

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Research in Developmental Disabilities

Research in Developmental Disabilities

Knowledge and attitudes regarding cervical cancer screening among women with physical disabilities living in the community

Li-Wei Wu^a, Lan-Ping Lin^b, Si-Fan Chen^b, Shang-Wei Hsu^c, Ching-Hui Loh^{a,d}, Chia-Ling Wu^e, Jin-Ding Lin^{b,*}

^a Department of Family and Community Medicine, Tri-Service General Hospital, National Defense Medical Center, Taipei, Taiwan

^b School of Public Health, National Defense Medical Center, Taipei, Taiwan

^c Graduate Institute of Healthcare Administration, Asia University, Taichung, Taiwan

^d SongShan Armed Forces General Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan

e Research Center for Intellectual Disabilities Taiwan, Chung-Hua Foundation for Persons with Intellectual Disabilities, New Taipei City, Taiwan

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 8 August 2011 Accepted 10 August 2011 Available online 24 November 2011

Keywords: Women with physical disabilities Cervical cancer Pap smear test Health perception Health policy

ABSTRACT

The study aims to explore knowledge and attitudes regarding cervical cancer screening and to examine its determinants based on the perspectives of Taiwanese women with physical disabilities living in the community. A cross-sectional survey was employed in the study, and we recruited 498 women aged more than 15 years who were officially registered as having physical disabilities in Taipei County. Taiwan, in March 2009, A mail-out structured questionnaire designed to collect data concerning the participants' demographics, reported use, health experience and perception (understanding and attitudes) of cervical cancer screening among women with physical disabilities. We used a scoring system (range 0-10) to categorize the study subjects' awareness of screening (low vs. high). The results showed that 77.3% of subjects reported a low level of awareness (score \leq 7), whereas 22.7% were in the high awareness level group (score > 7). The logistic regression model revealed that married women (OR = 3.30, 95%CI = 1.25 - 8.71), those with a higher educational level (OR = 2.88, 95%CI = 1.51–5.53), and those with a high familiarity with Pap smear resources (OR = 5.31, 95%CI = 2.82–9.98) had a significantly higher perception level of cervical cancer screening among women with physical disabilities. This study highlights the necessity of increasing the knowledge and awareness of cervical cancer screening and reducing the barriers to cervical cancer screening experienced by women with disabilities. © 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Cervical cancer is one of the leading causes of cancer death in women, and effective interventions against cervical cancer exist, including screening for and treating precancerous lesions and invasive cancer (WHO, 2006). However, there are still many barriers to the control of cervical cancer, such as the lack of awareness of cervical cancer among the population and health care providers, absent or poor quality screening plans and limited access to health care services. In addition to health awareness, many women may lack accurate information or they may not have heard of cervical cancer and do not recognize the early signs and symptoms when they occur (Alliance for Cervical Cancer Prevention,

E-mail address: a530706@ndmctsgh.edu.tw (J.-D. Lin).

^{*} Corresponding author at: School of Public Health, National Defense Medical Center, No. 161, Min-Chun East Road, Section 6, Nei-Hu, Taipei, Taiwan. Tel.: +886 2 87923100x18447; fax: +886 2 87923147.

^{0891-4222/\$ –} see front matter © 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2011.08.005

2004). These attitudes and beliefs about cervical cancer among the female population can increase the disease burden in the community.

Women with physical disabilities reported high levels of perceived stress; women who are limited by pain and lack social support are at particularly high risk (Hughes, Taylor, Robinson-Whelen, & Nosek, 2005). They are at risk for breast and cervical cancer, yet physical and attitudinal barriers contribute to lack of screening (Thierry, 2000). Consequently, disabled women were less likely to receive mammography and Pap smears within the recommended intervals (Tezzoni, McCarthy, Davis, Harris-David, & O'Day, 2006; Wei, Findley, & Sambamoorthi, 2006). Furthermore, Armour, Thierry, and Wolf (2009) analyzed the 2008 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System in the US and found that women with a disability were significantly less likely than those without a disability to report receiving a Pap test during the past three years (78.9% vs. 83.4%, respectively).

However, despite the fact that women with disabilities experience limitations in life activities, the study of health in the context of disability for women is a relatively new field of inquiry (Hughes, 2006). Health professionals need to be better informed and must take into account the needs and characteristics of this vulnerable population and to acknowledge the rights of women with disabilities to access Pap smear screening (Lin, Lin, et al., 2010). Alliance for Cervical Cancer Prevention (2004) also stated that heightened awareness of cervical cancer and effective prevention strategies are effective health policies that help decrease cervical cancer incidence and mortality. Therefore, it is important to consider the perspectives of women in the community, their knowledge and attitudes about cervical cancer, and their service needs to develop services that will meet those needs. Therefore, the present paper aims to describe the knowledge and awareness of cervical cancer screening and to examine its determinants among Taiwanese women with physical disabilities living in the community.

2. Methods

A cross-sectional survey was employed in the study, and the sampling of study participants was described in our previous paper (Lin, Chen, Lin, & Sung, 2011). We recruited the study participants based on a population composed of 17,455 women with physical disabilities aged more than 15 years who were officially registered as having physical disabilities in Taipei County, Taiwan, in March 2009. Those physical disabilities include upper and lower limb impairments, spinal cord impairments and other nervous system impairments.

A mail-out structured questionnaire was designed to consider demographics and reported use, health experience and perception (understanding and attitudes) of Pap smear tests among women with physical disabilities. We assessed 10 health issues, which were validated by five experts to examine the perception of the respondents toward the Pap smear test. These issues included the following: (1) Women with previous normal Pap smear results still need to receive regular Pap smear tests. (2) Women without any gynecological symptoms still need to receive Pap smear tests. (3) The Taiwan NHI provides annual free Pap smear tests for women. (4) Pap smear tests are necessary even in women who are not sexually active. (5) Cervical cancer is not a contagious disease. (6) Women who have had a hysterectomy still need to receive regular Pap smear tests. (7) Understand hospitals are providing Pap smear clinics to speed the test. (8) Women should not flush the vagina before receiving a Pap smear test. (9) Women should take a shower instead of a bath before the Pap smear test. (10) Human papilloma virus (HPV) can lead to cervical cancer. The responding questionnaires were analyzed by SPSS 18.0 software. Numbers, percentages and the Chi-squared test were used to describe the participants' demographic characteristics and health experience and to analyze the association of these characteristics with their perception of Pap smear tests. Multivariate analysis by logistic regression, odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) analyses were used to examine the factors that are potentially associated with Pap smear awareness in women with physical disabilities.

3. Results

The demographic characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1. Their mean age was nearly 50 years; 53.5% were aged less than 50 years and 46.3% were older than 50 years. A total of 82.5% women had married and 55.8% had obtained an education level of senior high school or higher. Most of the respondents had lower limb (72.8%) or upper limb (31.8%) impairments. A total of 14.5% of the cases reported the co-occurrence of other impairments in addition to the primary disability. Most of the study participants had either a mild (54.5%) or moderate (32.6%) level of disability. With regard to the household income levels of the study participants, 62.9% of cases reported that their monthly income was less than 40,000 New Taiwan Dollars (NTD).

Table 2 shows the understanding and awareness of Pap smear screening among women with physical disabilities; 86.6% and 72.8% of cases agreed that "those with previous normal Pap smear results still need to receive regular Pap smear tests" and "those without any gynecological symptoms still need to receive Pap smear tests," respectively. Most of the respondents (72.3%) knew that "the Taiwan National Health Insurance (NHI) provides annual free Pap smear tests for women". However, only 45.6% of cases expressed that they know that "hospitals provide a rapid Pap smear screening service". With regard to reproductive health awareness, 66.4% of cases agreed that Pap smear tests are still necessary even if they are not sexually active, 58.2% respondents knew that "cervical cancer is not a contagious disease", and 47.6% of cases agreed that they "should not flush the vagina before receiving a Pap smear test" (38.3%) or that they "should take a shower instead of a bath before a Pap smear test" (33.1%). Finally, only one third of the respondents knew that "human papilloma virus (HPV) can lead to

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of the women with physical disabilities.

Characteristics	n	%
Age (<i>n</i> = 480)		
Mean \pm SD	49.97 ± 12.36	
<0	257	53.5
≧50	223	46.5
Marital status ($n = 496$)		
Unmarried	87	17.5
Married	409	82.5
Education level (n = 498)		
Junior high school or less	220	44.2
Senior high school or more	278	55.8
Physical impairment type (multiple choices)		
Lower limb ($n = 496$)	361	72.8
Upper limb (<i>n</i> = 497)	158	31.8
Spinal cord injury (n = 496)	52	10.5
Other nervous system impairment $(n = 496)$	36	7.3
Accompanied with another disability $(n = 456)$		
Yes	66	14.5
No	390	85.5
Disability level (<i>n</i> = 497)		
Mild	271	54.5
Moderate	162	32.6
Severe	57	11.5
Profound	7	1.4
Household monthly income $(n = 445)$		
<40,000 NTD	280	62.9
≥40,000 NTD	165	37.1

Table 2

Respondent knowledge and awareness of cervical cancer screening.

Health perception issues	Agree/known, n (%)	Disagree/unknown, n (%)	Uncertain, n (%)
Women with previous normal Pap smear results still need to have regular Pap	425 (86.6)	18 (3.7)	48 (9.7)
smear tests $(n = 491)$			
Women without any gynecological symptoms still need to have Pap smear tests (<i>n</i> = 491)	357 (72.8)	67 (13.6)	67 (13.6)
The Taiwan NHI provides annual free Pap smear test for women \geq 30 years (<i>n</i> = 494)	357 (72.3)	102 (20.6)	35 (7.1)
Pap smear tests are necessary even if the woman is not sexually active $(n = 491)$	326 (66.4)	65 (13.2)	100 (20.4)
Cervical cancer is not a contagious disease $(n = 493)$	287 (58.2)	27 (5.5)	179 (36.3)
Women still need to have regular Pap smear tests following a hysterectomy $(n = 496)$	236 (47.6)	57 (11.5)	203 (40.9)
Understand hospitals are providing a rapid screening service $(n = 493)$	225 (45.6)	231 (46.9)	37 (7.5)
Women should not flush the vagina before having a Pap smear test ($n = 494$)	189 (38.3)	74 (15.0)	231 (46.7)
Women should take shower before having a Pap smear test $(n = 493)$	166 (33.1)	297 (60.2)	30 (6.1)
Human papilloma virus (HPV) can lead to cervical cancer $(n = 492)$	167 (33.9)	20 (4.1)	305 (62.0)

cervical cancer". Table 3 shows the calculated perception score distribution of the respondents; the mean score was 5.49 ± 2.57 for the study participants. We used a scoring system (range 0–10) to categorize the study participants' perception level of the Pap smear test (low vs. high). The results showed that 77.3% of the subjects had low perception scores (score \leq 7) and 22.7% had high perception scores (score > 7).

Tables 4 and 5 analyze the relationship of the participants' demographic characteristics, health experience and Pap smear perception in the bivariate Chi-squared tests. We analyzed the variables marital status, educational level, the presence of nervous system impairments, household monthly income, Pap smear experience, familiarity with Pap smear resources, willingness to use the Pap smear test as improving medical resource, and the quality of hospital services. We put the above statistically significant factors in bivariate Chi-squared tests into the logistic regression model (Table 6). Model I analyzed the effects of predisposing factors, model II tested the predicted effects of predisposing and enabling factors, and model III examined three domains: predisposing, enabling and need factors, to predict the perception level of the Pap smear test among women with physical disabilities. In model I, the results showed that married women (OR = 3.75, 95%CI = 1.67-8.42) and those with a higher educational level (OR = 3.33, 95%CI = 1.84-6.40) were likely to have a higher perception level of Pap smear tests than their unmarried and less educated counterparts. Model II indicated that married women (OR = 4.0, 95%CI = 1.54-10.42) and those with a higher educational level (OR = 3.07, 95%CI = 1.66-5.70) were likely to have a higher perception level of Pap smear tests. Finally, model III revealed that married status (OR = 3.30, 95%CI = 1.25-8.71), higher

Score distribution of knowledge and awareness (perception) of cervical cancer screening.

Scores (<i>n</i> = 498)	n	%
0	27	5.4
1	21	4.2
2	26	5.2
3	32	6.4
4	48	9.6
5	76	15.3
6	69	13.9
7	86	17.3
8	56	11.2
9	40	8.1
10	17	3.4
Mean \pm SD	5.49 ± 2.57	

Table 4

Relationship between screening awareness and the demographic characteristics of women with physical disabilities according to Chi-squared tests.

low, n (%)High, n (%) χ^2 p ValueAge (n = 477)0.1970.657<50199 (77.7)57 (22.3)≥50168 (76.0)53 (24.0)Marital status (n = 493)11.2650.001Unmarried79 (90.8)8 (9.2)Married30 (74.1)105 (25.9)Education level (n = 495)7.1130.008Junior high school and less181 (83.0)37 (17.0)Senior high school and more202 (72.9)75 (27.1)Upper limb (n = 494)0.1210.728Yes124 (78.5)34 (21.5)0.011No259 (77.1)77 (22.9)0.038Yes281 (78.5)77 (21.5)0.031No101 (74.8)34 (25.2)0.011Spinal cord impairment (n = 493)99 (22.4)0.011Yes35 (97.2)1 (2.8)0.011No342 (77.6)99 (22.4)0.011No347 (75.9)110 (24.1)0.012No347 (75.9)1 (2.8)0.036Yes52 (80.0)93 (20.0)0.048No295 (76.0)93 (20.0)0.032No295 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.036No202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.036No203 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.036No203 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.036No202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.036No202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.036No202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.375	Variable	Perception level ^a			
Age (n = 477)0.1970.657<50		Low, <i>n</i> (%)	High, <i>n</i> (%)	χ^2	p Value
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age (<i>n</i> = 477)			0.197	0.657
≥50168 (76.0)53(24.0)Marital status (n = 493)1.2650.001Unmarried79 (90.8)8 (9.2)Married301 (74.1)105 (25.9)Education level (n = 495)71130.008Junior high school and less181 (83.0)77 (17.0)Senior high school and more202 (72.9)75 (27.1)Upper limb (n = 494)0.1210.728Yes124 (78.5)34 (21.5)No259 (77.1)77 (21.5)No0.06134 (25.2)Spinal cord impairment (n = 493)0.0110.918Yes40 (76.9)12 (23.1)No35 (97.2)1 (2.8)No35 (97.2)1 (2.8)Yes35 (97.2)1 (2.8)No35 (20.0)33 (20.0)Yes52 (80.0)33 (20.0)No25 (75.1)67 (4.9)Noderate127 (78.9)Nid202 (75.1)67 (4.9)Mid202 (75.1)67 (4.9)Moderate127 (78.8)Severe or Profound5 (8.8)Hussehold monthly income (n = 442)43 (21.1)Severe or Profound5 (8.8)Nid39,99934 (21.	<50	199 (77.7)	57 (22.3)		
Married11.2650.001Unmarried79 (90.8)8 (9.2)Married301 (74.1)105 (25.9)Education level (n = 495)7 (17.0)Junior high school and more202 (72.9)Senior high school and more202 (72.9)Ves124 (78.5)34 (21.5)No259 (77.1)77 (22.9)Lower limb (n = 493)0.011Yes0.011No101 (74.8)34 (25.2)Spinal cord impairment (n = 493)0.011Yes40 (76.9)12 (23.1)Yes35 (97.2)10 (24.3)No342 (77.6)99 (22.4)Other nervous system impairments (n = 493)8.672Yes35 (97.2)11 (28.8)Yes35 (97.2)10 (24.1)No347 (75.9)31 (28.1)No295 (76.0)33 (24.0)Yes52 (80.0)33 (20.0)Yes52 (80.0)33 (24.0)No295 (76.0)33 (24.0)No295 (76.0)33 (24.0)No295 (76.0)33 (24.0)No295 (76.0)33 (24.0)No295 (76.0)33 (24.0)No295 (75.0)67 (24.9)Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)Moderate127 (78.8)11 (17.2)Severe or Profound53 (82.8)11 (17.2)Household monthly income (n = 442)4.3750.036Severe or Profound53 (82.8)11 (17.2)Sever	≧50	168 (76.0)	53(24.0)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Marital status (n = 493)			11.265	0.001
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Unmarried	79 (90.8)	8 (9.2)		
Education level (n = 495)7.1130.008Junior high school and less181 (83.0)37 (17.0)7Senior high school and more202 (72.9)75 (27.1)7Upper limb (n = 494)0.1210.728Yes124 (78.5)34 (21.5)7No259 (77.1)77 (22.9)7Lower limb (n = 493)0.7600.383Yes281 (78.5)77 (21.5)7No101 (74.8)34 (25.2)7Spinal cord impairment (n = 493)0.0110.918Yes40 (76.9)12 (23.1)7No342 (77.6)99 (22.4)7Other nervous system impairments (n = 493)8.6720.003Yes35 (97.2)1 (2.8)7No347 (75.9)110 (24.1)7Accompanied with another disability (n = 453)295 (76.0)93 (20.0)No295 (76.0)93 (20.0)734 (21.1)Severe or Profound202 (75.1)67 (24.9)34 (21.1)Severe or Profound53 (82.8)11 (17.2)4.3750.036Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)4.3750.036Moderate127 (78.9)34 (21.1)4.3750.036Severe or Profound53 (82.8)11 (17.2)4.3750.036<	Married	301 (74.1)	105 (25.9)		
$\begin{array}{cccc} \begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Education level $(n = 495)$			7.113	0.008
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Junior high school and less	181 (83.0)	37 (17.0)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Senior high school and more	202 (72.9)	75 (27.1)		
Yes124 (78.5)34 (21.5)No259 (77.1)77 (22.9)Lower limb (n = 493)0.7600.383Yes281 (78.5)77 (21.5)No101 (74.8)34 (25.2)Spinal cord impairment (n = 493)0.0110.918Yes40 (76.9)12 (23.1)No342 (77.6)99 (22.4)Other nervous system impairments (n = 493)8.6720.003Yes35 (97.2)1 (2.8)10 (24.1)No347 (75.9)110 (24.1)10 (24.1)Accompanied with another disability (n = 453)0.4890.484Yes52 (80.0)93 (24.0)10 (24.1)No202 (75.1)67 (24.9)10 (24.1)Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)10 (24.1)Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)10 (24.1)Moderate127 (78.9)34 (21.1)4.375Severe or Profound52 (80.8)11 (17.2)4.375Household monthy income (n = 442)4.3750.036 <nt 39,999<="" td="">221 (79.5)57 (20.5)57 (20.5)≥ NT 40,000116 (70.7)48 (29.3)11</nt>	Upper limb $(n = 494)$. ,	0.121	0.728
No259 (77.1)77 (22.9)Lower limb (n = 493)0.7600.383Yes281 (78.5)77 (21.5)No101 (74.8)34 (25.2)Spinal cord impairment (n = 493)0.0110.918Yes40 (76.9)12 (23.1)No342 (77.6)99 (22.4)Other nervous system impairments (n = 493)8.6720.003Yes35 (97.2)1 (2.8)No347 (75.9)110 (24.1)Accompanied with another disability (n = 453)0.4890.484Yes52 (80.0)93 (20.0)1No202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.352Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)4.3750.036Moderate127 (78.9)34 (21.1)4.3750.036Severe or Profound53 (82.8)11 (17.2)4.3750.036Household monthly income (n = 442)221 (79.5)57 (20.5)4.3750.036≥ NT 40,000116 (70.7)48 (29.3)48 (29.3)1	Yes	124 (78.5)	34 (21.5)		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	No	259 (77.1)	77 (22.9)		
Yes281 (78.5)77 (21.5)No101 (74.8)34 (25.2)Spinal cord impairment (n = 493)0.0110.918Yes40 (76.9)12 (23.1)No342 (77.6)99 (22.4)Other nervous system impairments (n = 493)8.6720.003Yes35 (97.2)1 (2.8)0.489No347 (75.9)110 (24.1)10.241Accompanied with another disability (n = 453)0.4890.484Yes52 (80.0)93 (20.0)10.240No295 (76.0)93 (24.0)10.352Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.352Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)10.352Moderate127 (78.9)34 (21.1)10.352Severe or Profound53 (82.8)11 (17.2)4.3750.036 <nt 39,999<="" td="">221 (79.5)57 (20.5)116 (70.7)48 (29.3)</nt>	Lower limb $(n = 493)$			0.760	0.383
No101 (74.8) $34 (25.2)$ Spinal cord impairment (n = 493)0.0110.918Yes40 (76.9)12 (23.1)No342 (77.6)99 (22.4)Other nervous system impairments (n = 493)8.6720.003Yes35 (97.2)1 (2.8)No347 (75.9)110 (24.1)Accompanied with another disability (n = 453)0.4890.484Yes52 (80.0)93 (20.0)No295 (76.0)93 (24.0)Disability level (n = 494)202 (75.1)67 (24.9)Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)Moderate127 (78.9)34 (21.1)Severe or Profound53 (82.8)11 (17.2)Household monthly income (n = 442)4.3750.036 <nt 39,999<="" td="">221 (79.5)57 (20.5)≥ NT 40,000116 (70.7)48 (29.3)</nt>	Yes	281 (78.5)	77 (21.5)		
Spinal cord impairment (n = 493)0.0110.918Yes40 (76.9)12 (23.1)0.0110.918No342 (77.6)99 (22.4)000300030003Yes35 (97.2)1 (2.8)0.00300030003Yes35 (97.2)1 (0 (24.1)0.4890.484Accompanied with another disability (n = 453)0.4890.4840.4890.484Yes52 (80.0)93 (20.0)0.0100.0100.0110.011No295 (76.0)93 (24.0)0.4840.0250.03520.03520.03520.0352Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.4370.0360.3520.0360.3520.036No295 (76.0)93 (21.1)0.4370.0360.03520.0360.03520.036Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.4370.0360.0360.0360.036Moderate127 (78.9)34 (21.1)0.0360.0360.0360.036 <nt 39,999<="" td="">221 (79.5)57 (20.5)57 (20.5)0.0360.036≥ NT 40,000116 (70.7)48 (29.3)0.0360.0360.036</nt>	No	101 (74.8)	34 (25.2)		
Yes40 (76.9)12 (23.1)No342 (77.6)99 (22.4)Other nervous system impairments ($n = 493$)8.6720.003Yes35 (97.2)1 (2.8)No347 (75.9)110 (24.1)Accompanied with another disability ($n = 453$)0.4890.484Yes52 (80.0)93 (20.0)93 (24.0)No295 (76.0)93 (24.0)0.489Disability level ($n = 494$)202 (75.1)67 (24.9)Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.352Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)10Severe or Profound127 (78.9)34 (21.1)Severe or Profound8.82.8)11 (17.2)Household monthly income ($n = 442$)4.3750.036 <nt 39,999<="" td="">221 (79.5)57 (20.5)$\geq NT 40,000$116 (70.7)48 (29.3)</nt>	Spinal cord impairment $(n = 493)$			0.011	0.918
No $342 (77.6)$ $99 (22.4)$ Other nervous system impairments (n = 493)8.6720.003Yes $35 (97.2)$ 1 (2.8)100 (24.1)No $347 (75.9)$ 110 (24.1)0.4890.484Accompanied with another disability (n = 453)0.4890.484Yes $52 (80.0)$ 93 (20.0)93 (24.0)0.489No295 (76.0)93 (24.0)0.4890.352Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)67 (24.9)0.352Mild127 (78.9)34 (21.1)100 (24.1)100 (24.1)Severe or Profound127 (78.9)34 (21.1)100 (24.1)Severe or Profound127 (78.9)34 (21.1)100 (24.1)Severe or Profound127 (78.9)34 (21.1)100 (24.1)Household monthly income (n = 442)4.3750.036 <nt 39,999<="" td="">221 (79.5)57 (20.5)116 (70.7)≥ NT 40,000116 (70.7)48 (29.3)11</nt>	Yes	40 (76.9)	12 (23.1)		
Other nervous system impairments $(n = 493)$ 8.672 0.003 Yes 35 (97.2) 1 (2.8) 10 (24.1) Accompanied with another disability $(n = 453)$ 0.489 0.489 0.484 Yes 52 (80.0) 93 (20.0) 0 0 No 295 (76.0) 93 (24.0) 0 0.352 Disability level $(n = 494)$ 202 (75.1) 67 (24.9) 0.352 Mild 202 (75.1) 67 (24.9) 34 (21.1) Severe or Profound 53 (82.8) 111 (17.2) 4375 0.036 <nt 39,999<="" td=""> 221 (79.5) 57 (20.5) 57 (20.5) 257 (20.5) 257 (20.5) \geq NT 40,000 116 (70.7) 48 (29.3) 0.036 0.036 0.036</nt>	No	342 (77.6)	99 (22.4)		
Yes $35 (97.2)$ $1 (2.8)$ No $347 (75.9)$ $110 (24.1)$ Accompanied with another disability $(n = 453)$ 0.489 0.484 Yes $52 (80.0)$ $93 (20.0)$ No $295 (76.0)$ $93 (24.0)$ Disability level $(n = 494)$ $202 (75.1)$ $67 (24.9)$ Mild $202 (75.1)$ $67 (24.9)$ Moderate $127 (78.9)$ $34 (21.1)$ Severe or Profound $53 (82.8)$ $11 (17.2)$ Household monthly income $(n = 442)$ 4.375 0.036 $221 (79.5)57 (20.5)\geq NT 40,000116 (70.7)48 (29.3)$	Other nervous system impairments $(n = 493)$			8.672	0.003
No347 (75.9)110 (24.1)Accompanied with another disability (n = 453)0.4890.484Yes52 (80.0)93 (20.0)93 (24.0)No295 (76.0)93 (24.0)20860.352Disability level (n = 494)202 (75.1)67 (24.9)0.484Mid202 (75.1)67 (24.9)4 (21.1)Severe or Profound53 (82.8)11 (17.2)43750.036 <nt 39,999<="" td="">221 (79.5)57 (20.5)57 (20.5)116 (70.7)48 (29.3)</nt>	Yes	35 (97.2)	1 (2.8)		
Accompanied with another disability (n = 453) 0.489 0.484 Yes 52 (80.0) 93 (20.0) 93 (20.0) No 295 (76.0) 93 (24.0) 202 (75.1) 67 (24.9) Mild 202 (75.1) 67 (24.9) 34 (21.1) Severe or Profound 53 (82.8) 11 (17.2) 4375 0.036 <nt 39,999<="" td=""> 221 (79.5) 57 (20.5) 20.00 20.00 ≥ NT 40,000 116 (70.7) 48 (29.3) 48 (29.3) 48 (29.3)</nt>	No	347 (75.9)	110(24.1)		
Yes52 (80.0)93 (20.0)No295 (76.0)93 (24.0)Disability level $(n = 494)$ 202 (75.1)67 (24.9)Mild202 (75.1)67 (24.9)Moderate127 (78.9)34 (21.1)Severe or Profound53 (82.8)11 (17.2)Household monthly income $(n = 442)$ 4.3750.036 $< NT 39,999$ 221 (79.5)57 (20.5) $\geq NT 40,000$ 116 (70.7)48 (29.3)	Accompanied with another disability $(n = 453)$			0.489	0.484
No 295 (76.0) 93 (24.0) Disability level (n = 494) 2.086 0.352 Mild 202 (75.1) 67 (24.9) Moderate 127 (78.9) 34 (21.1) Severe or Profound 58 (28.8) 11 (17.2) Household monthly income (n = 442) 4.375 0.036 <nt 39,999<="" td=""> 221 (79.5) 57 (20.5) ≥ NT 40,000 116 (70.7) 48 (29.3)</nt>	Yes	52 (80.0)	93 (20.0)		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	No	295 (76.0)	93 (24.0)		
Mild202 (75.1) $67 (24.9)$ Moderate127 (78.9) $34 (21.1)$ Severe or Profound53 (82.8) $11 (17.2)$ Household monthly income (n = 442)4.375 0.036 <nt 39,999<="" td="">221 (79.5)$57 (20.5)$$\geq$ NT 40,000116 (70.7)48 (29.3)</nt>	Disability level $(n = 494)$		()	2.086	0.352
Moderate 127 (78.9) 34 (21.1) Severe or Profound 53 (82.8) 11 (17.2) Household monthly income ($n = 442$) 4.375 0.036 <nt 39,999<="" td=""> 221 (79.5) 57 (20.5) \geq NT 40,000 116 (70.7) 48 (29.3)</nt>	Mild	202 (75.1)	67 (24.9)		
Severe or Profound 53 (82.8) 11 (17.2) Household monthly income ($n = 442$) 4.375 0.036 <nt 39,999<="" td=""> 221 (79.5) 57 (20.5) \geq NT 40,000 116 (70.7) 48 (29.3)</nt>	Moderate	127 (78.9)	34(21.1)		
Household monthly income (n = 442) 4.375 0.036 <nt 39,999<="" td=""> 221 (79.5) 57 (20.5) ≧ NT 40,000 116 (70.7) 48 (29.3)</nt>	Severe or Profound	53 (82.8)	11 (17.2)		
<nt 39,999<="" td=""> 221 (79.5) 57 (20.5) ≧NT 40,000 116 (70.7) 48 (29.3)</nt>	Household monthly income $(n = 442)$	00 (0210)	11 (1712)	4.375	0.036
≥NT 40,000 116 (70.7) 48 (29.3)	<nt 39.999<="" td=""><td>221 (79.5)</td><td>57 (20.5)</td><td></td><td> 9</td></nt>	221 (79.5)	57 (20.5)		9
	≧NT 40,000	116 (70.7)	48 (29.3)		

^a Perception level, low: 0–7, high: 8–10.

educational level (OR = 2.88, 95%CI = 1.51–5.53), and familiarity with Pap smear resources (OR = 5.31, 95%CI = 2.82–9.98) can significantly predict a high perception level of cervical cancer screening among women with physical disabilities.

4. Discussion

Unlike many other cancers, cervical cancer is mostly preventable through screening programs designed to identify and treat precancerous lesions (Alliance for Cervical Cancer Prevention, 2004). Although people with physical disabilities may have impaired mobility, their lifespans are similar to age-matched population controls. They therefore need standard preventive services to prevent early mortality (Cheng et al., 2001). Research is needed to better understand how cognitive and environmental barriers, both physical and social, interact to predict screening behaviors among this population of women (Thierry, 2000). In the present study, we aim to explore the understanding of the concept of cervical cancer, awareness of cervical cancer prevention services, and feelings about screening and the service system based on individual perspectives of women with physical disabilities living in the community. The results revealed that those women with

Table 5

Relationship between screening awareness and health experience of women with physical disabilities according to Chi-squared tests.

Variable	Perception level			
	Low, n (%)	High, <i>n</i> (%)	χ^2	p Value
Hysterectomy ($n = 485$)			0.473	0.491
Yes	39 (73.6)	14 (26.4)		
No	336 (77.8)	96 (22.2)		
Tubal ligation $(n = 467)$			2.622	0.105
Yes	93 (72.7)	35 (27.3)		
No	270 (79.6)	69 (20.4)		
Use of Pap smear $(n = 487)$			6.588	0.010
Yes	261 (74.8)	88 (25.2)		
No	118 (85.5)	20 (14.5)		
Familiarity with Pap smear resources $(n = 468)$			53.309	< 0.001
Low (score ≤ 3)	204 (91.9)	18 (8.1)		
High (score>3)	156 (63.4)	90 (36.6)		
Willing level to use Pap smear as improving medical resources $(n = 489)$			3.010	0.083
Low (score ≤ 3)	127 (81.9)	28 (18.1)		
High (score>3)	250 (74.9)	84 (25.1)		
Quality of hospital services $(n = 410)$			4.933	0.026
Low (score ≤ 3)	91 (85.0)	16 (15.0)		
High (score>3)	226 (74.6)	77 (25.4)		

Table 6

Factors that affect the level of screening awareness among women with physical disabilities in the logistic regression analysis (n = 345).

Variable (reference)	Model I	Model II	Model III
	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)	OR (95%CI)
Predisposing factors			
Marital status (unmarried)			
Married	3.75 (1.67-8.42)*	4.0 (1.54–10.42)*	3.30 (1.25-8.71)
Education level (junior high school or less)			
Senior high school or more	3.33 (1.84–6.40)*	3.07 (1.66-5.70)	2.88 (1.51–5.53)*
Other nervous system Impairments (No)			
Yes	0.17 (0.02-1.32)	0.19 (0.23-1.46)	0.17 (0.02-1.42)
Enabling factors			
Average monthly household income (<nt 39,999)<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td></nt>			
≧NT 40,000		1.27 (0.75-2.16)	1.11 (0.63-1.96)
Use of Pap smear (No)			
Yes		0.97 (0.45-2.08)	0.87 (0.39-1.92)
Quality of hospital services (low)			
High		1.92 (0.99-3.72)	1.49 (0.74-3.0)
Need factors			
Familiarity with the Pap smear test resources (low)			
High			5.31 (2.82–9.98)*
* <i>p</i> < 0.05.			

disabilities had inadequate understanding and awareness of cervical cancer and screening in general. In the long run, we should adopt the suggestion of WHO (2006), which stated that "health education should be an integral part of comprehensive cervical cancer control", to increase the health awareness in this group of people.

The logistic regression model of perception of the Pap smear test in the study indicated that the factors "marital status", "educational level" and "familiarity with Pap smear resources" can significantly predict the perception level among women with physical disabilities. In Taiwan, Chen et al. (2009) found that women with disabilities were at higher risk of lower compliance with Pap smear recommendations than women without disabilities. Liao, Wang, Lin, Hsieh, and Sung (2006) also revealed that, in addition to marital status, cancer awareness was the most significant factor associated with screening compliance in their multivariate logistic regression analysis. They suggested that women in Taiwan should be targeted for interventions to promote cancer awareness and screening compliance.

Another study by Nosek et al. (1995) found that knowledge, beliefs, psychological factors, and medical experiences have a strong influence on the reproductive health maintenance behaviors of women with physical disabilities. Cooper and Yoshida (2007) found the most common barriers to the cervical cancer screening tests were "not being sexually active," "my doctor told me I do not need one," and "the exam table is too high/narrow". They suggested that women with physical disabilities need further education on the necessity and benefits of regular cancer screening, especially among those who may not be sexually active. Furthermore, Agurto, Bishop, Sánchez, Betancourt, and Robles (2004) reported that the main barriers to cervical cancer screening in five Latin American countries are the limited accessibility and availability of quality services, the lack of facilities that comfortable and private, high costs, and the lack of courtesy from providers. All of these factors contribute to poor service delivery. Our previous study found that healthcare settings experienced in Pap smear tests for

women with intellectual disabilities were more likely to be in public healthcare settings. They were also more confident in providing screening tests and more likely to have a rapid screening program and a follow-up reminder system in place (Lin, Sung, et al., 2010). Lin, Lin, et al. (2010) found that marital status and a history of tubal ligation surgery were two factors that predicted Pap smear test use by women with intellectual disabilities in a logistic regression analysis.

Our findings also revealed that only one third of women were aware that HPV could lead to cervical cancer. Studies have shown that HPV infections may lead to the development of precancer and that cancer- and HPV DNA-based screening can begin after 30 years of age (WHO, 2006). HPV testing can identify high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasias earlier than Pap smears with acceptable rates of specificity (Lowy, Solomon, Hildesheim, Schiller, & Schiffman, 2008).

According to WHO (2006), there are still many barriers to the effective control of cervical cancer, including political barriers, community and individual barriers, economic barriers (lack of resources), and technical and organizational barriers caused by poorly organized health systems and weak infrastructures. In Germany, Schenck and von Karsa (2000) stated that improvements in the quality of the cervical cancer screening program management are necessary to ensure the effectiveness of the program. Therefore, to decrease the disease burden of cervical cancer, the involved parties should form partnerships to align disability policies with women's health policies, to increase public awareness, to create an effective communication strategy and to improve resource allocation to reduce the barriers to cervical cancer screening experienced by women with disabilities (Armour, Thierry, & Wolf, 2009; Giordano et al., 2008).

Acknowledgements

This project received financial support from the Bureau of Health Promotion, Department of Health, Taiwan (98-10002A). We would also like to acknowledge the women who participated in this study.

References

- Agurto, I., Bishop, A., Sánchez, G., Betancourt, Z., & Robles, S. (2004). Perceived barriers and benefits to cervical cancer screening in Latin America. *Preventive Medicine*, 39, 91–98.
- Armour, B. S., Thierry, J. M., & Wolf, L. A. (2009). State-level differences in breast and cervical cancer screening by disability status, United States, 2008. Women's Health Issues, 19, 406–414.
- Alliance for Cervical Cancer Prevention (ACCP). (2004). Planning and implementing cervical cancer prevention and control programs: A manual for managers. Seattle: ACCP.
- Chen, L. S., Chou, Y. J., Tsay, J. H., Lee, C. H., Chou, P., & Huang, N. (2009). Variation in the cervical cancer screening compliance among women with disability. Journal of Medical Screening, 16, 85–90.
- Cheng, E., Myers, L., Wolf, S., Shatin, D., Cui, X. P., Ellison, G., et al. (2001). Mobility impairments and use of preventive services in women with multiple sclerosis: Observational study. British Medical Journal, 323, 968–969.
- Cooper, N. S., & Yoshida, K. K. (2007). Cancer screening behaviors among Canadian women living with physical disabilities. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 88, 597–603.
- Giordano, L., Webster, P., Anthony, C., Szarewski, A., Davies, P., Arbyn, M., et al. (2008). Improving the quality of communication in organised cervical cancer screening programmes. Patient Education and Counseling, 72, 130–136.
- Hughes, R. B. (2006). Introduction to the theme issue on women and disabilities. Women's Health Issues, 16, 283-285.
- Hughes, R. B., Taylor, H. B., Robinson-Whelen, S., & Nosek, M. A. (2005). Stress and women with physical disabilities: Identifying correlates. *Women's Health Issues*, 15, 14–20.
- Liao, C. C., Wang, H. Y., Lin, R. S., Hsieh, C. Y., & Sung, F. C. (2006). Addressing Taiwan's high incidence of cervical cancer: Factors associated with the Nation's low compliance with Papanicolaou screening in Taiwan. Public Health, 120, 1170–1176.
- Lin, J. D., Chen, S. F., Lin, L. P., & Sung, C. L. (2011). Self-reports of Pap smear screening in women with physical disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 32, 456–461.
- Lin, L. P., Lin, J. D., Sung, C. L., Liu, T. W., Liu, Y. L., Chen, L. M., et al. (2010). Papanicolaou smear screening of women with intellectual disabilities: A cross-sectional survey in Taiwan. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 31, 403–409.
- Lin, J. D., Sung, C. L., Lin, L. P., Liu, T. W., Lin, P. Y., Chen, L. M., et al. (2010). Perception and experience of primary care physicians on Pap smear screening for women with intellectual disabilities: A preliminary finding. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 31, 440–445.
- Lowy, D. R., Solomon, D., Hildesheim, A., Schiller, J. T., & Schiffman, M. (2008). Human papillomavirus infection and the primary and secondary prevention of cervical cancer. *Cancer*, *113*, 1980–1993.
- Nosek, M. A., Young, M. E., Rintala, D. H., Howland, C. A., Foley, C. C., & Bennett, J. L. (1995). Barriers to reproductive health maintenance among women with physical disabilities. *Journal of Women's Health*, 4, 505–518.
- Schenck, U., & von Karsa, L. (2000). Cervical cancer screening in Germany. European Journal of Cancer, 36, 2221–2226.
- Tezzoni, L. I., McCarthy, E. P., Davis, R. B., Harris-David, L., & O'Day, B. (2006). Use of screening and preventive services among women with disabilities. American Journal of Medical Quality, 16, 135–144.
- Thierry, J. M. (2000). Increasing breast and cervical cancer screening among women with disabilities. *Journal of Women's Health & Gender-Based Medicine*, 9, 9–12. Wei, W., Findley, P. A., & Sambamoorthi, U. (2006). Disability and receipt of clinical preventive services among women. *Women's Health Issues*, 16, 286–296.
- WHO. (2006). Comprehensive cervical cancer control: A guide to essential practice. Geneva: Department of Chronic Diseases and Health Promotion, World Health Organization.