

University of Windsor

## Scholarship at UWindsor

---

Research Result Summaries

---

Summer 7-5-2023

### Assessment of the validity of the Attitudes to Disability Scale

Kelly Carr

*University of Windsor, carrk@uwindsor.ca*

Sean Horton

*Department of Kinesiology, University of Windsor, Windsor, ON*

Patricia Weir

*University of Windsor*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/research-result-summaries>

Consistent with the TCPS 2 (4.7) this is a research summary provided to participants and should not be considered a formal publication of results.

---

#### Recommended Citation

Carr, K., Horton, S., & Weir, P. (2023). Assessment of the validity of the Attitudes to Disability Scale. Retrieved from <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/research-result-summaries/214>

This Completed Summary is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Result Summaries by an authorized administrator of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact [scholarship@uwindsor.ca](mailto:scholarship@uwindsor.ca).

### **Assessment of the validity of the Attitudes to Disability Scale**

The Attitudes to Disability Scale (ADS), comprised of four subscales, was developed for use with adults with physical or intellectual disabilities, as well as healthy respondents. While Power et al. (2010) propose the use of the ADS among people without disability, its validity for such use is unknown. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to assess the validity of the ADS among people without disability. To do so, 423 adults without disability completed the ADS. Data examined using CFA and ESEM approaches revealed a poor fit for the initial 4-factor model. While post-hoc modifications resulted in a 3-factor model with acceptable model fit, reliability estimates for the three revised subscales were poor. Therefore, despite a three-factor model that evidences acceptable construct validity among a population of adults without disability, the reliability of the revised scale is inadequate.