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Importance of this Study

• Inmates with ID are at risk for victimization, misconduct, and legal right violation
• Assessing adaptive functioning in correctional facilities is challenging:
  • Resource and time constraints
  • Limited availability of reliable collateral informants
• Clear need for brief, performance-based measures of adaptive functioning

(Drizin & Leo, 2004; O’Connell et al., 2005; Petersilia, 1997; Scheyett et al., 2009)
Problems in Everyday Living Test (PEDL)

- 14-item problem-solving measure
- Interviewer administered (5-10 min)
- What an individual would do in a range of different situations (0 to 2 scale)
- Adaptive functioning as it existed in the community
  - *Identify inmates who are motivated to mask their disabilities to avoid stigma or victimization*
- Only two studies have examined the PEDL
- No established cut-score for identifying deficits in adaptive functioning

(Beatty et al., 1998)
Method & Participants

- Assessment battery designed to identify ID
- 119 Jail detainees in Rikers Island MH units (NYC)
- 5 excluded because TOMM Trial 2 < 35
- Males 108 (94.7%)
- Age 38.6 years (11.24)
- Education 11 years (1.89)
- Race/Ethnicity AA (47.4%)
- Special ed. 39 (34.2%)
- FSIQ $M=80.8$ ($SD=14.4$, range=53-128)
- TOMM (T2) $M=47.7$ ($SD=3.6$, range=37-50)
Results

• PEDL Total Score: $M=18.86$ ($SD=4.05$, range=1-28)

• PEDL Internal Consistency
  • 14-item PEDL $\alpha=.652$
  • 3 items removed $\alpha=.698$

• PEDL Correlates
  • FSIQ $r=.50; p<.001$
  • Age $r=.26; p<.01$
  • Special ed. $r=.20; p<.05$
  • Employment $r=.24; p<.05$
  • Education $r=.15; p=.11$
  • Live independently $r=.16; p=.12$
ROC Curve

- $AUC = .709 \quad 95\% \text{ CI } [.589, .829] \quad p < .001$
- Cutoff = 17.5 \quad Sensitivity = .761 \quad Specificity = .577
Study Limitations & Future Directions

- **Limitations**
  - Relatively small sample size
  - Only mental health units
  - Volunteers
  - No adaptive functioning comparison measure

- **Future Directions**
  - Non correctional samples
  - Determine optimal cut-scores to identify deficits in adaptive functioning
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