Published in final edited form as:

J Appl Res Intellect Disabil. 2015 May ; 28(3): 212–222. doi:10.1111/jar.12123.

Measuring Preparedness for Mammography in Women with Intellectual Disabilities: A Validation Study of the Mammography Preparedness Measure

Claire Tienwey Wang, BS¹, Nechama Greenwood, CPM¹, Laura F. White, PhD², and Joanne Wilkinson, MD, MSc^{1,3}

Department of Family Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine

Department of Biostatistics, Boston University School of Public Health

Department of Community Health Sciences, Boston University School of Public Health

Abstract

Background—Women with intellectual disabilities (ID) have similar breast cancer rates as the general population, but lower rates of regular mammography and higher breast cancer mortality rates. Though prior qualitative work demonstrates that women with ID face unique, disability specific barriers to mammography, we lack standardized, validated instruments for measuring knowledge of breast cancer screening in this population. In addition, much research related to adults with ID focuses on family or carer perspectives, rather than involving women with ID, themselves.

Methods—We first pilot tested a general population instrument measuring breast cancer knowledge, and found that it did not perform adequately in women with ID. In response, we developed the Mammography Preparedness Measure (MPM), a direct short interview tool to measure knowledge and preparedness in women with ID, themselves, rather than relying on caregiver or other reports, and using inclusive methodology. We validated the MPM by assessing test-retest reliability.

Results—Average test-retest percent agreement of 84%, ranging from 74% to 91% agreement per item, with an overall kappa of 0.59.

Conclusion—The MPM appears to be a valid instrument appropriate for measuring mammography preparedness in women with intellectual disabilities. The success of this innovative tool suggests that direct, rather than informant-directed tools can be developed to measure health knowledge and cancer screening readiness in adults with ID, an important measure in studying and reducing disparities.

Keywords

Intellectual disability; mammography; instrument design; validation; behavioral measurement tools; health disparities

Background

Though individuals with intellectual disabilities (ID) are now living longer, to a mean age of 66 years (Janicki et al. 1999), compared to the general population's life expectancy of 70 in the United States (Mathers et al. 2001), they represent a medically underserved population (Jobling 2001; Wisdom et al. 2010; Krahn et al. 2006). Adults with ID experience significant health disparities in accessing primary care (Stein 2000; Langan et al. 1993; Alborz et al. 2005), and routine cancer screenings (Sullivan et al. 2006; Wilkinson et al. 2007; Espie & Brown 1998) and health education and knowledge. Standard patient education materials may not be accessible for people with ID, who have varying levels of literacy (Greenhalgh 1994). There are also significant disparities in research participation, which in turn leads to difficulties in measuring health inequities (Freedman, 2001). Though notable exceptions exist, research related to the health of people with ID tends to focus on the perspectives of family members and other carers, excluding adults with ID, themselves. In the general population, lack of health knowledge is often a driver of health disparities. Though low health and general literacy is thought to be associated with health care access disparities in adults with ID, we lack effective and inclusive tools for measuring health knowledge in individuals with intellectual disabilities. Without appropriate measurement tools, we are unable to compare adults with ID with their peers without disabilities, and we lack means of evaluating interventions to improve health knowledge. Therefore, developing inclusive and accessible tools to measure health knowledge in adults with ID is an important step to reducing health disparities in this population.

Adults with ID face disparities in cancer screening rates, and have unique needs related to cancer (Satge & Merrick, eds, 2011). For example, women with ID have equal rates of breast cancer as compared to the general population of women (Patja, Eero & Iivanainen, 2001), Breast cancer is the second most common cancer among women, impacting approximately 1 in 8 women. Current thinking suggests early detection through regular mammography as a key component of breast cancer control (Women'sHealth.gov, 2013). In the United States, the United States Preventive Services Task Force recommends that all women over age 50 receive yearly mammograms, a screening test involving imaging of the breasts. Other agencies, such as the American Cancer Society, recommend that yearly mammography screening begin at age 40. Standard of care in our community is to offer mammography screening to all women beginning at age 40. It is beyond the scope of this paper to address the controversy in age of mammography initiation, as our concern is health equity among women with and without intellectual disabilities. In the general population, mammography rates are rising, and several successful breast cancer screening initiatives have reduced disparities in mammography rates among ethnic and racial minority groups (Peek & Han, 2004; CDC, 2011). However, women with intellectual disabilities have very low mammography rates, with rates of regular mammography as low as 12%, and higher breast cancer mortality, thought to be associated with lower rates of early detection (Davies & Duff 2001; Sullivan et al. 2003; Sullivan, Slack-Smith & Hussain, 2004; Parish, Saville & Taylor, 2006).

Women with ID face unique, disability specific barriers to mammography utilization , including increased dependency on others, such as family or paid support workers, low

levels of support staff knowledge regarding breast health, and lack of physician recommendation of mammography to women with ID (Kirby & Hegarty 2010; Tyler et al. 2010; Iacono & Sutherland, 2006; Tuffrey-Wijne, Bernal, Jones, Butler & Hollins. 2006; Barr, Giannotti, Van Hoof, Mangoven & Curry, 2008). In addition, recent studies have demonstrated that women with ID perceive mammography differently than their counterparts without disabilities (Wilkinson et al. 2011). Women with ID are more likely than their non-disabled peers to have low knowledge about breast cancer and breast cancer screening, anxiety about navigating the various steps of the mammogram process, such as checking in at the clinic, disrobing etc., lack of health education, and feelings of unpreparedness for the test itself (Wilkinson et al. 2011). In the past, we conducted a qualitative study asking women with ID about their perceptions of breast cancer and mammography screening using an interview guide focused on barriers and facilitators to cancer screening (removed for review). In this prior study women with ID felt neutral about the actual clinical mammogram procedure, but expressed frustration with their lack of preparedness for the logistical aspects of the mammography experience.

Though ensuring that women with ID access cancer screenings at the same rate as their non-disabled peers is an advocacy priority, clinicians, policy makers, and researchers currently lack a proven and effective intervention to help increase the rate of mammography uptake in this population (CDC, 2011). In order to effectively develop and evaluate interventions to increase health knowledge and cancer screening rates, we first need instruments that can measure breast cancer knowledge and preparedness for mammography in women with ID. Such instruments would allow researchers to evaluate and demonstrate the effectiveness of future interventions to increase breast cancer knowledge and screening rates. Many instruments used in other studies have been developed for patients with ID. However, these scales were designed for and found to be reliable only when completed by parents, caretakers, or the general population (Bastiaanse et al. 2012; Maas et al. 2011; Morin et al. 2013). They were not developed for patient self-reported measures (Taylor & Novaco 2013). In recent years, we have seen a positive trend towards inclusive research, which has been quite successful with people with ID, and so we felt that an instrument based on reports from adults with ID, rather than their carers, was warranted.

In connection with our prior qualitative study, we administered selected questions from the Breast Cancer and Heredity Knowledge Scale (BCHK) (Ondrusek et al. 1999) to a sample of 27 women with intellectual disabilities. The BCHK is a standardized instrument that has been validated as effective in measuring knowledge of breast cancer in the general population. The BCHK using a true/false format, and asks factual questions such as related to breast cancer signs and symptoms, treatments and incidence and survival rates, using a true/false format. In the prior study, we choose not to ask questions related to hereditary risks; the questions selected are listed in Table 1. During the course of our prior qualitative study, we noticed that participants with ID found the BCHK too abstract, and answered with great difficulty. In addition, while the BCHK measures factual breast cancer knowledge, it does not address the more logistical and practical concerns raised by women with ID in our qualitative study. So while a woman might theoretically understand the factual knowledge measured by the BCHK, she might still feel unprepared or unable to actually receive screening mammography..

At the start of this project, we thoroughly reviewed participant responses on the BCHK questions from our prior study, which had been audio recorded and transcribed verbatim as part of the qualitative interview process. Though percent of correct responses among our sample of 27 participants were generally high (ranging from 38% to 91% correct responses, with an average of 70.8% correct answer rate on the seven questions we administered), we also reviewed participants' comments in connection with the questions. Representative responses are described in table 1. In general, participants did not appear to understand the questions, and often appeared to be guessing either true or false. Through this content analysis, it was clear that standardized instruments using a true-false format were ineffective in our sample population of 27 women with intellectual disabilities. In addition, standard instruments measuring breast cancer knowledge are ineffective for measuring preparedness for mammography among women with ID.

Therefore, we have developed a new instrument more appropriate for women with ID called the Mammography Preparedness Measure, or MPM. It focuses on the respondent's (women with ID) desire to be more prepared for the mammography and uses concrete wording and an open-ended format. The MPM was created with our target population in mind and consists of verbally administered questions that use concrete wording and measure mammography preparedness, as demonstrated by concrete knowledge of mammography's purpose and procedure. The MPM provides a means of measuring the success of future interventions developed for this target population. The MPM measures each participant's preparedness for mammograms directly by having the participant complete the survey without help from relatives or caregivers. The MPM is unique in that it collects information directly from the women themselves, providing a patient-centered measurement of the patient's mammography preparedness, rather than the knowledge of her supporters. We evaluated the MPM's test-retest reliability and face and content validity.

Methods

Evaluating a general population instrument in adults with ID

As described above, we first analyzed the performance of prior participants on the Breast Cancer Heredity and Knowledge scale (BCHK), an instrument designed to measure breast cancer and mammography knowledge in the general population. In our prior study, we administered the BCHK to a sample of 27 women with ID. Results were tape recorded and transcribed. We analyzed these transcripts qualitatively using content analysis in order to determine whether it appeared that participants understood the questions. While participants had a high rate of correct answers on the true-false items, comments made by the participants in response led us to believe that most participants were simply guessing, with a 50% likelihood of guessing correctly on a true false survey item. For example, when asked if chemotherapy was always used to treat breast cancer, the participant answered no, which was the correct answer, but went on to state that chemotherapy is a treatment for hair. Another participant also provided the correct answer, but then elaborated that chemotherapy is a treatment for leukemia. Our content analysis demonstrated that participants did not generally understand the BCHK questions, and that the true-false format was inaccessible for many adults with ID, as it seemed to encourage blind guessing with a 50% likelihood of

success. This led to the development and evaluation of the Mammography Preparedness Measure (MPM), an instrument designed for use in adults with ID.

Developing the MPM

The MPM was developed using focus group interview data from our previous qualitative study (Wilkinson et al. 2011) in which participants were asked what they would like to have known in advance of their first mammography experience and what mammography knowledge they considered essential. An 8-item scale was drafted from this data and tested on a pilot group of 10 women with ID using cognitive interviewing (where we asked what the participant thought the question meant to see if it corresponded to what we wanted it to mean) (Willis 2005). Based on this pilot data, three questions were removed due to participant confusion, and the final instrument was created.

Materials

The MPM's items include open-ended questions regarding what body part a mammogram is for, the purpose of mammography, whether disrobing is required, how long a mammogram will take to complete, and how often one should have a mammogram. These items were selected because of their practical nature. The MPM uses a standardized introductory script in which the interviewer asks the respondent to pretend that the interviewer is having a mammogram tomorrow, and informs the participant that she would like her help in understanding the process. This script was developed in response to pilot testing with women with ID, who stated that the questions should be made as concrete as possible, and suggested putting the questions in the context of a story to facilitate comprehension through relationship-based understanding. The script includes language stating that incorrect answers are not penalized and that only the participant's opinions are needed. Guardians and caretakers are allowed to be present to help ensure the participants' comfort, but the MPM's introductory script states that they may not assist the participant in answering the questions.

Evaluation

Objectives—To evaluate the Mammography Preparedness Measure (MPM), we focused primarily on test-retest reliability (the extent to which participants' answers remain stable over time, reflecting that their understanding of the questions' meanings is consistent). This was our primary outcome of interest since we noted a high rate of random guessing on the prior instrument (see above) and also because we thought test-retest reliability would most accurately reflect the suitability of the instrument for the population. We looked, secondarily, at both face and content validity to assess the instrument. Face validity is the extent to which the questions seems to reflect their actual meaning. Content validity is the extent to which the questions ask about a content area that is easily defined and clear from reading the questions. Both of these concepts are relatively straightforward to assess with an instrument as concrete as the MPM, so we used data from preliminary testing and cognitive interviewing to assess this.

Participants

Recruitment—Our goal was to access a cross-section of women with ID who were the appropriate age for mammography. Adult women over the age of 37 were asked to participate in this study. We initially attempted to recruit participants using the clinical data warehouse at Boston Medical Center. In this strategy, a clinical data warehouse consultant queried the repository to identify female patients with an ICD-9 code indicating intellectual disability who were within or approaching the age range for mammography. (ICD-9 codes included 3.17 through 3.19; at the time of the study, our institution had not yet transitioned to ICD-10 codes. ICD 9 and ICD-10 codes are diagnostic codes used primarily for billing) The clinical data warehouse provided us with an initial list that included 172 patients. This list contained the patient's name, age contact information and name of the primary care provider (PCP) serving that patient. We then attempted to contact each identified PCP. PCPs were asked to verify their patient's intellectual disability and to determine the appropriateness of contacting the patient. We were able to contact PCPs for 96 of 172 patients and were given approval to contact 30 patients. Of these, we were able to contact 17 patients, 9 of whom agreed to participate. Eight of these 9 patients ultimately participated; one did not attend her scheduled study visit and did not respond to follow up calls. (See Flow Chart 1).

To expand our participant pool, we then partnered with four local agencies that provided services for people with ID. Partner agencies were asked to approach eligible clients (defined as females with ID over age 37 with sufficient verbal skills to answer questions) and obtain their permission to be contacted by a researcher during a visit to an agency site. Researchers then visited and provided further information and obtained informed consent. The majority of our participants (n=40) were recruited through these community partnerships, a recruitment strategy that was ultimately simpler and more high-yield than our initial strategy of recruiting through our clinical data warehouse (as described above).

No medical records were accessed, and only information on the patients' primary care provider (PCP) and contact information was provided to the PI. In order to protect participant confidentiality and privacy, we did not request information about specific ID diagnosis or severity, other diagnoses, disabilities or medical issues, medications used or the presence of mental health disorders. We also did not inquire about participants' marital status, literacy levels, educational attainment or work. While we recognize that these variables might impact access to mammography, we did not feel that our study's aim of validating a survey instrument justified that invasion of patient privacy that collecting additional variables would entail. Functionality was used as the benchmark of enrollment criteria instead and patients who were verbal enough to understand and answer questions read to them in the MPM and could provide informed consent were enrolled in the study. All participants were English speakers, as we did not have a translated version of the MPM. Participants included a wide range of verbal abilities, from highly articulate to communicating solely through the use of a pictorial/alphabetical communication board. While we recognize that a significant amount of the ID population is minimally verbal or non-verbal, these participants were excluded from our study, as we were interested in validating an instrument designed for verbal participants, including those who effectively use adaptive technology to communicate.

Procedure

Test-retest reliability—A research coordinator who is also a family caregiver of an adult with ID visited all participants and administered the MPM on both occasions using the same procedure. While experienced in interacting with adults with ID, she did not have any training in mammography or health care navigation. Once participants were identified and had given their consent for participation, we met them at their homes or workplaces for the preliminary interview and MPM administration. Three to six weeks following the first administration of the MPM, the same research coordinator re-administered the MPM to each participant again. More information (e.g. – did the participant get a mammogram between the two interviews?) was gathered from the participant’s caregiver to identify any factors that may exclude the data from analysis.

Face validity and content validity: The MPM represents a test for mammogram preparedness; because it measures concrete, objective knowledge, its face validity was easily demonstrated by assessment from women with ID during pilot testing. Staff members were also asked to provide their opinions, in order to triangulate data from the experts (women with ID). Its content validity was also measured during pilot testing when we interviewed a group of women with ID using cognitive interviewing.

Statistical Analysis—We assessed the test-retest reliability using percent agreement between time 1 and time 2 and calculating an overall kappa for the entire instrument. Validity was assessed qualitatively using the participants’ comments during pilot testing.

Consent and human subject protection—We used a careful process of informed consent where participants were given verbal and written information about the study in a private setting and all questions were answered. If a participant identified that she used a legal guardian, consent was obtained from the guardian with assent obtained from the participant. Our study was approved and monitored by the (removed for review) Institutional Review Board.

Results

We administered the MPM to 48 adults with ID over age 37. Characteristics of the participants are described in Table 3. It should be noted that a majority of participants had already undergone mammography on at least one occasion. We were interested in enrolling participants with prior mammogram experience, as we wanted to know how well women understood their experiences, and we wanted to measure mammography knowledge, which often comes from personal experience. One participant was excluded because she had received a mammogram in between tests, potentially biasing her results, as she may have learned new information during her very recent experience, making her answers different from each other, and thereby impacting our ability to measure test-retest reliability. There was a low loss-to-follow-up rate, with only one participant withdrawing from the study per guardian request after the first study visit. We were unable to re-administer the MPM to an additional five participants due to unforeseeable circumstances such as illness/medical appointment/family event and absence from her day program during the research coordinator’s scheduled visit. The mean time between the first and second interview was 37

days. After both of the interviews, the participant's answers were taken and marked as either correct or incorrect according to the MPM's scoring guidelines (see table 3). A percent agreement was calculated to determine how many of the participants answered each question correctly or incorrectly on both the test and the re-test (Table 3). As shown in Table 3, question 3 has the highest %-agreement.. All questions on the survey have a high %-agreement above 70% ranging between 74%–91%. Mean percentage agreement was 84% with kappa of 0.59. This indicates fair to good test-retest reliability (in general, kappa > 0.8 is excellent, > 0.6–0.8 is good, 0.4–0.6 is fair and below 0.4 is poor). Through participants' and staff member's feedback and cognitive interviewing in the pilot study, the MPM demonstrated face and content validity. The participants showed good comprehension of the items, which corresponded well to their intended meaning.

Discussion/Conclusions

In this study, we developed and validated the mammography preparedness measure (MPM), a reliable instrument to evaluate the mammography preparedness of adult women with intellectual disabilities. Test-retest reliability was demonstrated over a period of weeks. The MPM also demonstrated face and content validity.

To our knowledge, we are the first to investigate the reliability of an instrument measuring health knowledge and readiness for adults with ID who provide their answers without the assistance of a family member or caretaker. Measurements from these kinds of studies need to come from the participants as well as from their parents or caretakers. Many adults with ID are capable of interviews (Williams 1999), and inclusive research (Walmsley & Johnson 2008) is important both in measuring the effectiveness of research and in avoiding the dangers of paternalism towards these adults (Walmsley 2004). Adults with ID represent a disadvantaged group in terms of health disparities (Walmsley 2011), and so inclusive research regarding measurement is crucial for disparity reduction. With this population in mind, we have managed to successfully create an instrument that accurately measures the mammography preparedness of women.

The MPM's face and content validity are reasonable. Our experts, the women with ID themselves, helped finalize the instrument and made sure it was understandable and valid for its purpose. Given the concerns about our participants' comprehension of instruments intended for use with the general population, such as the Breast Cancer Hereditary Knowledge(BCHK), we felt that test-retest reliability would be the most helpful measure in demonstrating actual comprehension that remained stable over time (as opposed to random guessing). Therefore, our testing focused on reliability and the stability of answers over time rather than alternate forms of validity (especially given that the meaning of items on the instrument is concrete).

Our study had several limitations that are important to note. Our research used a small sample of verbal adults, rather than a broader spectrum of adults with ID. While we felt that this enrollment criterion was necessary to accomplish our stated goal of evaluating the validity of the verbally administered MPM, we recognize that we excluded adults who lacked verbal ability and/or who have more serious intellectual disabilities. Our inclusive

study design centered around enrolling participants with ID who could speak for themselves. We recommend, however, that research to develop needed breast cancer screening interventions include a more representative range of adults with ID. In addition, we were limited by the amount of information we were able to collect. In all research, we must balance the value of information gained with the risks to participants. While we recognize that factors such as ID type and severity, co-occurring disabilities, health conditions and mental health disorders, language, education, marital status, medication use and others might impact access to mammography, we did not feel that the information to be gained in this case justified the risks to confidentiality and the intrusion into protected medical records. Trials evaluating the efficacy of interventions would warrant the collection of this personal information, but in our opinion, such personal and protected information would not significantly impact a study evaluating the validity of a measurement tool, and so we opted not to risk participant confidentiality by gathering this additional information. Another limitation is the 91% rate of prior mammography in our study population. We chose to include women with prior mammography experience, as they were more likely to possess the kinds of knowledge measured by the MPM, thereby facilitating our evaluation of the instrument itself. In a study measuring the test-retest reliability, we were less interested in how the participant acquired her mammography knowledge, as our goal is to evaluate whether the instrument reliably and consistently measures this knowledge.

Though our instrument is proven to be reliable, there are some additional limitations in the use of the MPM. First, we could only test participants who had the verbal ability to complete the MPM. Participants who are not verbal will hypothetically have more logistical barriers to getting a mammogram than those who are verbal. Because the questions were developed for women with ID, our instrument would be more appropriate for participants with limited verbal skills than the instruments currently available. We hope that future interventions will be able to take into account women who are not verbal or who use alternative communication methods, as this represents a significant number of individuals with ID. . In addition, the range of intellectual disabilities is extensive. It would be difficult to use the MPM to measure preparedness in individuals with severe ID. While we focused primarily on evaluating the MPM in this study, further research related to adapting the MPM for use with various subpopulations of women with ID, such as non-verbal or hearing impaired individuals, is suggested. It would also be useful to develop versions of the MPM that could be used in various subpopulations, such as a pictorial version that could be used with nonverbal individuals. The MPM is currently only available in English and was tested with English speakers only. We would welcome research translating the MPM to other languages and evaluating its efficacy among non-English speaking populations. The MPM's introductory script assumes a female interviewer who states that she is planning to have her first mammogram tomorrow. However, a male interviewer could easily use third person and state that his friend is having her first mammogram tomorrow and ask the participants to provide advice for his friend. The MPM was designed with ease of administration in mind; the interview does not need extensive training or medical experience and need not have personal experience with mammography. Finally, our instrument measures the participants' preparedness, rather than general education levels regarding mammograms and breast cancer. However, we chose to focus the instrument on what was more important to the

participants as shown in previous qualitative studies (Wilkinson et al. 2011) rather than focus on knowledge that might be less useful for our target population.

This study shows that the MPM is a reliable and valid tool in assessing the preparedness of women with ID for breast cancer screening. Women with intellectual disabilities experience a higher burden of breast cancer deaths than their counterparts without disabilities, and are much less likely to access routine mammography screening. The development of interventions to increase rates of cancer screening, including mammography, has long been an advocacy priority. However, without tools such as the MPM, we are unable to measure the success of such interventions. . The creation of this instrument allows researchers to develop and evaluate interventions needed to raise mammography rates in this population. While overcoming health disparities will be a long and complex road, the ability to understand and measure the drivers of disparity is an important first step (James 2009). We encourage future researchers to create, refine and validate tools such as the MPM in order to further the work of disparity reduction among adults with ID, and we encourage further research using similar processes to develop future instruments to measure different drivers of disparities facing adults with ID and help close these gaps.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Triangle Inc., Bay Cove Human Services, The Bridge of Central Massachusetts, and the Brockton Area Arc for their collaboration, and Kailah Hayden-Karp and Caitlin Christie for their help with data collection. This research was supported by National Cancer Institute grant 5K07 CA 1345547-04.

References

- Alborz A, Glendinning C, McNally R. Access to health care for people with intellectual disabilities in the UK: mapping the issues and reviewing the evidence. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*. 2005; 10:173–182. [PubMed: 16053595]
- Barr JK, Giannotti TE, Van Hoof TJ, Mongoven J, Curry M. Understanding barriers to participation in mammography by women with disabilities. *American Journal of Health Promotion*. 2008; 22(6): 381–385. [PubMed: 18677877]
- Bastiaanse LP, Vlasveld G, Penning C, Evenhuis HM. Feasibility and reliability of the mini nutritional assessment (MNA) in older adults with intellectual disabilities. *The Journal of Nutrition, Health & Aging*. 2012; 16(9):759–762.
- Center for Disease Control. Mammograms for Women With/Without A Disability, 2010 data. 2011. Accessed online 11/12/13 via <http://www.cdc.gov/Features/dsmammograms/>
- Davies N, Duff M. Breast cancer screening for older women with intellectual disability living in community group homes. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. 2001; 45(Pt 3):253–257. [PubMed: 11422650]
- Espie CA, Brown M. Health needs and learning disabilities: An overview. *Health Bulletin*. 1998; 56(2):603–611.
- Ruth, I Freedman. Ethical challenges in the conduct of research involving Persons with mental retardation. *Mental Retardation*. 2001; 39(2):130–141. [PubMed: 11340962]
- Greenhalgh, L. Well aware: Improving access to health information for people with learning difficulties. Anglia and Oxford: NHS Executive; 1994.
- Iacono T, Sutherland G. Health screening and developmental disabilities. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disability*. 2006; 3(3):155–163.
- James SA. Epidemiologic research on health disparities: some thoughts on history and current developments. *Epidemiologic Reviews*. 2009; 31:1–6. [PubMed: 19822533]

- Janicki MP, Dalton AJ, Henderson CM, Davidson PW. Mortality and morbidity among older adults with intellectual disability: health services considerations. *Disability Rehabilitation*. 1999; 21(5–6):284–294. [PubMed: 10381241]
- Jobling A. Beyond sex and cooking: health education for individuals with intellectual disability. *Mental Retardation*. 2001; 39(4):310–321. [PubMed: 11448253]
- Kirby S, Hegarty J. Breast awareness within an intellectual disability setting. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing*. 2010; 14(4):328–336. [PubMed: 20493767]
- Krahn GL, Hammond L, Turner A. A cascade of disparities: health and health care access for people with intellectual disabilities. *Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Research Review*. 2006; 12(1):70–82.
- Langan, J.; Russell, O.; Whitfield, M. Community care and the general practitioner: Primary health care for people with learning disabilities. Summary of final report to Department of Health. Bristol: Norah Fry Research Centre; 1993.
- Maas AP, Didden R, Korzilius H, Braam W, Collin P, Smits MG, et al. Psychometric properties of a sleep question for use in individuals with intellectual disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2011; 32:2467–2479. [PubMed: 21840166]
- Mathers CD, Sadana R, Salomon JA, Murray CJ, Lopez AD. Healthy life expectancy in 191 countries, 1999. *The Lancet*. 2001; 357(9269):1685–1691.
- Morin D, Crocker AG, Beaulieu-Bergeron R, Caron J. Validation of the attitudes toward intellectual disability – ATTID questionnaire. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. 2013; 57(3):268–278. [PubMed: 22533629]
- Office on Women's Health. Breast Cancer. 2013. Accessed 5/8/14 via <https://www.womenshealth.gov/breast-cancer/>
- Ondrusek N, Warner E, Goel V. Development of a knowledge scale about breast cancer and heredity (BCHK). *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment*. 1999; 53:9–75. [PubMed: 10206068]
- Parish SL, Saville AW, Taylor SJ. Women with cognitive limitations living in the community: Evidence of disability-based disparities in health care. *Mental Retardation*. 2006; 44(4):249–259. [PubMed: 16834462]
- Peek ME, Han JH. Disparities in screening mammography: current status, interventions, and implications. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2004; 19(2):184–194. [PubMed: 15009798]
- Satge, D.; Merrick, J., editors. *Cancer in children and adults with intellectual disabilities: current research aspects*. New York, NJ: Nova Biomedical Publishing; 2011.
- Stein K. Caring for people with learning disability: A survey of general practitioners' attitudes in Southampton and South West Hampshire. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 2000; 28(1):9–15.
- Sullivan SG, Glasson EJ, Hussain R, Petterson BA, Slack-Smith LM, Montgomery PD, et al. Breast cancer and the uptake of mammography screening services by women with intellectual disabilities. *Preventive Medicine*. 2003; 37(5):507–512. [PubMed: 14572435]
- Sullivan SG, Slack-Smith LM, Hussain R. Understanding the use of breast cancer screening services by women with intellectual disabilities. *Sozial-und Praventivmedizin*. 2004; 49(6):398–405. [PubMed: 15669440]
- Sullivan WF, Heng J, Cameron D, Lunskey Y, Cheetham T, Hennen B, et al. Consensus guidelines for primary health care of adults with developmental disabilities. *Canadian Family Physician*. 2006; 52(11):1410–1418. [PubMed: 17279198]
- Taylor JL, Novaco R. A brief screening instrument for emotionally unstable and dissocial personality disorder in male offenders with intellectual disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2013; 34:546–553. [PubMed: 23123867]
- Tuffrey-Wijne I, Bernal J, Jones A, Butler G, Hollins S. People with intellectual disabilities and their need for cancer information. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing*. 2006; 10(2):106–116. [PubMed: 16213787]
- Tyler CV, Zyzanski SJ, Panaite V, Council L. Nursing perspectives on cancer screening in adults with intellectual and other developmental disabilities. *Intellectual Developmental Disabilities*. 2010; 48(4):271–277. [PubMed: 20722477]

- Walmsley J. Involving users with learning difficulties in health improvement: lessons from inclusive learning disability research. *Nursing Inquiry*. 2004; 11(1):54–64. [PubMed: 14962347]
- Walmsley J. An investigation into the implementation of Annual Health Checks for people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities*. 2011; 15(3):157–166. [PubMed: 22123675]
- Walmsley, J.; Johnson, K. *Inclusive Research with People with Learning Disabilities: Past, Present, and Futures*. London: Jessica Kingsley Pub.; 2008.
- Whitehead M. The concepts and principles of equity and health. *International Journal of Health Services*. 1991; 22(3):429–445. [PubMed: 1644507]
- Wilkinson JE, Deis CE, Bowen DJ, Bokhour BG. "It's Easier Said Than Done": Perspectives on mammography from women with intellectual disabilities. *Annals of Family Medicine*. 2011; 9(2): 142–147. [PubMed: 21403141]
- Wilkinson JE, Culpepper L, Cerreto M. Screening tests for adults with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2007; 20(4):399–407. [PubMed: 17615421]
- Williams V. Researching together. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 1999; 27(2):48–51.
- Willis, GB. *Cognitive interviewing: A tool for improving questionnaire design*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications; 2005.
- Wisdom JP, McGee HG, Horner-Johnson W, Michael YL, Adams E, Berlin M. Health disparities between women with and without disabilities: a review of the research. *Social Work Public Health*. 2010; 25(3):368–386.

Flow Chart 1.
Recruitment Flow Chart

Table 1**BCHK Questions and Responses**

BCHK Pilot Test Questions	% Correct Answers	Representative Qualitative Comments – When asked what the they thought the question meant
Q1: 75% of women with breast cancer are alive and well 10 years later.	70%	“It would be good to do all the tests.” “You don’t get it done, women could die.” “I don’t know.” “A lot of women with breast cancer still don’t go to doctors and get it checked out and everything.”
Q2: Stress increases the risk of breast cancer.	70%	“I don’t know what that means.” “Well I don’t have breast cancer but I do got stress.” “Means it hurts like its painful” “You don’t want to get breast cancer or something like that.”
Q3: Women over 50 are more likely to get breast cancer than younger women.	70%	“Yeah. 54, I’m gonna be 54.” “Yeah, I don’t understand these questions.”
Q4: A change in size or shape of one breast could be a sign of breast cancer.	78%	“They check for cancer in your breast, if you have it in one, you could have it in the other one.”
Q5: Over a lifetime, one in nine women will develop breast cancer.	78%	“I don’t know what you mean by that.” “Nope, I’m healthy.” “It means that you’ll get the cancer. And then if they can’t cure it, it will be too late.”
Q6: Chemotherapy is always used to treat breast cancer.	39%	“I thought chemotherapy was for your hair?” “What does [chemotherapy] mean?” “A medicine that brings your hair back?” “When someone has leukemia they go through chemo.”
Q7: Women over 50 should get a mammogram every 2 years.	91%	“You should have one every two weeks, I mean every month.”

Table 2

Participant Characteristics

Characteristic		Number	Percent
Total participants		48	100%
Residence type			
	Group homes	14	29.1%
	Independent (with live-out support services)	15	31.25%
	Supported living	3	6.25%
	Family	7	14.58%
	Other or unknown	9	18.75%
Lives with other enrolled participants?			
	Yes	8	16.6%
Previous mammogram?			
	Yes	44	91.6%
Age			
	37–39	3	6.25%
	40–49	11	22.91%
	50–59	13	27.08%
	60–69	15	31.25%
	70+	6	12.5%

Table 3

Percent Agreement Per Question

Question	% Agreement
Q1: What part of the body is the mammogram for? Correct= breast (or any reasonable slang term)	88%
Q2: Why would I have a mammogram? Correct = check for cancer, must include cancer and screening (not curing etc)	86%
Q3: Would I have to take my clothes off for a mammogram? Correct = top only, shirt and bra etc	91%
Q4: When I have the mammogram how long will I be in the machine? Correct = any answer under 30 minutes	74%
Q5: How often am I supposed to have a mammogram? Correct= every year or every other year, annually etc	86%
Overall Kappa	0.59