>4.23 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td>16.64 (2.09)</td>
<td>17.46 (1.60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anger Inventory for Mental Retarded Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-treatment M (SD)</th>
<th>Post-treatment M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td>78.00 (17.18)</td>
<td>72.29 (14.55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
**p<0.001
***p<0.0001
Future work

- Ongoing feasibility trial. Current accrual is approaching 60.
- Future adaptations for community settings.
- Future adaptations, including more work around social skills teaching, cognitive mediation, etc.
- Information about acceptability and ideas from trial participants about further adaptations.