

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Jobson, Laura and Stanbury, Alexandra and Langdon, Peter E. (2013) The Self-and Other-Deception Questionnaires - Intellectual Disabilities (SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID): component analysis and reliability. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 34 (10). pp. 3576-3582. ISSN 0891-4222.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2013.07.004>

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/36214/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

This is the accepted version of the following article: Jobson, Stanbury and Langdon (2013). The Self- and Other-Deception Questionnaires-Intellectual Disabilities (SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID): Component analysis and reliability, 34, 3576-3582, which has been published in final form at [10.1016/j.ridd.2013.07.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2013.07.004).

The Self- and Other-Deception Questionnaires-Intellectual Disabilities (SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID): Component Analysis and Reliability

Laura Jobson
University of East Anglia
&
MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit

Alexandra Stanbury
Partnerships in Care Ltd.

Peter E Langdon
University of East Anglia
&
Hertfordshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust

Author Note

Laura Jobson, Department of Psychological Sciences, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia and MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Cambridge, UK; Alex Stanbury, Learning Disabilities Service, Partnerships in Care Ltd., UK; Peter E. Langdon, Department of Psychological Sciences, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, UK and Broadland Clinic, Hertfordshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, UK

Laura Jobson is funded by a National Institute for Health Research Postdoctoral Fellowship; Peter E Langdon is funded by a National Institute for Health Research Postdoctoral Fellowship

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the National Institute for Health Research or the Department of Health.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr Peter E Langdon, Department of Psychological Sciences, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom. Email: P.Langdon@uea.ac.uk

Abstract

The objectives of this research were to, 1) investigate the component structure and psychometric properties of the Self- and Other-Deception Questionnaires-Intellectual Disabilities (SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID), 2) to examine the relationship between social desirability and IQ, and 3) to compare social desirability scores of those with intellectual disabilities (IDs) and a history of criminal offending to the social desirability scores of participants with IDs and those without IDs and no such history, controlling for general intellectual functioning. Men with mild to borderline IDs detained within medium secure inpatient forensic mental health services (N = 40) completed the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID at Time 1 and then two-weeks later at Time 2. Data for the men with and without IDs and no known criminal offending history were taken from a previous study (N = 60). Following exploratory Principal Components Analysis, the number of questionnaire items were reduced, and a two-factor structure was found for the SDQ-ID which was labelled, 1) Positive Self Representation, and 2) Denial of Intrusive Thoughts. A two-factor structure was also found for the ODQ-ID and these two factors were labelled, 1) Denial of Negative Social Interaction, and 2) Untrustworthiness. Both the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID had acceptable internal consistency and test-retest reliability. Fifteen percent of the variance in SDQ-ID scores was explained by Full Scale IQ, while 21% of the variance in ODQ-ID scores was explained by Full Scale IQ. Between group comparisons controlling for intelligence did not yield any significant differences. The shortened SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID have promising psychometric properties, and their component structures appear robust. Differences between men with and without IDs on these two measures of social desirability can be accounted for by differences in general intellectual functioning.

The Self- and Other-Deception Questionnaires-Intellectual Disabilities (SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID): Component Structure and Reliability

1. Introduction

Socially desirability is the tendency for people to present themselves in a favourable way (Johnson & Fendrick, 2005) and involves people inaccurately attributing positive qualities to oneself (self-deception) or inaccurately denying that one has undesirable qualities to others (other-deception or impression management) (Paulhus, 1984, 1998). People scoring high on measures of social desirability tend to overrate their positive qualities and underrate their negative qualities. Social desirability may occur because of attempts to please others or attempts to ‘fake good’ in order to conform to socially acceptable values; it may also occur as a result of attempts to gain social approval, avoid criticism or may occur because people believe the information they report (Coolican, 2004; van de Mortel, 2008). When asked for a response, people may ‘manage’ their behaviour and attitudes to a misleading extent and provide responses aligned with what they think they ought to respond and therefore hide their real views (Coolican, 2004). Socially desirable responding occurs more often in responses to socially sensitive questions (King & Bruner, 2000) and therefore has obvious consequences for research, interviews and clinical assessments.

There is evidence that people with intellectual disabilities (IDs) have higher levels of social desirability. For instance, Sturmey (2007) reports high levels of social desirability in psychiatric interviews with populations with people with IDs. Small (1995) found that adolescents with IDs endorsed statements that may suggest a tendency to give socially desirable and unrealistic responses. Langdon, Clare, and Murphy (2010b) found that men with IDs scored significantly higher on a measure of

self-deception and other-deception than did men without IDs. However, they found that this difference disappeared when intellectual functioning was controlled. They also found significant negative correlations between social desirability and IQ. Keeling, Rose, and Beech (2007) conducted a treatment study with sex offenders with and without IDs. As part of this study they found that sex offenders with IDs had higher levels of social desirability than sex offenders without IDs. They state that social desirability bias had a significant influence on treatment efficacy; especially for the sexual offenders with IDs. Consequently, they highlight that reducing the impact of the social desirability response bias in self-report measures is an essential future research pursuit. They also stress the need to assess social desirability and recommend that, whenever using self-report measures, a measure of social desirability should also be administered. Furthermore, a measure of social desirability that can be used with people with IDs is of particular importance because in the past it has been considered that the self-report of people with IDs is of limited use as a result of social desirability (e.g. Balla & Zigler, 1979; Stenfert Kroese, 1998).

Research has also indicated that forensic populations have higher levels of social desirability than non-forensic populations (e.g. Andrews & Meyer, 2003). In forensic settings, mental health practitioners are often charged with obtaining accurate psychological data from questionnaires and interviews to plan treatment efforts. Therefore, it is imperative to identify and consider the effects of social desirability (McEwan, Davis, MacKenzie, & Mullen, 2009). Tan and Grace (2008) highlight that social desirability poses a significant threat to the validity of self-reports in forensic settings. They note that several measures for assessing social desirability have been proposed. However, they challenge the effectiveness of these methods in increasing

the validity of offenders' self-reports, and thus claim that research is required to address measuring social desirability in offender populations.

One way to deal with some of these problems is to include a measure of socially desirability. Such scales assume that if a person responds in a socially desirable manner on the social desirability scale, they are likely to respond in a socially desirable way on other measures and in interviews. Palhaus (1998) developed the Palhaus Deception Scales (PDS) which measures impression management and self-deception. The PDS has a solid theoretical grounding and is considered the most appropriate measure of social desirability (Langdon, et al., 2010b). However, some of the items are inappropriate for use with people with have IDs. In order to overcome these problems, Langdon et al. (2010b) revised the Self-Deception Questionnaire (SDQ; Sackheim and Gur, 1979) and the Other Deception Questionnaire (ODQ; Sackheim and Gur, 1979). The SDQ was designed to assess a person's tendency to attribute positive characteristics to him or herself (self-deceive), while the ODQ is meant to assess a person's tendency to present him or herself in a favourable manner.

Langdon et al. (2010b) found that the revised measures (SDQ-ID and the ODQ-ID) had adequate internal consistency and test-retest reliability when used with men with and without IDs, but they did not examine the component structure of the two instruments. Therefore, their findings are promising with regards to the reliability of the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID. However, as the authors themselves highlight, given that social desirability has also been found to be significantly higher in forensic populations, there is still the need to examine the psychometric properties of the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID in a forensic population with IDs. While the original SDQ and ODQ have previously been used with adults undergoing forensic assessment (Gudjonsson,

1990) and individuals detained within maximum and medium secure units (Gudjonsson & Moore, 2001), to date, research has not examined whether the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID are appropriate for use in forensic settings with those with IDs.

Therefore the aim of the present study is to further investigate the component structure and psychometric properties (i.e. test-retest, internal consistency) of the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID within a sample of men with IDs who have a criminal offending history, combined with a sample of men with and without IDs who have no known history of criminal offending taken from Langdon et al. (2010b). Second, the study aimed to examine the relationship between social desirability and IQ. It is hypothesised, given Langdon et al.'s (2010b) findings, that social desirability will be related to Full Scale IQ. The third aim of the study is to compare the social desirability scores of participants with IDs and a history of criminal offending with those of participants with or without IDs and no history of criminal offending. It is hypothesised that the two groups of men with IDs will have significantly higher levels of social desirability than the men without IDs. Furthermore, among the participants with IDs, those with a history of criminal offending will have significantly higher levels of social desirability than those without such a history. However, it is expected that these differences will be accounted for by Full Scale IQ.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

A total of 100 participants took part in this study. Forty men with IDs were recruited from medium secure forensic mental health inpatient units in the East of England and formed the Offender Group. All offenders included committed an indictable offence which had been dealt with by a Crown Court and led to them being

sentenced to custody within hospital. The mean age of participants was, $M = 33.03$ ($SD = 12.45$). The mean Full Scale IQ of this group was $M = 67.27$ ($SD = 8.80$).

The previously collected data from 32 men with IDs was included and these participants formed the IDs Group. The mean age of this group was 45.88 years ($SD = 15.01$), and the mean Full Scale IQ was 59.35 ($SD=6.16$). The No-IDs Group was comprised of previously collected data from 28 men without IDs. The men age of this group was 40.64 years ($SD = 10.41$), and the Full Scale IQ was 102.29 ($SD = 8.06$).

The three groups differed significantly in terms of age, $F(2, 94) = 10.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .18$. Posthoc testing using the Sidak method indicated that the Offenders Group were significantly younger than the IDs Group, $p < .001$, and the No-IDs Group, $p = .03$, while there was no significant difference between the IDs and No-IDs Group, $p = .31$. The groups differed significantly in terms of Full Scale IQ, $F(2, 89) = 2340.12$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .85$. Posthoc testing using the Sidak method revealed that all groups were significantly different from each other, $p < .001$.

2.2 Design

A 3 (Group) x 2 (Time) x S design was used. There were three groups of men included in this study, 1) Offender Group: Men with IDs who had a history of criminal offending, 2) IDs Group: Men with IDs and no known history of criminal offending, and 3) No-IDs Group: Men without IDs who had no known history of criminal offending. The data collected from the IDs and No-IDs group was previously collected and has been published elsewhere (Langdon, et al., 2010b). Participants completed measures at Time 1 and then completed the measures again following a two-week time interval (Time 2).

2.2.1 Measures

The Self and Other Deception Questionnaire – Intellectual Disabilities (SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID). The original SDQ and ODQ (Sackeim & Gur, 1979) were comprised of 20 items. Langdon et al. (2010b) after inspecting items on the SDQ and the ODQ found that some items were not necessarily applicable to some people with IDs. Therefore, Langdon et al. (2010b) revised the existing questionnaires in an attempt to try to make the questionnaires more appropriate for people with mild IDs. They did this by identifying items that were inappropriate and these items were revised into a more relevant version which attempted to maintain the original meaning of the item. The original items and the revised items are reported elsewhere (Langdon et al. 2009). The original 7-point Likert scale was revised to a 5-point scale in an attempt to reduce complexity. Only extreme responses are scored (e.g. endorsing either 1 or 5 on the Likert Scale). Higher scores represent higher levels of self- or other-deception. The new questionnaires were re-titled the Self-Deception and Other-Deception Questionnaire – Intellectual Disabilities (SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID). Langdon et al. (2010b) reported that the internal consistency of both measures was moderate to substantial, while the test-retest reliability was moderate to excellent.

2.3 Procedure

Following a favourable National Health Service ethical opinion, men detained within hospitals for people with intellectual and other developmental disabilities were informed about the study and invited to speak to a researcher to consider whether or not they would like to take part. They were provided with an information sheet which explained that study and those who wished to take part were asked to sign a consent form. With participant's consent, the researcher obtained the participant's age and Wechsler IQ (Wechsler, 1998) scores from their patient file in order to confirm that they had "mild to borderline" intellectual disabilities. At Time 1, the SDQ-ID and

ODQ-ID were administered. Two weeks later (Time 2) the researcher again met with the participant. The information sheet was again discussed and participants were asked to sign a second consent form to indicate that they wished to continue to take part. The SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID were re-administered.

The pre-existing data was collected as outlined in Langdon et al. (2010b). This previous study was conducted as part of a set of other studies (Langdon, Clare, & Murphy, 2010a; Langdon, Clare, & Murphy, 2011; Langdon, Murphy, Clare, & Palmer, 2010c; Langdon, Murphy, Clare, Palmer, & Rees, 2013; Langdon, Murphy, Clare, Steverson, & Palmer, 2011) where the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID were initially revised and tested. Langdon et al. (2010b) invited participants with and without IDs living within the community to complete the original questionnaires in the year 2008. At this time, participants completed the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID on two occasions in order to allow for the computation of test-retest reliability.

2.3 Data Analysis

Initially, exploratory Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was completed on the 20 items of the SDQ-ID and the ODQ-ID separately with direct quartimin rotation as it was likely that there may be some correlation between components. Following the initial analysis, the correlation matrix was examined and items that did not correlate $> .30$ with more than one other item were excluded and the analysis re-run. Additionally, item communalities of $> .50$, and the criterion of $> .60$ for the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy for individual items were used to retain items. The KMO measure of sample adequacy for the final PCA for the SDQ-ID was $KMO = .68$, and the values for individual items were all above $.60$. As well, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was, $\chi^2 = 132.53$, $p < .001$. The KMO measure of sample adequacy for the final PCA for the ODQ-ID was $KMO = 0.83$, while the values for

individual items were all above .70; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was, $\chi^2=223.17$, $p < .001$.

Following the final PCAs, and using the revised instruments, the internal consistency (Cronbach's α) and test-retest reliability (intraclass correlation) was calculated for the SDQ-ID and the ODQ-ID. The amount of variance explained by Full Scale IQ in the SDQ-ID and the ODQ-ID total scores was determined using regression. ANCOVA comparing total scores on the SDQ-ID and the ODQ-ID across groups at Time 1 only, while controlling for IQ, was then completed. Considering that some of the data was not normally distributed, bootstrapping using resampling 5000 times with replacement was employed. Bootstrapping is a powerful alternative to parametric statistics and generates robust estimates of standard error and confidence intervals. Parameters were estimated and bias corrected and accelerated (BC_a) 95% confidence intervals were generated and reported.

3.0 Results

The means of the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID and subscales are found in Table 2.

3.1 Aim One: Component Structure and Reliability of the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID

The exploratory PCA led to the exclusion of 14 items on the SDQ-ID. Items 4, 8, 15, 17, 19 and 20 were retained. See Langdon et al. (2010b) for a description of all the items. The final PCA of the SDQ-ID returned two components with eigenvalues greater than Kaiser's criterion of 1. Examination of the scree plot revealed a slightly ambiguous point of inflexion and suggested retaining either two or three components; considering that two components had eigenvalues >1 , these were retained. These two components together explained 65.02% of the variance. The Pattern and Structure Matrix for the SDQ-ID are found in Table 1. The three items within component one appear to represent attempts to portray oneself in a positive

way by denying thoughts or behaviours (e.g. denying that you have had sexual fantasies), while the three items that cluster within component two represent the denial of intrusive negative thoughts (e.g. denying that you have ever felt like you wanted to kill someone).

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Turning to the ODQ-ID, the exploratory PCA led to the exclusion of 12 items, while item 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 18 and 19 were retained Langdon et al. (2010b). The final PCA for the ODQ-ID indicated that two components had eigenvalues >1 and this was supported by the point of inflexion on the scree plot. These two components explained 58.80% of the variance. The Pattern and Structure Matrix for the ODQ-ID are found in Table 1. The five items within component one relate to denial of negative attributes within the context of social interaction (e.g. endorsing that you are very much fair or polite to other people), while the three items that clustered within component two appeared to represent being untrustworthy (e.g. do you always keep your promises).

The internal consistency was moderate for the SDQ-ID at both Time 1, $\alpha = .71$, and Time 2, $\alpha = .73$. The internal consistency of the Positive Self Representation subscale was moderate at Time 1, $\alpha = .76$, and Time 2, $\alpha = .68$, as was the case for the Denial of Intrusive Thoughts subscale at Time 1, $\alpha = .67$, and Time 2, $\alpha = .77$, bearing in mind that these subscales contain only three items. Test-retest reliability was found to be good for the SDQ-ID, $ICC_{(82)} = .76$. The internal consistency was good for the ODQ-ID at Time 1, $\alpha = .81$, and Time 2, $\alpha = .84$. Cronbach's α for the Denial of Negative Social Interaction subscale was good at Time 1, $\alpha = .85$, and at Time 2, $\alpha = .80$. For the Untrustworthiness subscale, the internal consistency was moderate at

Time 1, $\alpha = .66$, and Time 2, $\alpha = .63$, again considering that this subscale contains three items. The test-retest reliability was found to be moderate for the SDQ-ID, $ICC_{(84)} = .61$.

3.2 Aim Two: The relationship between social desirability and general intellectual functioning.

There was a significant negative correlation between Full Scale IQ and Total Score on the SDQ-ID, $r_{(86)} = -.38$, $p < .001$, BC_a 95% CI [-.55, -.21], and the ODQ-ID, $r_{(86)} = -.45$, $p < .001$, BC_a 95% CI [-.60, -.30] at Time 1. There was also a significant positive correlation between the SDQ-ID and the ODQ-ID, $r_{(86)} = .43$, $p < .001$, BC_a 95% CI [.23, .61]. Fifteen percent of the variance in SDQ-ID total score was explained by Full Scale IQ, $F(1, 84) = 14.58$, $p < .001$, BC_a 95% CI [-.50, -.02], while 21% of the variance in ODQ-ID total score was explained by Full Scale IQ, $F(1, 87) = 23.58$, $p < .001$, BC_a 95% CI [-.08, -.04] within the entire sample.

3.3 Aim 3: Group Comparisons

There was a significant main effect of Group for the SDQ-ID Total Score, $F(2, 93) = 8.59$, $p < .001$. Posthoc testing revealed that the IDs Group scored significantly higher than both the Offender Group, $p = .02$, BC_a 95% CI [-1.93, -.19], and the No-IDs Group, $p < .001$, BC_a 95% CI [-2.37, -.89], while there was no significant difference between the Offender and No-IDs Group on the SDQ-ID Total Score, $p = 0.08$, BC_a 95% CI [-.05, 1.19]. Turning to the two subscales on the SDQ-ID, there was a significant difference between the groups on the Positive Self Representation subscale, $F(1, 93) = 17.64$, $p < .001$, but not the Denial of Intrusive Thoughts subscale, $F(1, 93)$, $p = .53$. On the Positive Self Representation subscale, the IDs Group scored significantly higher than the Offender Group, $p = .005$, BC_a 95% CI [1.34, 1.92], and the No-IDs Group, $p < .001$, BC_a 95% CI [1.04, 1.92], while the Offender Group

scored significantly higher than the No-IDs Group, $p = .001$, BC_a 95% CI [.33, 1.03], Table 2.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Turning to the ODQ-ID, there was a significant difference between the three groups on the Total Score, $F(2, 96) = 12.27$, $p < .001$. Posthoc testing revealed that the IDs Group scored significantly higher than the Offender Group, $p = .03$, BC_a 95% CI [.14, 2.55], and the No-IDs Group, $p < .001$, BC_a 95% CI [1.86, 3.97]. The Offenders Group also scored significantly higher than the No-IDs Group, $p = .001$, BC_a 95% CI [.69, 2.49]. There was also a significant difference between the three groups on the Denial of Negative Social Interaction subscale, $F(2, 96) = 16.11$, $p < .001$. Again, posthoc testing revealed that the IDs Group scored significantly higher than the Offender Group, $p = .007$, BC_a 95% CI [.32, 1.60], and the No-IDs Group, $p < .001$, BC_a 95% CI [1.60, 2.96]. The Offenders Group also scored significantly higher than the No-IDs Group, $p = .001$, BC_a 95% CI [.55, 1.74]. Regarding the Untrustworthiness subscale, there was no significant difference between the groups, $F(2, 96) = 2.58$, $p = .08$. However, posthoc testing revealed that the IDs Group scored significant higher than the No-IDs Group, $p = .03$, BC_a 95% CI [.06, 1.18], while the remaining differences between the groups were not significant, Table 2.

Controlling for Full Scale IQ, all of the differences between the three groups on the SDQ-ID and the ODQ-ID, and associated subscales, were not significant, $p > .05$.

Discussion

The first aim of the study was to investigate the component structure and psychometric properties of the two questionnaires. The findings suggest that the SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID have a robust component structure and promising psychometric properties; the two instruments are also now much shorter. Gudjonsson (1990) previously completed a PCA with the original versions of the SDQ and the ODQ. He reported that the SDQ had a six factor structure, while the ODQ had eight factors, all with Eigenvalues of >1 . He reported on only the first three components of each questionnaire, noting that some items did not load on these three components. No attempt was made to reduce the number of items in an attempt to improve the component structure, but there are similarities between the components reported by Gudjonsson's (1990) and that found within the current study. For example, he noted that the components within the SDQ addressed the denial of negative emotional states, aggressive thoughts and sexual feelings, while within the current study, the two components measured reflect attempts to present oneself favourably or the denial of intrusive thoughts which have an aggressive theme. For the ODQ, Gudjonsson (1990) reported that the components within the ODQ reflected truthfulness and honesty, along with respect and reliability towards others. This is similar to the two components found within the current analysis which reflect the denial of interacting with others in a negative manner (e.g. being unreliable or unfair to others), and being truthful (e.g. always keeping a promise).

The second aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between social desirability and Full Scale IQ. The findings are similar to Langdon et al. (2010b), both self-deception and other-deception were significantly negatively associated with IQ; that is, as IQ increased, levels of social desirability decreased. This supports

previous research that has found people with an IDs have higher levels of social desirability and emphasises the need to consider social desirability in clinical interviews and when administering questionnaires in services working with IDs populations.

The final aim of the study was to undertake group comparisons. Ignoring the relationship between Full Scale IQ and the questionnaires, the results indicated that those with IDs and no history of criminal offending scored the highest on the SDQ-ID and the ODQ-ID, and some of the subscales. Offenders with IDs tended to score lower than those with IDs and no history of illegal behaviour, while those without IDs scored the lowest overall. It is worth noting that the offenders included in this sample had a significantly higher Full Scale IQ, than those with IDs and no such history. It was expected that there would be no difference between the three groups when Full Scale IQ was controlled in the analysis, and this was supported by the analysis.

There are some limitations associated with this study that are important to acknowledge. First, the sample size was modest and therefore the results need to be interpreted with caution. However, the KMO measures of sample adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity indicated that the sample was adequate for PCA. Second, those with lower IQs required more assistance from the researcher completing the measures (e.g. reading certain questions). It is likely that this would have increased social desirability compared to those who completed the measures individually. Third, it would be helpful in future research to have both IDs groups more closely matched in terms of IQ scores.

The SDQ-ID and ODQ-ID seem to be appropriate measures for assessing social desirability amongst people with IDs. That is, it is recommended that these measures be used with people with IDs to assist practitioners and researchers in ascertaining levels of social desirability, bearing in mind the relationship between social desirability and general intellectual functioning. For the future, ideally, a larger sample of people with IDs who do and do not have a history of criminal offending should be invited to complete the questionnaires. The two samples should be more closely matched on Full Scale IQ. This would allow the component structure reported within the current study to be confirmed.

Table 1.

Pattern and structure matrix for the SDQ-ID and the ODQ-ID

	Pattern Matrix		Structure Matrix	
<u>SDQ-ID</u>				
	1	2	1	2
Item 4: Have you ever felt like you wanted to kill somebody?	-.10	.80	.10	.78
Item 8: Have you ever made a fool of yourself?	.78	.02	.78	.22
Item 15: Do you have sexual fantasies?	.81	.02	.82	.23
Item 17: Have you ever thought that you weren't very good at sex?	.87	-.04	.86	.18
Item 19: Have you ever wanted to rape someone or be raped by someone?	-.00	.80	.20	.80
Item 20: Have you ever thought about killing yourself to get even with someone?	.16	.73	.35	.77
<u>ODQ-ID</u>				
Item 2: Do you know a lot about the things you talk about?	.21	.70	.45	.77
Item 5: Are you honest?	.59	.29	.70	.50
Item 6: Do you keep a promise, if you are going to do something, no matter how difficult it might be?	.19	.67	.42	.73
Item 7: When you say you are too sick, is it always really true?	-.19	.83	.09	.77
Item 11: Do you like all the people you know?	.81	-.14	.77	.14
Item 13: Are all of your habits nice and good ones?	.74	.06	.76	.32
Item 18: Are you fair to other people?	.63	.27	.72	.49
Item 19: Are you polite and understanding towards others?	.77	-.10	.74	.17

Note: SDQ-ID = Self-Deception Questionnaire-Intellectual Disabilities; ODQ-ID = Other-Deception Questionnaire-Intellectual Disabilities

Table 2.

Mean and standard deviation across Groups and Time for the SDQ-ID, ODQ-ID and subscales.

	Group	Time 1	Time 2
<u>SDQ-ID</u>			
Positive Self Representation	Offender Group	.81 (1.02)	.74 (0.93)
	IDs Group	1.61 (1.20)	1.70 (1.10)
	No-IDs Group	.14 (.36)	.19 (.49)
Denial of Intrusive Thoughts	Offender Group	2.08 (1.09)	2.16 (1.18)
	IDs Group	2.35 (.98)	2.70 (.74)
	No-IDs Group	2.17 (.90)	2.30 (.99)
Total Score	Offender Group	2.89 (1.62)	2.90 (1.74)
	IDs Group	3.97 (1.89)	4.41 (1.47)
	No-IDs Group	2.32 (.94)	2.50 (1.11)
<u>ODQ-ID</u>			
Denial of Negative Social Interaction	Offender Group	2.02 (1.80)	2.00 (1.93)
	IDs Group	3.19 (1.74)	2.85 (1.68)
	No-IDs Group	.89 (.74)	.96 (1.03)
Untrustworthiness	Offender Group	1.20 (1.09)	1.29 (1.24)
	IDs Group	1.39 (1.14)	1.26 (.90)
	No-IDs Group	.75 (1.07)	0.50 (.81)
Total Score	Offender Group	3.23 (2.49)	3.29 (2.97)
	IDs Group	4.58 (2.59)	4.11 (2.17)
	No-IDs Group	1.64 (1.42)	1.46 (1.97)

Note: SDQ-ID = Self-Deception Questionnaire-Intellectual Disabilities; ODQ-ID = Other-Deception Questionnaire-Intellectual Disabilities

References

- Andrews, P., & Meyer, R. G. (2003). Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale and Short Form: forensic norms. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 59, 483-492.
- Balla, D., & Zigler, E. (1979). Personality development in retarded persons. In N. R. Ellis (Ed.), *Handbook of Mental Deficiency: Psychology Theory and Research* (pp. 143-168). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Coolican, H. (2004). *Research methods and statistics in psychology*. Abingdon: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Gudjonsson, G. H. (1990). Self-deception and other deception in forensic assessment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 219-225.
- Gudjonsson, G. H., & Moore, E. (2001). Self-deception and other-deception among admissions to a maximum security hospital and a medium secure unit. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 7, 25-31.
- Johnson, T. P., & Fendrick, M. (2005). Modeling sources of self-report bias in a survey of drug use epidemiology. *Annals of Epidemiology*, 15, 381-389.
- Keeling, J. A., Rose, J. L., & Beech, A. R. (2007). Comparing sexual offender treatment efficacy: Mainstream sexual offenders and sexual offenders with special needs. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*, 32, 117-124.
- King, M., & Bruner, G. (2000). Social desirability bias: a neglected aspect of validity testing. *Psychology and Marketing*, 17, 79-103.
- Langdon, P. E., Clare, I. C. H., & Murphy, G. H. (2010a). Developing an understanding of the literature relating to the moral development of people with intellectual disabilities. *Developmental Review*, 30, 273-293.
- Langdon, P. E., Clare, I. C. H., & Murphy, G. H. (2010b). Measuring social desirability amongst men with intellectual disabilities: The psychometric properties of the Self- and Other-Deception Questionnaire-Intellectual Disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 31, 1601-1608.
- Langdon, P. E., Clare, I. C. H., & Murphy, G. H. (2011). Moral reasoning theory and illegal behaviour by adults with intellectual disabilities. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 17, 101 - 115.
- Langdon, P. E., Murphy, G. H., Clare, I. C. H., & Palmer, E. J. (2010c). The psychometric properties of the Socio-Moral Reflection Measure – Short Form and the Moral Theme Inventory for men with and without intellectual disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 31, 1204-1215.
- Langdon, P. E., Murphy, G. H., Clare, I. C. H., Palmer, E. J., & Rees, J. (2013). An evaluation of the EQUIP treatment programme with men who have intellectual or other developmental disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 26, 167-180.
- Langdon, P. E., Murphy, G. H., Clare, I. C. H., Steverson, T., & Palmer, E. J. (2011). Relationships among moral reasoning, empathy and distorted cognitions amongst men with intellectual disabilities and a history of criminal offending. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 116, 438-456.
- McEwan, T. E., Davis, M. R., MacKenzie, R., & Mullen, P. E. (2009). The effects of social desirability response bias on STAXI-2 profiles in a clinical forensic sample. *Br J Clin Psychol*, 48, 431-436.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of social desirability responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 598-609.

- Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Paulhus Deception Scales. North Tonawanda, NY: Mental Health Systems, Inc.
- Sackeim, H. A., & Gur, R. C. (1979). Self-deception, other-deception, and self-reported psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 47, 213-215.
- Small, D. M. (1995). Depressive symptomatology in learning disabled and non-learning disabled adolescents. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences*, 56(1-A), 0147.
- Stenfert Kroese, B. (1998). Cognitive-behavioural therapy for people with learning disabilities. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 26, 315-322.
- Sturmey, P. (2007). Psychopathology: depression, anxiety and related disorders. *International Review of Research in Mental Retardation*, 34, 197-226.
- Tan, L., & Grace, R. C. (2008). Social desirability and sexual offenders: a review. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of research and Treatment*, 20, 61-87.
- van de Mortel, T. (2008). Faking it: social desirability response bias in self-report research. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25, 40-48.
- Wechsler, D. (1998). WAIS-III (UK): Administration and scoring manual. London: The Psychological Corporation.