"Talking" psychological therapies with people who have intellectual disabilities

WARWICK THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Professor Peter Langdon

RADiANT – 30 July 2021

Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership



Mental Health

- "Mental health is a state of wellbeing, in which an individual realizes his or her own abilities, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and is able to make a contribution to his or her community."
 - World Health Organization, 2004







Mental Disorders

 "Mental disorders represent disturbances to a person's mental health that are often characterized by some combination of troubled thoughts, emotions, behaviour and relationships with others. Examples of mental disorders include depression, anxiety disorder, conduct disorder, bipolar disorder and psychosis."



• World Health Organization, 2004





World Health Organization, 2012



Table 1 Mental health determinants

Level	Adverse factors		Protective factors						
	Low self-esteem	↔	Self-esteem, confidence						
Individual	Cognitive/emotional immaturity	\leftrightarrow	Ability to solve problems and						
attributes			manage stress or adversity						
	Difficulties in communicating	\leftrightarrow	Communication skills						
	Medical illness, substance use	\leftrightarrow	Physical health, fitness						
	Loneliness, bereavement	↔	Social support of family & friends						
	Neglect, family conflict	\leftrightarrow	Good parenting / family interaction						
Social	Exposure to violence/abuse	\leftrightarrow	Physical security and safety						
circumstances	Low income and poverty	\leftrightarrow	Economic security						
	Difficulties or failure at school	\leftrightarrow	Scholastic achievement						
	Work stress, unemployment	$ \longleftrightarrow $	Satisfaction and success at work						
	Poor access to basic services	↔	Equality of access to basic services						
Environmental	Injustice and discrimination	\leftrightarrow	Social justice, tolerance, integration						
factors	Social and gender inequalities	\leftrightarrow	Social and gender equality						
	Exposure to war or disaster	\leftrightarrow	Physical security and safety						

World Health Organization, 2012

Kinderman P, Schwannauer M, Pontin E, Tai S (2013) Psychological Processes Mediate the Impact of Familial Risk, Social Circumstances and Life Events on Mental Health. PLOS ONE 8(10): e76564. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0076564 https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0076564

Wade and Halligan, 2017

Figure 2. Holistic, biopyschsocial model of illness: components of importance.

Comment on figure:

Text =one of four levels concerning the person.

Text = one of four contextual domains.

- (Text) =a construct outside model-not accessible.
- =direct influences. Note that they are two-way.
- --- > =indirect influences.

Note:

- I. Pathology, impairment, personal context, and choice are all within the person and are not directly observable.
- 2. Activities and physical context are both directly observable.
- 3. Social participation and social context concern meaning and require interpretation or inference of observed actions or situations.
- 4. Temporal context is a given, but is often overlooked.
- 5. Potentially there are relationships and influences between all variables, and many can be reciprocal.

Mental Illness

- Rates of mental illness are higher for people with intellectual disabilities
 - 36% of kids with intellectual disabilities had a mental illness compared to 8% of those without an intellectual disability (Emerson and Hatton, 2007).
 - 15.7 to 40.9% of adults with intellectual disabilities have been estimated to have a mental illness (Cooper et al., 2018).
 - Global mental illness for people with intellectual disabilities has been estimated to range from 16 to 54% (Rojahn and Meier, 2009).

THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Therapy

- Treatment fidelity or integrity (Fairburn & Cooper, 2011)
 - this if often seen as:
 - Treatment adherence using the correct therapy procedures
 - Treatment competence how well the procedures are implemented
 - Treatment differentiation not including extraneous or proscribed elements

Therapy

- Therapist competence (Fairburn & Cooper, 2011)
 - Do therapists have the knowledge and skills needed? In this context:
 - Knowledge and skills about therapy
 - Knowledge and skills about intellectual and other developmental disabilities
 - Knowledge and skills about mental health presentations

WARM/I

THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

CK

Therapist Factors

- Variability in outcome due to therapists has been estimated to be up to 10%.
- Therapists who are rated as having better interpersonal behaviours have better outcomes (Schottke et al. 2017)
- Therapists who engage in self-practice of CBT may have greater technical and interpersonal skills (Davis et al. 2015)
- In a trial comparing CBT and IPT for depression, therapists accounted for 1 to 12% in outcome. The difference between CBT and IPT disappeared when this was taken into account (Kim et al. 2007)

Therapist Factors

- Empathy
- Skilfulness
- Alliance
- Ability to deal with alliance problems
- Positive Regard
- Warmth
- Genuineness
- Persuasiveness
- Verbal ability
- Ability to enhance hope or expectations

Coventry City Council

WARWICK

THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

Anderson et al. (2016)

Can people with intellectual disabilities take part successfully in talking therapies?

- Historically, an assumption they cannot (Hurley et al. 1996).
 - Problems with cognitive flexibility and learning.
 - Difficulties with communication.
 - Unable to understand the models underpinning cognitive behavioural therapy.

What are some of the things you need to understand in order to take part in cognitive behavioural therapy?

- Communicate.
- Form a therapeutic relationship or alliance.
- Motivation to change.
- Flexibility of thought.
- Perspective taking and mentalisation.
- Understanding the cognitive model
 - Recognise a thought, feeling or behaviour.
 - Understand the difference between thoughts, feelings and behaviours.
 - Understand the interaction between thoughts, feelings and behaviours cognitive mediation.
 - Accessibility of automatic thoughts.
- Record experiences.
- Learn.

Short-term Cognitive Therapy Rating Scale

- Accessibility of automatic thoughts
- Awareness and differentiation of emotion
- Personal responsibility for change
- Buy in with the cognitive rationale
- Alliance within and outside of therapy
- Problem chronicity
- Psychological processes that reduce anxiety and promote a positive selfview
- Capacity to work in-depth on a particular issue
- Whether the person believes that CBT will be helpful
- There is evidence that scores on this scale relate to treatment outcome (Safran et al. 1993; Myhr et al. 2007; Renaud et al. 2013; 2014).

Short-term Cognitive Therapy Rating Scale

- Comprises two-factors:
 - Capacity for participation in cognitive-behaviour therapy
 - Psychological processes that reduce anxiety and promote a positive self-view
 - Accessibility of automatic thoughts
 - Awareness and differentiation of emotions
 - Capacity to work in-depth on a particular issue
 - Attitudes relevant to the process of cognitive-behaviour therapy
 - Whether the person believes that CBT will be helpful
 - Personal responsibility for change
 - Buy in with the cognitive model
 - Alliance out of session
- Renaud et al. (2014) demonstrated that capacity for participation in cognitive-behaviour therapy predicted treatment outcome in a sample of 256 patients, rather than Attitudes

Challenges when working with people with intellectual disabilities

- Initial problems may arise in the assessment phase when mental health problems are not recognised as distinct from the IDs (Reiss, Levitan, & Szyszko, 1982) or misdiagnosed as challenging behaviour (Azam, Sinai, & Hassiotis, 2009).
- For those who continue to receive psychological therapy, being uninformed about the grounds for their referral may negatively impact upon their motivation to engage in therapy; hence, affecting treatment outcomes (Willner, 2006).

Challenges when working with people with intellectual disabilities

- Likewise, difficulties in establishing a therapeutic alliance may lead to clients engaging in a dependencyinducing relationship rather than taking ownership of the therapeutic process (Brechin & Swain, 1988; Jahoda et al., 2009).
- Furthermore, the perceived level of cognitive functioning may pose an additional barrier when therapists are more likely to use the cognitive aspects of CBT with more abled clients only (Willner, 2006).

What do we know about whether people with intellectual disabilities can take part in therapy?

- Ability to link situations and feelings is associated with verbal ability (Reed & Clements, 1989; Joyce et al. 2006; Oathamshaw & Haddock, 2006).
- People with IDs find it difficult to identify thoughts, feelings and behaviours; generally, feelings/emotions are easier (Oathamsaw & Haddock, 2006; Quakley et al. 2004).
- Cognitive mediation much more difficult for people with IDs were able to identify a mediating belief (Dagnan & Chadwick, 1997). When the task is incongruent, even more difficult (Dagnan et al. 2000; Joyce et al. 2006).

What do we know about whether people with intellectual disabilities can take part in therapy?

- Stott et al. (2017) reviewed the literature about measuring readiness to take part in cognitive behaviour therapy for people with intellectual disabilities.
- They included 12 studies. There is a lack of well developed valid and reliable tools to assess readiness to take part in cognitive behaviour therapy for people with intellectual disabilities.
- While it seems sensible, there really isn't that much evidence that specific training in skills leads to improved outcomes.

Does training improve understanding of core concepts in cognitive behaviour therapy by people with intellectual disabilities? A randomized experiment

Melanie Bruce 🗸, Suzanne Collins 🤟, Peter Langdon 🤟, Stephanie Powlitch 🗸, Shirley Reynolds 🛛 🗸

First published: 24 December 2010 | https://doi.org/10.1348/014466509X416149 | Citations: 17

Coventry City Council

WARWICK THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

 34 were randomised to relaxation or taught about identifying thoughts, feelings and conditions and took part in a discussion about specific situations where a feeling would be triggered by a thought.

Behaviour Research and Therapy Volume 71, August 2015, Pages 10-19

Behaviour Research and Therapy Volume 76, January 2016, Pages 13-23

Can a computerised training paradigm assist people with intellectual disabilities to learn cognitive mediation skills? A randomised experiment

Leen Vereenooghe ^a, Shirley Reynolds ^b, Lina Gega ^e, Peter E. Langdon ^{c, d} A

Using computers to teach people with intellectual disabilities to perform some of the tasks used within cognitive behavioural therapy: A randomised experiment

Leen Vereenooghe ^a, Lina Gega ^b, Shirley Reynolds ^c, Peter E. Langdon ^d 🙁 🖾

65 randomised to computerised training or an attention control condition. Researchers were blind to allocation.

BTFQ Total

Intercept	21.152 (6.345)	-	3.334**	
Pre-test BTFQ	.737 (.112)	.759	6.577***	
IQ	-5.852 (3.949)	169	-1.482	.543
Intervention	7.589 (3.635)	.219	2.088*	.580

Notes. IQ, split at mean of 53.10 and categorised as low or high; *, p < .05; **, p < .01; ***,

p < .001; R², applies to regression model that includes this predictor and all of the above.

- 55 randomised to computerised training or an attention control condition. Researchers were blind to allocation.
- Specific training in linking thoughts, feelings, and behaviours.

Research in Developmental Disabilities 34 (2013) 4085-4102

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Research in Developmental Disabilities

Review article

Psychological therapies for people with intellectual disabilities: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Leen Vereenooghe^a, Peter E. Langdon^{a,b,*}

^a Department of Psychological Sciences, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom ^b Broadland Clinic, Hertfordshire Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust–Norfolk, United Kingdom

Fig. 2. Forest plot of estimated treatment effect of psychological therapy for people with IDs. Horizontal lines represent the confiden standardised mean difference (black squares) of each study. The size of the black square is indicative of the study's sample size. The centr indicates the effect size for that subgroup analysis, while the width of the diamond covers the 95% CI. The vertical dashed line and bottom the overall size and its corresponding 95% CI.

	Control			Experimental				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI			
2.1.1 Randomised												
Cooney et al. (2017)	22.39	11.45	23	17.17	9.1	24	6.3%	0.50 [-0.08, 1.08]	\vdash			
Hagiliassis et al. (2005)	97.36	21.27	14	81.13	18.85	15	5.5%	0.79 [0.03, 1.55]				
Hartley et al. (2015)	35.38	3.31	8	22.5	2.34	16	2.6%	4.63 [2.96, 6.29]	(
Hassiotis et al. (2013)	54.93	11.48	15	54.67	13.11	15	5.7%	0.02 [-0.70, 0.74]	+			
Klein et al. (2018)	2.61	0.84	33	2.78	0.99	30	6.7%	-0.18 [-0.68, 0.31]	$+$ \checkmark			
Lindsay et al. (2015)	1.38	0.74	12	0.55	0.33	12	4.9%	1.40 [0.49, 2.31]				
Maston & Senatore. (1981)	125.3	27.2	10	131.7	13.5	10	5.0%	-0.29 [-1.17, 0.60]				
McCabe et al. (2006)	12.8	4.23	15	5.71	4.54	34	5.8%	1.57 [0.88, 2.26]				
McGillivray et al. (2008)	16.15	13.81	27	8.45	6.69	20	6.2%	0.67 [0.07, 1.26]				
Taylor et al. (2005)	70.7	16.29	20	62	15.92	16	5.9%	0.53 [-0.14, 1.20]				
Willner et al. (2002)	2.1	0.45	7	1.28	0.87	7	4.0%	1.11 [-0.05, 2.26]				
Willner et al. (2013b)	47.8	14.81	85	41.5	29.15	77	7.3%	0.28 [-0.03, 0.59]	-			
Subtotal (95% CI)			269			276	65.8%	0.72 [0.30, 1.14]	◆			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.40;	Chi ² = !	52.57, 0	if = 11	(P < 0.0)	00001);	$I^2 = 79$	1%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	.33 (P =	0.0009))		<i>g</i> = 0).53;	95% C	I [0.20, 0.85], z =	= 3.18, p = 0.001			
2.1.2 Non-randomised												
Lindsay et al. (2004)	28.5	8.83	14	22.03	12.86	33	6.1%	0.54 [-0.10, 1.17]				
McGaw et al. (2002)	5.12	1.01	12	5.58	1.21	10	5.1%	-0.40 [-1.25, 0.45]				
Rose et al. (2005)	102.9	12.7	36	93.7	12.1	50	6.9%	0.74 [0.30, 1.18]				
Rose et al. (2008)	101.8	14.01	21	84.15	14.48	20	5.9%	1.22 [0.54, 1.89]				
Rose et al. (2009)	101.8	9.8	21	84.97	12.61	41	6.3%	1.41 [0.83, 2.00]				
Taylor et al. (2004)	26	3.17	8	17.56	6.04	9	4.0%	1.63 [0.49, 2.77]				
Subtotal (95% CI)			112			163	34.2%	0.84 [0.35, 1.33]	•			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.25;	$Chi^2 = 1$	16.01, c	if = 5 (P = 0.00	07); I ² =	69%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	.36 (P =	0.0008	;)									
Total (95% CI)			381			439	100.0%	0.75 [0.43, 1.08]	◆			

Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.35$; $Chi^2 = 73.99$, df = 17 (P < 0.00001); $l^2 = 77\%$ Test for overall effect: Z = 4.53 (P < 0.00001)Test for subgroup differences: $Chi^2 = 0.14$, df = 1 (P = 0.71), $l^2 = 0\%$

-4

-2 0

Favours [control] Favours [experimental]

Psychological Therapies

Fig. 4. Forest plot of subgroup meta-analysis based on clinical presentation.

Horizontal lines represent the confidence interval for the standardised mean difference (black squares) of each study. The size of the black square is indicative of the study's sample size. The centre of the diamonds indicates the effect size for that subgroup analysis, while the width of the diamond covers the 95% CI. The vertical dashed line and bottom diamond indicate the overall size and its corresponding 95% CI.

	c	ontrol		Experimental				itd. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	l Mean SD Total		Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI				
2.3.1 Anger												
Hagiliassis et al. (2005)	97.36	21.27	14	81.13	18.85	15	5.5%	0.79 [0.03, 1.55]				
Lindsay et al. (2004)	28.5	8.83	14	22.03	12.86	33	6.1%	0.54 [-0.10, 1.17]				
Rose et al. (2005)	102.9	12.7	36	93.7	12.1	50	6.9%	0.74 [0.30, 1.18]				
Rose et al. (2008)	101.8	14.01	21	84.15	14.48	20	5.9%	1.22 [0.54, 1.89]				
Rose et al. (2009)	101.8	9.8	21	84.97	12.61	41	6.3%	1.41 [0.83, 2.00]				
Taylor et al. (2004)	26	3.17	8	17.56	6.04	9	4.0%	1.63 [0.49, 2.77]				
Taylor et al. (2005)	70.7	16.29	20	62	15.92	16	5.9%	0.53 [-0.14, 1.20]	<u>+</u>			
Willner et al. (2002)	2.1	0.45	7	1.28	0.87	7	4.0%	1.11 [-0.05, 2.26]				
Willner et al. (2013b)	47.8	14.81	85	41.5	29.15	77	7.3%	0.28 [-0.03, 0.59]				
Subtotal (95% CI)			226			268	51.8%	0.82 [0.50, 1.14]	•			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.12; Chi ² = 18.77, df = 8 (P = 0.02); l ² = 57%												
Test for overall effect: Z = 5	.07 (P <	0.0000	1)									
2.3.2 Depression and/or A	nxiety											
Cooney et al. (2017)	22.39	11.45	23	17.17	9.1	24	6.3%	0.50 [-0.08, 1.08]				
Hartley et al. (2015)	35.38	3.31	8	22.5	2.34	16	2.6%	4.63 [2.96, 6.29]				
Hassiotis et al. (2013)	54.93	11.48	15	54.67	13.11	15	5.7%	0.02 [-0.70, 0.74]	$+ \setminus /$			
Klein et al. (2018)	2.61	0.84	33	2.78	0.99	30	6.7%	-0.18 [-0.68, 0.31]	+ -			
Lindsay et al. (2015)	1.38	0.74	12	0.55	0.33	12	4.9%	1.40 [0.49, 2.31]				
McCabe et al. (2006)	12.8	4.23	15	5.71	4.54	34	5.8%	1.57 [0.88, 2.26]				
McGillivray et al. (2008) Subtotal (95% CI)	16.15	13.81	27 133	8.45	6.69	20 151	6.2% 38.1%	0.67 [0.07, 1.26] 1.01 [0.27, 1.74]				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.81:	Chi ² =	45.34. d	lf = 6 (P < 0.00	0001): 1	$^{2} = 879$	6		-			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2$.69 (P =	0.007)		-								
			g	= 0.	62;9	5%	CI [0.0	7, 1.18], z = 2.	20, p = 0.03			
2.3.3 Interpersonal Function	oning											
Maston & Senatore. (1981)	125.3	27.2	10	131.7	13.5	10	5.0%	-0.29 [-1.17, 0.60]				
McGaw et al. (2002)	5.12	1.01	12	5.58	1.21	10	5.1%	-0.40 [-1.25, 0.45]				
Subtotal (95% CI)			22			20	10.1%	-0.35 [-0.96, 0.27]	◆			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00;	Chi ² =	0.03, df	= 1 (P	= 0.85)	$; I^2 = 0!$	%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 1	.11 (P =	0.27)										
Total (95% CI)			381			439	100.0%	0.75 [0.43, 1.08]	▲			
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.35$	Chi ² =	73.99	f = 17	(P < 0.0	00001)	$l^2 = 77$	196					
Test for overall effect: $7 = 4$	53 (P <	0.0000	1)						-4 -2 0 2 4			
Test for subgroup difference	s Chi ²	= 12.17	df =	2 (P = 0	002)	2 = 83 4	5%		Favours [control] Favours [experimental]			
rest for subgroup differences: Chi ⁺ = 12.17 , df = 2 (Y = 0.002), i ⁺ = 55.5%												

g = 0.64; 95% *CI* [0.36, 0.92], *z* = 4.50, *p* < 0.00001

Summary

- People with IDs may find some aspects of CBT difficult.
- This relates to cognitive ability, including communication.
- It may be possible to remedy aspects of these difficulties; however, we still know very little.
- Talking psychological therapies appears to be associated with a moderate effect size.
- People make adaptations, but again, we know very little about effectiveness - session length, inclusion of carers, inclusion of illustrations, increased number of sessions, simplification of concepts and language, changing content etc.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

What next?

WARWICK THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

- Do we need more "social" in therapy?
- Should we focus increasingly on behavioural psychotherapies?
- We need to know what adaptations to therapy work.

- 161 adults with intellectual disabilities were randomised to Guided Self-Help or Behavioural Activation.
- No difference between the groups at 12-months.
- Within group improvement was significant for both groups.
 - Behavioural Activation: 4.2point decrease on the GDS-LD
 - Guided Self-Help: 4.5-point decrease on the GDS-LD

Comparison of behavioural activation with guided self-help (for treatment of depression in adults with intellectual disabilities: a randomised controlled trial

Andrew Jahada, Richard Hastings, Chris Hatton, Sally-Ann Cooper, Dave Dagnan, Ruiqi Zhang, Alex McConnachie, Nicola McMeekin, Kim Appleton, Rob Jones, Katie Scott, Lauren Fulton, Rosie Knight, Dawn Knowles, Chris Williams, Andrew Briggs, Ken MacMahon, Helen Lynn, Ian Smith, Gail Thomas, Craig Melville

Articles

WARWICK

THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

What next?

- WARWICK THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK
- Mental illness is a public health priority for people with intellectual disabilities? Should we be working in a way to prevent the development of mental illness? Do we need to intervene more at the societal level?
- What about technology?

2 x Participants	A1 1 week	B 1 x dos	A ₂ 1 weel	2 eek							
2 x Participants	A ₁ 1 week	2	B x doses		1	A2 week					
2 x Participants	A1 2 week	CS .	H 1 x (B dose		2	A2 weeks				
2 x Participants	A1 2 week	s		B 2 x doses				A2 2 week	s		
2 x Participants	3	A1 3 weeks					B 1 x dose				
2 x Participants	3	A1 weeks			2 x	B doses			3 1	A2 weeks	

Note. A₁ = baseline assessment phase; B = intervention phase; 1 x dose = one session of participation in 8 VI videos; 2 x doses = 2 sessions of participation with the same 8 VI videos from previous session; A₂ = follow-up phase; shaded area = different durations of baseline phases.

WARWICK THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

For all 12 participants: z = -2.35, p = .02; d = .89

AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR

RESEARCH ARTICLE | 🖻 Open Access | 🕝 🔅

Attentional bias toward negative and positive pictorial stimuli and its relationship with distorted cognitions, empathy, and moral reasoning among men with intellectual disabilities who have committed crimes

Susan A. Sadek, Matthew R. Daniel, Peter E. Langdon 💌

First published: 17 June 2020 | https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21908 | Citations: 1

■No Offending History Offending History

CONSORT 2010 Flow Diagram

EQUIP

JARID Junnal of Applied Research in Intellecture

Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities 2013, 26, 167-180

An Evaluation of the EQUIP Treatment Programme with Men who have Intellectual or Other Developmental Disabilities

Peter E. Langdon**[†], Glynis H. Murphy[‡], Isabel C.H. Clare^{\$,¶}**, Emma J. Palmer^{††} and Joanna Rees^{‡‡}

*Department of Psychological Sciences, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, East Anglia, UK; ¹Broadland Clinic, Hertfordshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, Norfolk, UK; ¹Tizard Centre, University of Kent, Kent, UK; ¹Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; ¹Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, UK; ^{**}NIHR Collaborations for Applied Health Research and Care, Cambridge, UK; ¹¹School of Psychology, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK; ¹¹Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust, Norwich, UK

Figure 1: Emotional Problems Scale - Behaviour Rating Scale