

Table 1

*Mean and standard deviation of participants' scores at pre and post time points for the adapted PPKAQ and the QUPID-C ( $n_{full\ sample} = 50$ ).*

	Pre			Post		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>
Adapted PPKAQ	99.93	9.41	43	114.04	9.87	41
QUPID-C	21.20	5.69	41	26.78	4.12	40

*Note:* Maximum score for adapted PPKAQ: 130; Maximum score for QUPID-C: 35. Values by group are available upon request to the corresponding author.

Table 2

*Correlational analyses for participant ratings of feasibility, confidence and skill in pain assessment and management for children with ID.*

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 <sup>^</sup>	8	9	10 <sup>^</sup>	11	12
1. Assessment - Feasibility (Pre)	--											
2. Assessment - Confidence (Pre)	.273	--										
3. Assessment - Skill (Pre)	.369	.611**	--									
4. Treatment - Feasibility (Pre)	.389	.564**	.306	--								
5. Treatment - Confidence (Pre)	.302	.806**	.581**	.582**	--							
6. Treatment - Skill (Pre)	.341	.768**	.585**	.602**	.844**	--						
7. Assessment - Feasibility (Post) <sup>^</sup>	.271	.329	.388	.280	.348	.192	--					
8. Assessment - Confidence (Post)	.268	.339	.316	.230	.387	.352	.536**	--				
9. Assessment - Skill (Post)	.191	.191	.272	.100	.269	.213	.348	.816**	--			
10. Treatment - Feasibility (Post) <sup>^</sup>	.128	.277	.236	.394	.328	.222	.583**	.616**	.454	--		
11. Treatment - Confidence (Post)	-.008	.439	.098	.401	.395	.316	.411	.554**	.457	.711**	--	
12. Treatment - Skill (Post)	-.069	.332	.150	.196	.280	.216	.256	.511**	.519**	.523**	.742**	--

*Note.* Ratings with a <sup>^</sup> sign indicates that the distribution was non-normal, and that Spearman's correlation coefficient was used. \*\* indicates  $p < .001$ .

Table 3

*Participant evaluation of numerous aspects of the pain training [0 (strongly disagree) - 10 (strongly agree)].*

	Full Sample (n = 46)
1. The training content was valuable.*	
• Mean (SD)	• 8.61 (1.76)
• Range	• 4 - 10
2. The information provided at this training is applicable to my work.**	
• Mean (SD)	• 9.15 (1.33)
• Range	• 5 - 10
3. The format of the training was effective/ well suited to the material.**	
• Mean (SD)	• 8.85 (1.58)
• Range	• 5 - 10
4. The size of the group present for the training was ideal.	
• Mean (SD)	• 8.96 (1.52)
• Range	• 5 - 10
5. The group discussions were useful in further understanding the topic. *	
• Mean (SD)	• 8.93 (1.64)
• Range	• 4 - 10
6. The topic was interesting. ***	
• Mean (SD)	• 8.96 (1.58)
• Range	• 5 - 10
7. I would encourage other RW to take part in a training workshop like this. **	
• Mean (SD)	• 9.02 (1.36)
• Range	• 5 - 10
8. I would be interested in learning more about this topic.	
• Mean (SD)	• 8.67 (1.66)
• Range	• 5 - 10
9. I plan to incorporate what I have learned into my work. ***	
• Mean (SD)	• 9.07 (1.86)
• Range	• 0 - 10
10. I believe my pain-related training needs were met in completing this training program. **	
• Mean (SD)	• 8.74 (1.48)
• Range	• 5 - 10

*Note:* RW = Respite Workers; Across the full sample, the mode for all questions was 10, and the median for all questions ranged from 9 to 10. Significant differences in ratings between the two pilot groups are denoted as follows: \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$  Values by group are available upon request to the corresponding author.