

Training staff to promote self-management in people with intellectual disabilities

Janice Sandjojo^{1,2,3}  | Aglaia M. E. E. Zedlitz^{1,2} | Winifred A. Gebhardt^{1,2} |
Joop Hoekman⁴ | Elise Dusseldorp⁵ | Jeanet A. den Haan³ | Andrea W. M. Evers^{1,2,6}

¹Health, Medical and Neuropsychology Unit, Institute of Psychology, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

²Leiden Institute for Brain and Cognition (LIBC), Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

³Raamwerk, Noordwijkerhout, The Netherlands

⁴Clinical Child and Adolescent Studies, Institute of Education and Child studies, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

⁵Methodology and Statistics Unit, Institute of Psychology, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

⁶Department of Psychiatry, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

Correspondence

Janice Sandjojo, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Institute of Psychology, Health, Medical and Neuropsychology Unit, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Email: j.sandjojo@fsw.leidenuniv.nl

Funding information

Funding for the study was provided by Raamwerk. This funding had no influence on the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data; on the writing of the report; or on the decision to submit the article for publication.

Background: People with intellectual disabilities have increasing difficulties managing their daily affairs. This study examined the effectiveness of a staff training, which teaches staff to promote self-management in people with intellectual disabilities.

Method: Effectiveness was assessed with questionnaires addressing clients' ($n = 26$) independence and self-reliance, support needs and challenging behaviour, using a pre-posttest control group design. Additionally, focus groups were conducted with trained staff members 6 months after the training.

Results: In the long term, the intervention group showed a significant increase in independence and self-reliance, in contrast to the comparison group. No effect was found on support needs and challenging behaviour. Trained staff members reported limited benefits of the training, but had noticed changes in their attitude and method of working afterwards.

Conclusions: Further self-management research is required to investigate how independence and self-reliance can be promoted more effectively in this population. Future trainings should carefully consider their content, format, and implementation.

KEYWORDS

independence, intellectual disabilities, self-management, self-reliance, staff training, support need

1 | INTRODUCTION

People with intellectual disabilities commonly have difficulties managing their own affairs (Sigafoos et al., 2005; Van Laarhoven & Van Laarhoven-Myers, 2006). This can pertain to many aspects of daily living, from taking care of their personal hygiene and their household, to dealing with social interactions and employment (Dusseljee, Rijken, Cardol, Curfs, & Groenewegen, 2011; Smith, Shepley, Alexander, & Ayres, 2015; Van Laarhoven & Van Laarhoven-Myers, 2006). Therefore, people with intellectual disabilities often have to rely on

others (Hale, Trip, Whitehead, & Conder, 2011; Vilaseca et al., 2017). This does not only pose everyday challenges for these individuals, but also for their families and health care providers.

While there is a growing view that people with intellectual disabilities should participate as fully as other members of society (Netherlands Institute for Social Research, 2014; Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, 2005; United Nations, 2006), our society is also becoming more complex. Social developments, such as higher demands at work and the digitalisation of our society, are considered a main explanation for the increasing difficulty of people with intellectual

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2018 The Authors. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities* Published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd

disabilities to function independently (Netherlands Institute for Social Research, 2014). Partially as a result of these developments, the demand for care for people with intellectual disabilities has grown considerably over the past few years in several north western European countries (Netherlands Institute for Social Research, 2014). Possibly related to this, the costs for the care for people with intellectual disabilities have greatly increased as well (Van der Kwartel, 2013) and support staff experience increasing difficulties to meet the care needs of their clients (Hermsen, Embregts, Hendriks, & Frielink, 2014). As different countries have different, and sometimes restricted, budgets and care systems, this could mean that people with intellectual disabilities do not always have sufficient access to the increasing amount of care they need. Altogether, this requires support staff to focus on promoting self-management in people with intellectual disabilities, in order to make them more independent and self-reliant (Ferretti, Cavalier, Murphy, & Murphy, 1993; Netherlands Institute for Social Research, 2014).

Broadly, self-management refers to a variety of activities that are related to deliberately changing or maintaining behaviours in order to achieve self-selected outcomes (Browder & Shapiro, 1985). It can be seen as an overarching term, related to concepts such as self-determination, autonomy, independence and self-reliance. Self-determination and autonomy are centred around having personal control over making choices and decisions in order to lead one's life according to one's own preferences, free from external influences (e.g., Tonkens & Weijers, 1999; Wehmeyer, Kelchner, & Richards, 1996). Independence and self-reliance involve abilities to take actions to manage one's own affairs and to provide for oneself, thereby relying on one's own efforts, resources, judgement and abilities, without requiring help and support from others. Self-management thus includes the former, making self-selected choices, and the latter, having the capacities to shape one's own behaviour in order to achieve the personally desired outcomes.

Previous research on self-management in people with intellectual disabilities has focused mainly on specific behaviours or domains. For instance, various studies have concentrated on health behaviour (e.g., Hale et al., 2011; Taggart et al., 2015; Wilson & Goodman, 2011; Young, Naji, & Kroll, 2012), work-related activities (Rusch & Dattilo, 2012; Storey, 2007), challenging behaviour (e.g., Adkins, Singh, Winton, McKeegan, & Singh, 2010; Benson, 1994; Embregts, 2003; Rossiter, Hunnisett, & Pulsford, 1998), self-instruction (e.g., Smith et al., 2015, 2016) and the use of technology (Douglas, Ayres, & Langone, 2015; Ramdoss et al., 2012). What is valuable for people with intellectual disabilities in terms of self-management is that they learn to do more by themselves, thereby becoming more independent and self-reliant. This is important, as this could enhance their overall quality of life and their participation and inclusion as equal and valued co-citizens (Dollar, Fredrick, Alberto, & Luke, 2012; Sigafos et al., 2005), which could lead to reductions in behavioural problems (García-Villamisar, Dattilo, & Matson, 2013). Furthermore, it could decrease their demand for professional care and the burden that is experienced by family members (Dawson et al., 2016; Vilaseca et al., 2017).

So far, little self-management research has been directed at improving overall independence and self-reliance in people with intellectual disabilities. However, several studies have focused on teaching

individual skills to people with intellectual disabilities that would lead to improvements in these domains, such as teaching safety skills (Dixon, Bergstrom, Smith, & Tarbox, 2010; Mechling, Gast, & Gustafson, 2009; Wright & Wolery, 2011), food preparation (Graves, Collins, & Schuster, 2005; Lancioni & O'Reilly, 2002) and setting the table (Cannella-Malone et al., 2006; Goodson, Sigafos, O'Reilly, Cannella, & Lancioni, 2007). A few intervention studies from the field of occupational therapy have also been conducted, which focused on (instrumental) activities of daily living (Hällgren & Kottorp, 2005; Kottorp, Hällgren, Bernspång, & Fisher, 2003; McInerney & McInerney, 1992). Although they showed some promising results, limitations such as a small sample size and a limited number of trained activities impede the generalisability of the findings. Whether these approaches would also be effective and applicable to promoting overall independence and self-reliance has not been investigated.

There is also a lack of research focusing on how support staff can be trained to improve their clients' level of independence and self-reliance. If support staff stimulate clients to do things themselves, instead of taking over, this could reduce clients' dependency, passivity, and "learned helplessness" (Sigafos et al., 2005), regardless of whether someone has a mild or severe intellectual disability (Ramdoss et al., 2012). Several studies have investigated person-centred active support, an approach directed at active engagement and participation in meaningful activities (e.g., Beadle-Brown, Hutchinson, & Whelton, 2012; Mansell, Elliott, Beadle-Brown, Ashman, & Macdonald, 2002; Riches et al., 2011). Although this approach could enhance the ability of people with intellectual disabilities to manage (parts of) tasks independently, it is not its primary aim. What staff can do to effectively target overall independence and self-reliance has not been studied. In general, research on staff training in the field of intellectual disabilities has put forward the importance of practice leadership. Good practice leadership can lead to better implementation of a staff training, as a practice leader enables, encourages, coaches and reviews staff in order to ensure good support (Beadle-Brown, Bigby, & Bould, 2015). Coaching was also found to be important in a meta-analysis by Van Oorsouw, Embregts, Bosman, and Jahoda (2009). They found that the most effective way to change client behaviour through staff training was by adding coaching-on-the-job and verbal feedback to classroom trainings. With adding an on-the-job component, it becomes more likely that performance of target skills acquired during a training will generalise to the regular work situation (Parsons, Rollyson, & Reid, 2012). Whether practice leadership and coaching-on-the-job are also essential for training staff to promote self-management is yet unknown.

The current study is the first to evaluate the effectiveness of a staff training aimed at promoting overall self-management of people with intellectual disabilities. The methodology of the training is called "On Your Own Two Feet" (Scholten & Schuurman, 2008) and is based on the method of Feuerstein (Feuerstein, Rand, & Rynders, 1993) and the "Own Initiative Model" (Timmer & De Vries, 2014). Inspired by Seligman's positive psychology (Seligman, 2002), staff are taught to focus on clients' abilities, instead of disabilities, and on expanding these abilities. By letting clients perform tasks that are within their

zone of proximal development, they facilitate their learning process (Vygotski, 1964). According to the methodology, staff need to encourage clients to think and handle things themselves. This approach thus targets clients' general problem solving skills by teaching them to find the answers to their own questions, which could also help them become more independent and self-reliant (Mastropieri, Scruggs, & Shiah, 1997; Smith et al., 2016). The idea is that teaching such a pivotal skill as general problem solving, is more efficient than teaching someone a specific skill, since it could generalise more easily to untrained skills (Smith et al., 2015).

The primary aim of the current study was to investigate whether the staff training "On Your Own Two Feet" (Scholten & Schuurman, 2008), which promotes self-management, was effective in increasing the level of independence and self-reliance of people with intellectual disabilities and whether it would decrease the amount of required support. It was also hypothesised that the training would reduce the occurrence of behavioural problems. The secondary aim of the study was to explore the opinions of trained staff members regarding the effectiveness of the training.

2 | METHOD

2.1 | Procedure

The Medical Ethics Committee of the Leiden University Medical Center evaluated the study protocol and declared that no formal medical ethical approval nor written informed consent was required, because the study did not fall under the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act. All participating people with intellectual disabilities, their legal representatives and support staff were informed about the study beforehand. People with intellectual disabilities and their legal representatives were informed by letter and were invited to an information meeting. Staff were informed during team meetings. They were notified that all data would be handled confidentially and anonymously for the purpose of a scientific study and publication. They were given the opportunity to ask questions for further clarification. People with intellectual disabilities or their legal representatives could decline participation. If someone would have objected to participation, the person in question would have been excluded from the study. However, no one declined. As this study was conducted in collaboration with Raamwerk, a health care organisation in Noordwijkerhout, the Netherlands, data collection took place at this location. Preceding the training sessions (T0), questionnaires about the participating people with intellectual disabilities were filled in. This was repeated 3 (T1) and 6 months (T2) after the training.

In addition, 6 months after the training, focus groups were held with trained staff members to evaluate the training and to see whether they had experienced any changes in the past half year. Trained staff members were informed about the focus groups during their team meeting and were asked to participate on a voluntary basis. They were told beforehand that the data from the focus groups would be handled confidentially and anonymously, and that it would be used for the

publication of a scientific study. Participation occurred during work hours.

2.2 | Staff training

In total, 28 staff members (11 men and 17 women) received the training in promoting self-management. They worked either as support staff in group homes ($n = 17$) or day care services ($n = 10$), or as a remedial educationalist ($n = 1$). Their ages ranged from 23.24 to 59.24 years (mean [M] age = 33.26; standard deviation [SD] = 9.47), the years of work experience with people with intellectual disabilities varied from 2 to 20 years ($M = 9.45$; $SD = 4.29$). They were divided into three groups that received the training on three different occasions. The training was provided by professional trainers who were instructed by the developers of the training and who all had experience in the field of intellectual disabilities.

The training that was provided is called "On Your Own Two Feet" ("Op Eigen Benen" in Dutch) and is developed and described in greater detail by Scholten and Schuurman (2008). During the two consecutive days of the classroom training, lasting about 12 hr in total, staff are provided with a theoretical framework of the methodology and participate in exercises and role-play to practice different techniques. They start with evaluating and discussing their current attitudes and ways of providing support when working with people with ID, by means of a self-report questionnaire. Next, the philosophy behind the methodology is explained, which is based on the method of Feuerstein (Feuerstein et al., 1993), the "Own Initiative Model" (Timmer & De Vries, 2014), positive psychology (Seligman, 2002) and the zone of proximal development (Vygotski, 1964). The ideology concerns looking at people with intellectual disabilities as unique individuals and having a positive attitude towards them by focusing on each person's strengths, capacities, abilities to learn and way of learning. This is illustrated by an exercise to show that each individual has his or her own talents and that an individual approach is therefore necessary. In another exercise, staff are trained to rephrase difficult behaviours in a positive way.

The role of staff also forms an important part of the training. Staff are taught to adopt the role of a coach or a mediator, who encourages people with intellectual disabilities to think, find out, and do things for themselves, instead of taking over or telling them what to do. It is explained how they can promote self-management in their clients, which is practised with a role-playing exercise on coaching people towards the proper execution of a task by asking them questions, while not giving away the answers. Staff are also taught to build on an individual's existing strengths, interests, knowledge and abilities to stimulate learning and development. This can be achieved by letting clients perform tasks for which they still need some assistance and letting them discover themselves how to execute something. This is also practised with various exercises that teach staff how to connect to another person's knowledge, skills and style of learning in order to adapt their way of coaching. Attention is also paid to the importance of fostering self-worth and building an equal, trusting and respectful relationship with clients. Toward the end of the training, the changes in the attitude and

TABLE 1 Descriptive statistics of participant groups

	Intervention group (<i>n</i> = 15)	Comparison group (<i>n</i> = 11)
Male, <i>n</i> (%)	8 (53.3)	8 (72.7)
Age in years, <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	31.1 (9.9)	35.8 (11.1)
Level of intellectual disability, <i>n</i>		
Borderline	1	2
Mild	11	6
Moderate	2	3
Severe	1	
Full Scale IQ, <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	61.3 (8.5)	61.6 (11.3)
Psychiatric comorbidity, <i>n</i>		
Autism spectrum disorder	6	2
Other	6	5

role of staff throughout various phases of learning are also addressed. Where providing safety and trust are important in the initial stage of learning, as clients progress, it becomes more important for staff to step back and provide room for their clients to experiment. Finally, it is discussed that it is important to support the transfer of learnt skills to daily life and to include the social network of clients.

2.3 | Primary research question

2.3.1 | Participants

Raamwerk selected three group homes for people with intellectual disabilities whose support staff would receive the training in promoting self-management. The participants of the intervention group were thus selected by means of purposive sampling. This intervention group consisted of 15 people with intellectual disabilities. Between T1 and T2, three of these people moved away and therefore dropped out of the study. The comparison group was put together by two remedial educationalists of Raamwerk, who selected people with intellectual disabilities that were as comparable as possible to the intervention group with respect to the level of the intellectual disability, age and gender. This group consisted of 11 people with intellectual disabilities, living in four different group homes whose support staff were not trained. Descriptive statistics of the participants are presented in Table 1. Diagnostic information was obtained from their electronic client records.

2.4 | Measurements

2.4.1 | Independence and self-reliance

The Social Functioning Scale for the Mentally Retarded (SFSMR; Kraijer, Kema, & De Bildt, 2004) was used, which consists of 31 items addressing several components of independent functioning and self-reliance at home and in social situations (e.g., getting dressed, setting

the table, cleaning up, language expression). Items can be rated on four levels, objectively reflecting what a participant currently does by himself, with higher scores indicating better functioning. The raw total scores were used for the analyses, which could range from 0 to 124. The questionnaire was filled in by the client's personal tutor, together with either the remedial educationalist or another staff member who frequently worked with the participant at home or at day care. The questionnaire is widely used in Dutch health care organisations for people with intellectual disabilities. The psychometric properties of the questionnaire regarding both the reliability and construct and criterion validity have been found to be good (Egberink, Janssen, & Vermeulen, 2004).

2.4.2 | Support needs

To evaluate the support needs of the participating people with intellectual disabilities, the Dutch version of the Supports Intensity Scale (SIS; Thompson et al., 2010) was used. The SIS was only filled in at T0 and T2, since we only expected an effect on support needs in the long term. The SIS is a semi-structured interview that assesses the intensity of support that an individual with an intellectual disability requires to successfully perform several activities. Section 1 of the SIS includes 49 activities that are grouped into six domains; home living, community living, lifelong learning, employment, health and safety and social activities. Section 2 consists of eight items that address protection and advocacy. For the analyses, the sum of the raw total score of Sections 1 and 2 was used, which could range from 0 to 655. The SIS was administered by a trained interviewer who obtained the required information from two respondents who knew the person with the intellectual disability well. This always included the client's personal tutor, together with either the remedial educationalist or another staff member who frequently worked with the client at home or at day care. Respondents had to answer whether their client would require support when having to successfully perform a certain activity, and if so, how frequent, how long and what kind of support would be needed. The more support is needed, the higher the score on the SIS. Several studies have demonstrated the reliability and validity of the SIS (Claes, Van Hove, van Loon, Vandeveldel, & Schalock, 2009).

2.4.3 | Behavioural problems

The Dutch version of the Developmental Behaviour Checklist (DBC; Koot & Dekker, 2001) was filled in by the client's personal tutor to assess the occurrence of emotional and behavioural problems. These concerned disruptive/antisocial, self-absorbed, communication, anxiety and social problems. In this questionnaire, 95 items are rated on a 3-point scale, indicating the frequency of occurrence of a particular type of behaviour (0 = not at all, 1 = a little or sometimes and 2 = clearly, often). The raw total score was used for the analyses, with higher scores reflecting more behavioural problems. This score could range from 0 to 190. Although the questionnaire is aimed at minors with intellectual disabilities, it has been

TABLE 2 Descriptive statistics for total raw scores on the questionnaires for participant groups

	Intervention group			Comparison group		
	T0 (n = 15)	T1 (n = 15)	T2 (n = 12)	T0 (n = 11)	T1 (n = 11)	T2 (n = 11)
SFSMR ^a , M (SD)	105.7 (11.6)	109.1 (9.3)	108.5 (10.1)	112.1 (9.9)	111.9 (11.1)	111.0 (11.9)
SIS ^b Section 1 + 2, M (SD)	284.9 (82.9)		295.2 (63.8)	303.7 (96.7)		291.9 (95.2)
DBC ^c , M (SD)	33.2 (15.6)	34.3 (9.5)	33.0 (11.8)	33.3 (27.0)	35.9 (27.4)	36.8 (24.0)

^aSocial Functioning Scale for the Mentally Retarded.

^bSupports Intensity Scale.

^cDevelopmental Behaviour Checklist.

used in previous research on adults with intellectual disabilities (Van Wouwe & Simons, 2013). Both the reliability and construct validity of the questionnaire were rated as satisfactory (Dekker, Nunn, Einfeld, Tonge, & Koot, 2002; Dekker, Nunn, & Koot, 2002; Egberink, Janssen, & Vermeulen, 2007).

2.5 | Statistical analysis

A pre-test/post-test follow-up control group design was used to study whether the staff training in promoting self-management had an effect on the level of self-reliance, the support needs, and the occurrence of behavioural problems of people with intellectual disabilities. The data was analysed with IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 23.0. Descriptive statistics were used to summarise the characteristics of the groups at baseline. The groups were compared by means of an independent samples *t* test and Chi-squared tests. The total scores of the questionnaires used for the analyses were normally distributed (*z*-scores of skewness and kurtosis <3.0) per measurement per group, except for the scores of the comparison group on the DBC at T0 and for the scores of the intervention group on the DBC at T2. There was one outlier (>3 SD) in the data of the DBC. Analyses were performed with and without this outlier.

Longitudinal multilevel analyses were conducted to examine the differences between the groups in the scores on the three different questionnaires. This type of analysis accounts for missing data. We included a random intercept and the fixed factor of group. In addition, for the analysis of the SFSMR and the DBC, two dummy variables for time were created (Time 1 and Time 2), representing the short term (T1 versus T0) and long term (T2 versus T0), respectively. Only for these two questionnaires, to analyse the short- and long-term effects of the staff training, the interaction terms (i.e., cross-products) between group and each of the two dummy variables for time were included. For the SIS, only one post-test was available, therefore the two dummy variables for time were not used, but merely the fixed factor of time and the interaction between group and time.

Given the small sample size, non-parametric Mann-Whitney tests were conducted as well on the difference scores between T1 and T0 (only for the SFSMR and DBC) and T2 and T0, in order to check whether the results from the longitudinal multilevel analyses could be confirmed.

2.6 | Secondary research question

2.6.1 | Focus groups

To further evaluate the staff training in promoting self-management, two focus groups were held with trained staff members of Raamwerk 6 months after the training. Unlike individual interviews and surveys, focus groups use group interaction to generate a better understanding of not only *what* people think, but also *how* they think and *why* they think that way. It is a particularly useful method for exploring people's knowledge, attitude and experiences, and for gaining insight into behaviour, organisational issues and needs (Kitzinger, 1995; Krueger & Casey, 2015). One focus group was with support staff working in the group homes that were part of the training ($n = 6$; 1 man and 5 women; mean age = 36.29 ± 12.51 SD). The other focus group was held with trained staff members working in day care services ($n = 7$; 5 men and 2 women; mean age = 33.60 ± 9.33 SD). The addressed topics included what they had learnt from the training and whether they had noticed any changes afterwards in knowledge, attitude, skills and method of working of themselves and their team members. If so, they were asked what might have caused these changes. Moreover, they were asked whether they missed anything within the training. The focus groups were chaired by an independent moderator with experience in the field of intellectual disabilities. The primary researcher (first author) observed both meetings and took notes, but did not actively participate in the discussions. The focus groups were audio-recorded with the participants' consent and were transcribed verbatim.

2.6.2 | Qualitative analysis

For the secondary research question, a qualitative analysis was performed to study the opinions of trained staff members regarding the effectiveness of the staff training in promoting self-management. Analysis of the data took a general inductive approach (Thomas, 2006), using ATLAS.ti 7.5.6 software. The four questions addressed in the focus groups served as a framework for the analysis. Two coders independently listened to the recordings, while reading and coding the transcripts. Discrepancies between coding were discussed until consensus was reached. In case of a remaining disagreement, a senior

TABLE 3 Results of the longitudinal multilevel analysis of the Social Functioning Scale for the Mentally Retarded

	Coefficient (b)	SE	t	F	p-Value	95% confidence interval	
Intercept	112.09	3.13	35.84	1,284.61	.00	105.73	118.46
Group	-6.42	4.12	-1.56	2.43	.13	-14.81	1.96
Time 1 (short-term versus baseline)	-0.18	1.86	-0.10	0.01	.92	-3.91	3.55
Time 2 (long-term versus baseline)	-1.09	1.86	-0.59	0.35	.56	-4.82	2.64
Group * Time 1	3.58	2.44	1.47	2.15	.15	-1.33	8.49
Group * Time 2	6.74	2.54	2.66	7.08	.01*	1.65	11.84

* $p < .05$.

TABLE 4 Results of the longitudinal multilevel analysis of the Supports Intensity Scale

	Coefficient (b)	SE	t	F	p-Value	95% confidence interval	
Intercept	303.73	25.33	11.99	143.74	.00	252.00	355.45
Group	-18.86	33.35	-0.57	0.32	.58	-86.96	49.24
Time	-11.82	15.91	-0.74	0.55	.47	-44.79	21.16
Group * Time	-1.27	21.92	-0.06	0.00	.95	-46.66	44.12

researcher was asked to make a final decision. The definitive codes were analysed and categories were inductively identified based on how extensively codes were discussed.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Baseline characteristics

The intervention group and the comparison group had a similar gender balance and did not differ in age. The level of severity of the intellectual disability, IQ and the presence of comorbid psychiatric diagnoses also did not differ significantly between the groups. Baseline scores on all three questionnaires were not significantly different either. Overall descriptive statistics for both groups per questionnaire per measurement point are presented in Table 2.

3.2 | Effect of the training on independence and self-reliance

Table 3 presents the results of the longitudinal multilevel analysis. There was a significant interaction effect of Group by Time 2. In the long term (T2 versus T0), the intervention group showed a significant increase in the score on the SFSMR, in contrast to the comparison group.

3.3 | Effect of the training on support needs

The results of the longitudinal multilevel analysis of the SIS indicated that there was no Group by Time effect, indicating that the support needs of the intervention group did not significantly differ (from T0 to T2) compared to the comparison group (Table 4).

3.4 | Effect of the training on behavioural problems

The longitudinal multilevel analysis of the DBC did not show a Group by Time effect, which means that there were no significant differences in the occurrence of behavioural problems, neither in the short term nor in the long term. The results that are reported (Table 5) are from the analysis with the outlier included, since there were no differences in terms of statistical significance between the outcomes of the analyses with and without the outlier.

3.5 | Non-parametric tests

In addition to the longitudinal multilevel analyses, non-parametric Mann-Whitney tests were performed to see whether the above-mentioned results could be confirmed. Again, only the difference score on the SFSMR between T2 and T0 differed significantly between the groups, $U = 9.00$, $p < .01$. The difference scores on the DBC, the SIS and the SFSMR between T1 and T0 were not significantly different between the groups (all p -values $> .05$).

3.6 | Focus groups

The content of the focus group discussions were mostly comparable between those working in group homes and those working in day care services. Table 6 summarises the identified categories and lists several illustrative quotes. Overall, according to the trained staff members, the training provided them with little new information. What they had learnt, however was (how) to ask their clients more questions. Although the various teams did not make any new agreements on how to guide their clients after the training, they had noticed several changes since then, especially within the group homes. Some staff

TABLE 5 Results of the longitudinal multilevel analysis of the Developmental Behaviour Checklist

	Coefficient (b)	SE	t	F	p-Value	95% confidence interval	
Intercept	33.34	5.70	5.85	34.18	.00	21.88	44.79
Group	-0.10	7.51	-0.01	0.00	.99	-15.19	14.98
Time 1 (short-term versus baseline)	2.53	5.56	0.46	0.21	.65	-8.65	13.71
Time 2 (long-term versus baseline)	3.43	5.56	0.62	0.38	.54	-7.76	14.61
Group * Time 1	-1.45	7.33	-0.20	0.04	.84	-16.17	13.27
Group * Time 2	-6.33	7.58	-0.84	0.70	.41	-21.56	8.90

TABLE 6 Overview of categories and illustrative quotes from the focus groups

<i>What have you learnt from the training?</i>		
Category	Subcategory	Quotes
Not much new	Little new knowledge	There was little new knowledge obtained.
	Confirmation	To me it was more a confirmation. What was said in the training, yes, that is how we work as well.
Skills	General	Yes, skills have grown, in my opinion.
	Asking questions	With regard to skills, we have learnt questioning techniques.
<i>Have you noticed any changes after the training in knowledge, attitude, skills, method of working?</i>		
Category	Subcategory	Quotes
Awareness	General	I tend to take things over a lot from clients, but I am now more aware that I should do that less frequently.
		We are now more aware that clients can do much more themselves.
Attitude	Focus on abilities	I now focus more on clients' possibilities to develop, which makes my job more fun.
Method of working	Client in control	In our group home, we should sit with our feet up more often, give some guidance, and do nothing more. Just follow them with your hands behind your back. If I look back 6 to 12 months to see whether this has happened, then, yes. Now you can, so to speak, really sit with your feet up on the table and say 'Go ahead, what would you do?'
		We let the client take control more often than before. We dare to let go more often. Less automatic thinking, but listening more to the client, what he wants.
	Taking over	More letting go, letting them think for themselves more, letting them do things themselves more.
Little changes	General	We already did a lot of those things.
	Team agreements	In our group home, little changed. After the training, there was no meeting on how to implement this within the team and in our way of guiding clients.
<i>What might have caused these changes?</i>		
Category	Subcategory	Quotes
Training	Training effect	The awareness has increased because of the training.
	No training effect	I do not think these changes are caused by the training.
<i>Have you missed anything within the training?</i>		
Category	Subcategory	Quotes
Application	Daily practice	Putting it into practice was not discussed that much.
Own case studies	General	It [the training] was more with the use of pictures and case studies, but it is different when you focus on your own client: 'I am running into these difficulties with this client, how can we approach that?'... Everyone from the other group homes can learn from that as well. That is an easier way to help each other and give each other advice than with a picture.
Coaching-on-the-job	General	Shadow me for a day, a couple of hours, and observe how I am doing within my group home.
Techniques	Communication	Yes, conversational techniques. How are you going to motivate clients that find it difficult to devise themselves how to do something, to still find this out themselves?

members attributed these changes to the training, whereas others did not. Changes included a difference in their attitude towards clients and an increased awareness that they should not take over from them but instead focus on what their clients are able to do themselves. Furthermore, many noticed an alteration in their method of working. They listened more carefully to their clients, instead of (automatically) thinking on their behalf. They did not take over tasks from them as much as they used to and they more often dared to let go and let the clients take charge. When asked whether they missed anything within the staff training, additional coaching-on-the-job was mentioned, next to learning new techniques and learning how to apply the training to their own daily practice at work, for example by discussing and practising with their own case studies.

4 | DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to evaluate a training for support staff, which teaches them how to promote self-management in people with intellectual disabilities. Apart from improvements in independence and self-reliance, it was hypothesised that the staff training would lead to reductions in support needs and behavioural problems of people with intellectual disabilities. The main finding of this study was that even though no differences between the intervention and comparison group were found in support needs and behavioural problems, the intervention group showed more improvement in independence and self-reliance in the long term. However, this latter effect was small, and thus overall, it can be concluded that the results only provide limited evidence for the effectiveness of the staff training.

Although various previous studies have found more convincing evidence for the effectiveness of self-management interventions, caution is still in order, for example because of their even smaller sample sizes and the lack of a comparison group (Cannella-Malone et al., 2006; Mechling et al., 2009; Storey, 2007). The heterogeneity of the studies' specific goals, designs and outcome measures also impedes a proper comparison of the interventions and their impact (Dannenberg, Mengoni, Gates, & Durand, 2016). However, important factors for an effective intervention seem to be that it can be adapted to the individual user and the specific context (Hale et al., 2011; Storey, 2007; Young et al., 2012), and that not only people with intellectual disabilities are involved, but also those who care for them (Hale et al., 2011; Wilson & Goodman, 2011; Young et al., 2012). Although both were the case in the intervention that we evaluated, its effect was still small.

In the focus groups, trained staff members also reported that the staff training had limited benefits. It mainly confirmed their knowledge and method of working. Nevertheless, after the training, some staff members had noticed positive alterations in their attitude towards clients and in their method of working. However, these were possibly too subtle to induce significant changes in their clients' level of functioning. Concerning the content of the training, support staff stated that they would have liked to learn more about things they did not know yet and could therefore develop during the training, such as new techniques for guiding their clients. They also would have liked to focus

more on the application of the training's methodology to their own daily practice.

The above-mentioned findings from the focus groups could suggest that the training did not yet sufficiently clarify how the staff members could have promoted self-management in their own clients. This might explain why afterwards, none of the teams made new agreements on how to guide their clients based on the methodology that was taught. It seems that the actual implementation of good support staff practices in the field of intellectual disabilities is a difficult task, as was also seen in previous research (Beadle-Brown et al., 2015). A barrier to the implementation also possibly concerns insufficient encouragement from within the organisation to practice the methodology (Totsika, Toogood, Hastings, & Nash, 2008). If a practice leader would have been appointed, this person could have organised, encouraged, supervised and coached the trained staff to put the methodology of the training into practice. This could have improved the implementation of the training, the quality of staff practice, and therefore the outcomes for the people with intellectual disabilities who were supported by the trained staff members (Beadle-Brown et al., 2015).

Apart from an inadequate implementation, the format of the training also shows room for improvement. Because our study took place in a naturalistic setting, at the time, it was only feasible to provide a classroom training, whereas previous research has found that coaching is an important addition to this. This was confirmed by several staff members who stated in the focus groups that they would have liked additional coaching. Classroom training therefore seems to be insufficient for teaching staff to guide their clients towards greater self-management.

Apart from aspects related to the training, another explanation for the limited effects could pertain to the fact that people with intellectual disabilities need more time to develop their self-management skills, given their overall learning deficit (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Therefore, it may well take more than 6 months before significant improvements in independence and self-reliance, support needs and behaviour can be observed. Furthermore, the questionnaires that were used in this study might not be sensitive enough to measure change in our population. On the DBC (Koot & Dekker, 2001), participants showed relatively low scores overall. As was mentioned, this questionnaire is aimed at minors with intellectual disabilities, which may explain why many of the behaviours that were addressed were uncommon in our adult participants. Conversely, there was a ceiling effect on the SFSMR (Kraijer et al., 2004), already at baseline. Therefore, for many participants, there was little room for improvement in scores, whereas in real life much progress in independence and self-reliance was possible. It should also be noted that the significant difference between the groups on this outcome measure could also be related to the fact that the scores of the comparison group slightly decreased over time, especially in the long term. Therefore, this significant result should be interpreted with caution. Furthermore, contrary to what would be expected, the intervention group had higher support needs in the long term, whereas the comparison group showed a decrease in support needs. These results were, however, not significantly different.

Besides the use of questionnaires that seem inadequate for our population, other limitations of the study include the small

sample size and the fact that our follow-up measurements only lasted until 6 months after the training. In addition, quality of life was not assessed in this study, although this would have been a valuable outcome measure, as people can experience a higher quality of life when self-management is promoted (Dollar et al., 2012). Furthermore, there was a non-random allocation of the homes to either the intervention or comparison group and participants could not be matched, given the diversity and complexity of their problems. Although there were no significant differences between the groups on several background characteristics, slight differences between the groups may still have influenced the results. Also, while there were no dropouts in the comparison group, there were three in the intervention group, who were all relatively well functioning people with intellectual disabilities.

Despite its limitations, this study could still offer a valuable contribution to the field of intellectual disabilities. Apart from being a mixed-methods study, it is to our best knowledge also the first to evaluate the effectiveness of a staff training aimed at promoting overall self-management in people with intellectual disabilities. Thus, the study could serve as a starting point for the further development and evaluation of similar kind of trainings. When designing these trainings, the content and setup should be carefully considered, as well as the implementation and application into daily practice. Organising good practice leadership and coaching-on-the-job appear to be important factors to consider in this context. In future research, it would also be of interest to study the effects on different subgroups of people with intellectual disabilities, as well as the cost-effectiveness. Apart from selecting measurement instruments that are more appropriate for this population, such as the SFSMR for a higher level (Kraijer & Kema, 2004) or the Adult Behavior Checklist (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2003), it is also worthwhile to consider self-reports. This could be achieved by including people with intellectual disabilities when filling in questionnaires or by interviewing them to hear their perspectives and experiences. Studying whether any improvements in quality of life occur, would be of interest as well. Furthermore, to avoid bias of trained staff members, investigating (changes in) client and staff behaviour by using a more direct and objective measure (e.g., through observations) would be a valuable addition to the more subjective experiences as collected through questionnaires and focus groups.

In conclusion, this study found limited evidence for the effectiveness of a staff training that promotes self-management in people with intellectual disabilities. Further research is required on how this can be achieved more effectively. Although the limitations should be kept in mind, this study could serve as a basis for the further development and evaluation of similar kind of trainings. In order to be more effective, the training's content, format, and implementation should be carefully considered, for example by paying more attention to its application into daily practice and including coaching-on-the-job.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank all staff members of Raamwerk and Leiden University who contributed to the study.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

ORCID

Janice Sandjojo  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8784-1261>

REFERENCES

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2003). *Manual for the ASEBA adult forms & profiles* (F. C. Verhulst & J. van den Ende, Trans.). Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth & Families.
- Adkins, A. D., Singh, A. N., Winton, A. S. W., McKeegan, G. F., & Singh, J. (2010). Using a mindfulness-based procedure in the community: Translating research to practice. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *19*, 175–183. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-009-9348-9>
- American Psychiatric Association (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Beadle-Brown, J., Bigby, C., & Bould, E. (2015). Observing practice leadership in intellectual and developmental disability services. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, *59*, 1081–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jir.12208>
- Beadle-Brown, J., Hutchinson, A., & Whelton, B. (2012). Person-centred active support – increasing choice, promoting independence and reducing challenging behaviour. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *25*, 291–307. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-3148.2011.00666.x>
- Benson, B. A. (1994). Anger management training: A self-control programme for persons with mild mental retardation. In N. Bouras, & N. Bouras (Eds.), *Mental health in mental retardation: Recent advances and practices* (pp. 224–232). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Browder, D. M., & Shapiro, E. S. (1985). Applications of self-management to individuals with severe handicaps: A review. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, *10*, 200–208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/154079698501000403> <https://doi.org/10.1177/154079698501000403>
- Cannella-Malone, H., Sigafoos, J., O'Reilly, M., de la Cruz, B., Edrisinha, C., & Lancioni, G. E. (2006). Comparing video prompting to video modeling for teaching daily living skills to six adults with developmental disabilities. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, *41*, 344–356.
- Claes, C., Van Hove, G., van Loon, J., Vandeveld, S., & Schalock, R. L. (2009). Evaluating the inter-respondent (consumer vs. staff) reliability and construct validity (SIS vs. Vineland) of the Supports Intensity Scale on a Dutch sample. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, *53*, 329–338. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2008.01149.x>
- Dannenberg, M., Mengoni, S. E., Gates, B., & Durand, M. (2016). Self-management interventions for epilepsy in people with intellectual disabilities: A scoping review. *Seizure*, *41*, 16–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seizure.2016.06.022> <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seizure.2016.06.022>
- Dawson, F., Shanahan, S., Fitzsimons, E., O'Malley, G., Mac Giollabhui, N., & Bramham, J. (2016). The impact of caring for an adult with intellectual disability and psychiatric comorbidity on carer stress and psychological distress. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, *60*, 553–563. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jir.12269> <https://doi.org/10.1111/jir.12269>
- Dekker, M. C., Nunn, R. J., Einfeld, S. E., Tonge, B. J., & Koot, H. M. (2002). Assessing emotional and behavioral problems in children with intellectual disability: Revisiting the factor structure of the Developmental

- Behavior Checklist. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 32, 601–610. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1021263216093>
- Dekker, M. C., Nunn, R., & Koot, H. M. (2002). Psychometric properties of the revised Developmental Behaviour Checklist scales in Dutch children with intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 46, 285–285. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2788.2002.00353.x>
- Dixon, D. R., Bergstrom, R., Smith, M. N., & Tarbox, J. (2010). A review of research on procedures for teaching safety skills to persons with developmental disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 31, 985–994. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2010.03.007>
- Dollar, C. A., Fredrick, L. D., Alberto, P. A., & Luke, J. K. (2012). Using simultaneous prompting to teach independent living and leisure skills to adults with severe intellectual disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 33, 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2011.09.001>
- Douglas, K. H., Ayres, K. M., & Langone, J. (2015). Comparing self-management strategies delivered via an iPhone to promote grocery shopping and literacy. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 50, 446–465.
- Dusseljee, J. C. E., Rijken, P. M., Cardol, M., Curfs, L. M. G., & Groenewegen, P. P. (2011). Participation in daytime activities among people with mild or moderate intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 55, 4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2010.01342.x>
- Egberink, I. J. L., Janssen, N. A. M., & Vermeulen, C. S. M. (2004). COTAN beoordeling 2004, Sociale-redzaamheidsschalen [COTAN review 2004, Social functioning scale for the mentally retarded]. Retrieved from www.cotandocumentatie.nl
- Egberink, I. J. L., Janssen, N. A. M., & Vermeulen, C. S. M. (2007). COTAN beoordeling 2007, Vragenlijst over Ontwikkeling en Gedrag [COTAN review 2007, Developmental Behaviour Checklist]. Retrieved from www.cotandocumentatie.nl
- Embregts, P. J. C. M. (2003). Using self-management, video feedback, and graphic feedback to improve social behavior of youth with mild mental retardation. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 38, 283–295.
- Ferretti, R. P., Cavalier, A. R., Murphy, M. J., & Murphy, R. (1993). The self-management of skills by persons with mental-retardation. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 14, 189–205. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0891-4222\(93\)90030-n](https://doi.org/10.1016/0891-4222(93)90030-n)
- Feuerstein, R., Rand, Y., & Rynders, J. E. (1993). *Don't accept me as I am: Helping "retarded" people to excel*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- García-Villamizar, D., Dattilo, J., & Matson, J. L. (2013). Quality of life as a mediator between behavioral challenges and autistic traits for adults with intellectual disabilities. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 7, 624–629. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2012.12.009>
- Goodson, J., Sigafoos, J., O'Reilly, M., Cannella, H., & Lancioni, G. E. (2007). Evaluation of a video-based error correction procedure for teaching a domestic skill to individuals with developmental disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 28, 458–467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2006.06.002>
- Graves, T. B., Collins, B. C., & Schuster, J. W. (2005). Using video prompting to teach cooking skills to secondary students with moderate disabilities. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 40, 34–46.
- Hale, L. A., Trip, H. T., Whitehead, L., & Conder, J. (2011). Self-management abilities of diabetes in people with an intellectual disability living in New Zealand. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 8, 223–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-1130.2011.00314.x>
- Hällgren, M., & Kottorp, A. (2005). Effects of occupational therapy intervention on activities of daily living and awareness of disability in persons with intellectual disabilities. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 52, 350–359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1630.2005.00523.x>
- Hermesen, M. A., Embregts, P., Hendriks, A. H. C., & Frielink, N. (2014). The human degree of care. Professional loving care for people with a mild intellectual disability: An explorative study. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 58, 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2012.01638.x>
- Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative research – Introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal*, 311, 299–302. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.311.7000.299>
- Koot, H. M., & Dekker, M. C. (2001). *Handleiding voor de VOG. Ouder-en leerkrachtversie*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Erasmus Universiteit.
- Kottorp, A., Hällgren, M., Bernspång, B., & Fisher, A. G. (2003). Client-centred occupational therapy for persons with mental retardation: Implementation of an intervention programme in activities of daily living tasks. *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 10, 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11038120310009416>
- Kraijer, D. W., & Kema, G. N. (2004). *Sociale Redzaamheidsschaal voor verstandelijk gehandicapten van hoger niveau*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Pearson.
- Kraijer, D. W., Kema, G. N., & De Bildt, A. A. (2004). *SRZ/SRZ-I Sociale Redzaamheidsschaal voor verstandelijk gehandicapten*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Pearson.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2015). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Lancioni, G. E., & O'Reilly, M. F. (2002). Teaching food preparation skills to people with intellectual disabilities: A literature overview. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 15, 236–253. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1468-3148.2002.00122.x>
- Mansell, J., Elliott, T., Beadle-Brown, J., Ashman, B., & Macdonald, S. (2002). Engagement in meaningful activity and “active support” of people with intellectual disabilities in residential care. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 23, 342–352. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0891-4222\(02\)00135-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0891-4222(02)00135-x)
- Mastropieri, M. A., Scruggs, T. E., & Shiah, R. L. (1997). Can computers teach problem-solving strategies to students with mild mental retardation? A case study. *Remedial and Special Education*, 18, 157–165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259701800304>
- McInerney, C. A., & McInerney, M. (1992). A mobility skills training program for adults with developmental disabilities. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 46, 233–239. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.46.3.233>
- Mechling, L. C., Gast, D. L., & Gustafson, M. R. (2009). Use of video modeling to teach extinguishing of cooking related fires to individuals with moderate intellectual disabilities. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 44, 67–79.
- Netherlands Institute for Social Research (2014). *Zorg Beter Begrepen. Verklaringen voor de groeiende vraag naar zorg voor mensen met een verstandelijke beperking*. Den Haag, The Netherlands: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.
- Parsons, M. B., Rollyson, J. H., & Reid, D. H. (2012). Evidence-based staff training: A guide for practitioners. *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, 5, 2–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03391819>
- Prime Minister's Strategy Unit (2005). *Improving the life chances of disabled people*. Retrieved from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/strategy/assets/disability.pdf>
- Ramdoss, S., Lang, R., Fragale, C., Britt, C., O'Reilly, M., Sigafoos, J., ... Lancioni, G. E. (2012). Use of computer-based interventions to promote daily living skills in individuals with intellectual disabilities: A systematic review. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 24, 197–215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10882-011-9259-8>
- Riches, V. C., Harman, A. D., Keen, D., Pennell, D., Harley, J. H., & Walker, M. (2011). Transforming staff practice through active support. *Journal of Intellectual Developmental Disability*, 36, 156–166. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13668250.2011.598499> [doi]
- Rossiter, R., Hunnisett, E., & Pulsford, M. (1998). Anger management training and people with moderate to severe learning disabilities. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 26, 67–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-3156.1998.tb00051.x>

- Rusch, F. R., & Dattilo, J. (2012). Employment and self-management: A meta-evaluation of seven literature reviews. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 50*, 69–75. <https://doi.org/10.1352/1934-9556-50.1.69>
- Scholten, G., & Schuurman, M. (2008). *Eigenwaarde. Leermethodiek Op Eigen Benen achtergrond en toepassing*. Wezep, The Netherlands: INVRA.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness. Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Sigafoos, J., O'Reilly, M., Cannella, H., Upadhyaya, M., Edrisinha, C., Lancioni, G. E., ... Young, D. (2005). Computer-presented video prompting for teaching microwave oven use to three adults with developmental disabilities. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 14*, 189–201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10864-005-6297-2>
- Smith, K. A., Ayres, K. A., Alexander, J., Ledford, J. R., Shepley, C., & Shepley, S. B. (2016). Initiation and generalization of self-instructional skills in adolescents with autism and intellectual disability. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 46*, 1196–1209. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-015-2654-8>
- Smith, K. A., Shepley, S. B., Alexander, J. L., & Ayres, K. M. (2015). The independent use of self-instructions for the acquisition of untrained multi-step tasks for individuals with an intellectual disability: A review of the literature. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 40*, 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2015.01.010>
- Storey, K. (2007). Review of research on self-management interventions in supported employment settings for employees with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 30*, 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08857288070300010301>
- Taggart, L., Coates, V., Clarke, M., Bunting, B., Davies, M., Carey, M., ... Karatzias, T. (2015). A study protocol for a pilot randomised trial of a structured education programme for the self-management of type 2 diabetes for adults with intellectual disabilities. *Trials, 16*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-015-0644-y>
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analysing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*, 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748>
- Thompson, J. R., Bryant, B. R., Campbell, E. M., Craig, E. M., Hughes, C. M., Rotholz, D. A., ... Wehmeyer, M. L. (2010). *Supports Intensity Scale. Schaal Intensiteit van Ondersteuningsbehoeften. Handleiding SIS NL 1.2* (W. H. E. Buntinx, Trans.). Houten, The Netherlands: BSL.
- Timmer, J. T., & De Vries, A. (2014). Begeleid Ontdekkend Leren volgens het Eigen Initiatief Model. In B. Twint, & J. De Bruijn (Eds.), *Handboek verstandelijke beperking, 24 succesvolle methoden* (pp. 98–115). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Uitgeverij Boom.
- Tonkens, E., & Weijers, I. (1999). Autonomy, solidarity, and self-realization: Policy views of Dutch service providers. *Mental Retardation, 37*, 468–476. [https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765\(1999\)037<468:ASASPV>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765(1999)037<468:ASASPV>2.0.CO;2)
- Totsika, V., Toogood, S., Hastings, R. P., & Nash, S. (2008). Interactive training for active support: Perspectives from staff. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 33*, 225–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668250802283348>
- United Nations (2006). *Convention of the rights of persons with persons with disabilities*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml>
- Van der Kwartel, A. (2013). *Brancherapport gehandicaptenzorg 2012*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Kiwa Prismant.
- Van Laarhoven, T., & Van Laarhoven-Myers, T. (2006). Comparison of three video-based instructional procedures for teaching daily living skills to persons with developmental disabilities. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities, 41*, 365–381.
- Van Oorsouw, W. M. W. J., Embregts, P. J. C. M., Bosman, A. M. T., & Jahoda, A. (2009). Training staff serving clients with intellectual disabilities: A meta-analysis of aspects determining effectiveness. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 30*, 503–511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2008.07.011>
- Van Wouwe, H., & Simons, L. (2013). Implementatie van Triple-C: Veranderingen in vaardigheden en probleemgedrag; een longitudinale studie bij cliënten met ernstig probleemgedrag. In R. Didden, & X. Moonen (Eds.), *Met het oog op behandeling 3: Diagnostiek en behandeling van gedragsproblematiek bij mensen met een licht verstandelijke beperking* (pp. 33–39). Utrecht, The Netherlands: LKC LVB.
- Vilaseca, R., Gràcia, M., Beltran, F. S., Dalmau, M., Alomar, E., Adam-Alcocer, A. L., & Simó-Pinatella, D. (2017). Needs and supports of people with intellectual disability and their families in Catalonia. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 30*, 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12215>
- Vygotski, L. S. (1964). *Denken und sprechen*. Berlin, Germany: Akademie Verlag.
- Wehmeyer, M. L., Kelchner, K., & Richards, S. (1996). Essential characteristics of self determined behavior of individuals with mental retardation. *American Journal on Mental Retardation, 100*, 632–642.
- Wilson, P. M., & Goodman, C. (2011). Evaluation of a modified chronic disease self-management programme for people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Nursing and Healthcare of Chronic Illness, 3*, 310–318. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-9824.2011.01105.x>
- Wright, T., & Wolery, M. (2011). The effects of instructional interventions related to street crossing and individuals with disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 32*, 1455–1463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2011.03.019>
- Young, A. F., Naji, S., & Kroll, T. (2012). Support for self-management of cardiovascular disease by people with learning disabilities. *Family Practice, 29*, 467–475. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmr106>

How to cite this article: Sandjojo J, Zedlitz AMEE, Gebhardt WA, et al. Training staff to promote self-management in people with intellectual disabilities. *J Appl Res Intellect Disabil.* 2018;31:840–850. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jar.12440>