

ATTITUDES TOWARD DISABLED PERSONS AMONG  
FEMALE COLLEGE STUDENTS IN TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

---

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN OCCUPATIONAL  
THERAPY IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

BY  
MEI-FEN YEN, B. S.

---

DENTON, TEXAS  
DECEMBER, 1982

The Graduate School  
Texas Woman's University  
Denton, Texas

August 10, 1982

We hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under  
our supervision by Mei-Fen Yen.

entitled ATTITUDES TOWARD DISABLED PERSONS  
AMONG FEMALE COLLEGE STUDENTS IN TEXAS WOMAN'S  
UNIVERSITY.

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the Degree of Master  
of Arts in Occupational Therapy

Committee:

Nancy L. Griffin  
Chairman  
Caroline Staccard  
Marie M. Fuller

Accepted:

Herbert R. Smith  
Provost of the Graduate School

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special acknowledgement is given to Dr. Nancy Griffin for the continued encouragement, support and enthusiasm she provided in the planning and completion of this study.

Further acknowledgements are extended to Dr. Marie M. Fuller, Mrs. Caroline S. Polliard, for their interest and assistance as members of the thesis committee.

Gratitude is expressed to my parents. Their understanding and love have been my inspiration and encouraged me to progress in academic and personal growth.

Thanks are given to Aunt Pi-Ching and many friends who continually offered their support and help.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
The statement of the Problem	
The statement of Purposes	
The Hypotheses	
The Definitions of Terms	
Assumptions	
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
The Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale	
Norms of ATDP-B	
Reliability of ATDP-B	
Scoring the ATDP-B	
Interpretation of ATDP-B	
III. METHODOLOGY.....	14
Subjects	
Proceure for Collecting Data	
Statistical analysis	
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	17
Results	
Amount of contact	
Closeness of Relationship	
Health Science Versus Other Majors	
Comparison of Normative Data	
Discussions	
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	25
APPENDIX A. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AMOUNT OF CONTACT AND ATTITUDES TOWARD DISABLED PERSONS.....	28
APPENDIX B. ATDP-B.....	32
APPENDIX C. THE COVER LETTER.....	35



APPENDIX D. PERSONAL DATA SHEET.....	36
APPENDIX E. RAW SCORE OF ATDP AND RESPONSES TO THE AMOUNT OF CONTACT AND CLOSENESS OF RELATIONSHIP WITH DISABLED PERSONS .....	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	41

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GROUPS WITH DIFFERENT AMOUNTS OF CONTACT, THEIR MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION IN ATDP SCORES .....	17
II. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GROUPS WITH VARYING CLOSENESS OF RELATIONSHIP WITH DISABLED PERSONS AND THEIR MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION IN ATDP SCORES .....	18
III. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GROUPS WITH ONE RELATIONSHIP OR MULTIPLE RELATIONSHIPS WITH DISABLED PERSONS AND THEIR MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION IN ATDP SCORES.....	20
IV. ATDP SCORES FOR NONDISABLED AND DISABLED RESPONDENTS.....	20
V. COMPARISON BETWEEN HEALTH SCIENCE MAJOR AND OTHER MAJORS IN ATDP SCORES.....	21
VI. COMPARISON OF ATDP SCORES OF THE NONDISABLED IN PRESENT SAMPLE AND ATDP NORMATIVE SAMPLE.....	22

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Attitudes toward disabled persons have been the focus of much research. Two different attitudes toward disabled persons seem to be held by non-disabled persons in our society (Himes, 1958). One view, which may be the more commonly held position, is that the disabled person is "different" from physically normal persons. This view suggests that the handicapping nature of the disability spreads throughout the total personality and influences characteristics of the individual apart from his physical disabilities. The other view suggests that the disabled person, while limited to some degree, is in most respects not different from physically normal persons.

In the past twenty-five years, there has been increasing recognition given to the importance of changing those persons categorized as disabled into more useful and effective people. Concern for this group has been evident in the growth of programs whose goals are to help the disabled gain the necessary knowledge and skills to become more effective citizens. Accompanying the recognition of the need for these persons to have knowledge and skills, is

recognition that negative attitudes in the general population toward them form barriers against achieving these goals (Wright, 1960).

### The Statement of the Problem

Despite the increased interest in the attitudes of the nondisabled toward the disabled, this is still an area needing further attention. Wright (1960) stated that not enough was known about the psychodynamics of attitudes toward disability. If it is possible to understand more fully the factors involved in attitudes toward the disabled, it may be possible to suggest ways and means of influencing or guiding the formation of attitudes. It is assumed that attitudes toward the disabled might be a function of components within the individual's life experience (Yuker et al, 1966). Aspects of experience which may influence attitudes toward the disabled are amount of contact with and closeness of relationship with disabled persons.

### The Statement of Purposes

This study attempted to assess the relationship between the attitudes of college students and the contacts they had had with disabled persons. Knowledge about how these factors interrelate might help educators learn to influence attitudes in a more favorable direction. The

study also attempted to find whether there is an attitude difference between those students who selected a health science major and those who did not.

### The Hypotheses

1. There is no relationship between the amount of contact with disabled persons and attitudes toward disabled persons.

2 There is no relationship between closeness of relationship with and attitudes toward disabled persons.

3. There is no difference in attitudes toward disabled persons between students who selected a health science major and students who selected other majors.

### The Definitions of Terms

Health science majors include: nursing, health care administration, health science instruction, occupational therapy, physical therapy, dental hygiene, special education, speech pathology, music therapy, and medical technology.

For this study, the term "disabled persons" was used to mean those at a disadvantage because of physical defects regardless of the specific kind.

### Assumptions

The following assumptions was made:

1. All the subjects responded to the statements honestly.

2. The response of students on the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale (ATDP) can reflect the attitudes of students toward disabled persons.
3. The findings from the sample in this study may be generalized to all students enrolled in Summer Session I in Texas Woman's University, since probability sampling was used.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

In the literature dealing with the relationship between attitudes and behavior, there are discussions of the relationship between attitudes and the past experiences of the individuals. It is assumed that the particular attitudes which a person holds will be a function of experiences that the person has undergone. Since attitudes are learned, it can be assumed that they are learned in experiential context. One would predict that the attitude nondisabled persons have toward disabled persons would be a function of their past experiences with disabled persons. Among these experiences would be the amount and closeness of their contact with disabled persons (Yuker et al, 1966).

Yuker et al. (1966), hypothesized that a person with a relatively high amount of contact with disabled persons would tend to be more accepting of them than one with less contact. This hypothesis was based on the assumption that prejudice is often, at least in part, related to a lack of direct, equal-status contact with the group toward whom the prejudice is expressed. Consequently, the greater the amount of contact with a particular group, the lower

the expected amount of prejudice toward that group. This is consistent with Homans' (1950) hypothesis which stated that contact results in increased positive attitudes, if the contact is voluntary.

Literature is available from many studies. Appendix A lists the studies that investigated the relationship between amount of contact and attitudes toward disabled persons. Using point scales to measure nondisabled persons' amount of contact with disabled persons, seven studies found no relationship between amount of contact with and attitudes toward physically disabled persons (Baskin & Herman, 1951; Coggin, 1964; Cowen et al, 1958; Rusalem, 1950; Siller & Chipman, 1965; Szuhay, 1961; William & Guney, 1966). Seven studies found more favorable attitudes in the people who have higher amounts of contact with disabled persons than in those who have lower amounts of contact (Bateman, 1962; Chesler, 1965; Fischbein, 1962; Higgs, 1975; Human Resources Center, 1962; Siller, 1964; Voeltz, 1980).

It has been demonstrated in the literature of social psychology that the closeness of relationship is sometimes of crucial importance. One would predict differences in attitudes as a result of contacts with a disabled relative, a disabled friend or acquaintance, a disabled co-worker, or the contact of professional staff working with disabled



persons in rehabilitation settings. Closeness of relationship can be considered apart from a simple tabulation of the amount of contacts. Individual's attitudes toward disabled persons are, in part, a function of specific experiences with one or a few disabled persons.

Using six possible relationships, varying in intimacy from speaking acquaintance through spouse, Siller et al (1967), Lamer (1965) and Connine (1968) concluded that the closeness of relationship with disabled persons is not related to their attitudes toward such persons.

Roehrer (1959) found that the persons who were intimate friends of disabled persons or worked directly with the disabled (group III) had more favorable attitudes than did persons who only knew a disabled person in school, worked indirectly with one, or had a distant relative with a disability (group II). Group II had more favorable attitudes than persons who had no personal contact with the disabled (group I). The persons who were disabled themselves held attitudes toward disability similar to people in group III. Those who had a disabled member in family (group IV) held slightly less positive attitudes than groups II, III, IV. Their attitudes were slightly more favorable than those of subjects in group I.

Roommates of disabled students were found to have more favorable attitudes toward disabled persons than those

whose contacts were as "casual acquaintance" and "stranger" in Webb's study (1963). No significant differences were found between those whose contacts were as "casual acquaintance" and "stranger".

Contact in different setting may influence the attitudes toward disabled persons. Some studies indicated that contacts in an employment setting, social setting, or personal setting appear to have equally positive effects on attitudes (Arnholter, 1963; Cohn, 1966; Genskow & Maglione, 1965). In other studies, contact in a medical setting was found to have more positive effects on attitude than contact in either an employment, social, or personal setting (Dickie, 1967; Human Resources, 1962). These differences may be attributed to differences in types of information provided by the different types of contact.

Bereiter & Freedman (1961) found that different curricula attract different kinds of people. The curricula themselves may enhance and modify differences of students in various fields. There is probably a complex interaction between the people who select training in a given specialty and its subsequent effect on them (Duteman et al, 1966). Because their curricula relate to the physically disabled, it is expected that students who major in a health science might have more favorable attitudes toward the physically disabled than those students with other majors.

There are three studies comparing students in various health related services on the basis of their attitudes toward the disabled. Two of these found that students who selected one of the health related fields, when compared with those in other disciplines, showed no difference in attitudes toward disabled persons (Anderson & Barry, 1965; Duteman, 1966). One study found more positive attitudes toward disabled persons among the helping profession majors versus all other majors (Bishop, 1969). "Helping profession" included psychology, social work, pre-medicine, health sciences and education.

#### The Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale

The Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale was developed by Yuker, Block & Campbell (1960). According to the authors, the ATDP was developed due to a need for a reliable instrument to measure attitudes toward the disabled in general. They emphasized differences between disabled and nondisabled persons, rather than specific disease entities or disabilities. The fundamental assumption underlying the development of this scale was that disabled people may be viewed as either different from physically normal persons or as essentially the same (Yuker et al, 1966).

Three forms of the ATDP have been developed. The original Form O has 20 items. The two more recent forms, Form A and Form B, have 30 items. Form B was arbitrarily selected for this study and is reproduced in Appendix B. The scale may be administered either individually or to groups. The ATDP consists of Liker-type items to which the subject responds by indicating the extent of his agreement or disagreement according to the following scale:

- +3: I agree very much
- +2: I agree pretty much
- +1: I agree a little
- 1: I disagree a little
- 2: I disagree pretty much
- 3: I disagree very much

Approximately half of the items on the ATDP-B refer to similarities or differences in personality characteristics between normal and physically disabled individuals, while the other half is concerned with the necessity of special treatment for disabled persons.

Instructions are printed at the top of the scale. The subjects are instructed to think of disabled persons as those at a disadvantage because of physical defects regardless of the specific kind.

ATDP scores may be interpreted as reflecting the subject's perception of disabled persons as either basically the same as nondisabled (acceptance) or as different (rejection or prejudice). Yuker et al (1966) reported numerous studies on the ATDP's reliability, normative data, and validity.

#### Norms

ATDP norms were derived from samples tested by the Human Resources Center in Albertson, New York and by other users of the scale. On the ATDP-B male Ss had a mean of 110.16 with a standard deviation of 21.47 (N= 345) and female Ss had a mean of 113.45 and a standard deviation of 22.02 (N= 549).

#### Reliability

The reliability of ATDP-B, using the test-retest method as a measure of stability, was reported at +.71 with a four month interval and +.85 with a five week interval (Yuker et al, 1966). Using the split-half method the reliability coefficients ranged from +.72 to +.84. These coefficients place the ATDP-B in the middle to high range of reliability for attitude scales reported by Helmstadter (1964).

#### Validity

Validity of the ATDP was established by relating the scores of nondisabled persons on the ATDP to other measures of overall attitudes toward disabled persons. A significant relationship was found between the ATDP-B and Variability of Distance Setting of "Disabled" photos,  $r=.30$ ,  $p .05$  (Krammer, 1965). Validity tests of other forms of the ATDP resulted in significant relationships between the Auvenshine Attitudes Toward Severely Disabled Students and ATDP-O,  $r=+.64$ ,  $p .01$  (Knittel, 1963), The Social Distance Scale and ATDP-O,  $r=-.34$ ,  $p .01$  (Siller, 1964), and The Attitudes Toward Physically Disabled Scale and ATDP-A,  $r=+.72$ ,  $p .001$  (Szuhay, 1961). Shaw and Wright (1967) stated that the ATDP has reasonably good validity which seems to be adequate for research purposes.

#### Scoring the ATDP-B

If more than 10 percent of the items are left blank, the test is considered not scorable. If 10 percent or fewer items are omitted, the completed items are scored as usual. This is equivalent to assigning a neutral value to the omitted items.

The ATDP-B is scored as follows:

First change the algebraic signs of responses to items 1,3,4,6,7,10,12,13,22,26,28. Next, add all scores algebraically to obtain a total score.

To facilitate dealing with ATDP-B scores, a transformation formula is applied to the obtained scores. This eliminates negative values and results in a system where higher scores represent an attitude suggesting that disabled people are in most ways similar to physically normal people. The total raw score obtained is transformed by changing the sign of the algebraic resultant and adding 90. The range of scores resulting from this transformation is from 0 to 180.

#### Interpretation of ATDP-B

High scores are interpreted to represent an acceptance of disabled persons, while low scores represent prejudice toward the disabled. A low score not only reflects the facts that the respondent perceives the disabled as different, but also to some degree "inferior" or "disadvantage".

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Subjects

A list of students enrolled in Summer Session I of 1982 in Texas Woman's University was supplied by the Open Records Office. A table of random numbers (Leedy, 1978) was used to determine a starting point within the list. The total number of names on the list was divided by 120 and the resulting number 37 became the span of names omitted between each of the names selected.

#### Procedure for collecting data

A cover letter (Appendix C), the ATDP scale, a personal data sheet (Appendix D), and a stamped envelope were sent by mail to each subject. The subject was asked to return the anonymous personal data sheet and questionnaire within 7 days. Replies received after three weeks were not included.

#### Statistical analysis

The subjects were categorized into five groups according to amount of contact with disabled persons. Those groups were designated as people with:



1. Less than 10 occasions
2. Between 11 and 50 occasions
3. Between 51 and 100 occasions
4. Between 101 and 500 occasions
5. More than 500 occasions

The subjects were categorized into four groups according to closeness of relationship with disabled persons. Those groups were as follows:

1. Those subjects regarded as having little contact with disabled persons. Their choice was the first responses: I have studied about physically disabled persons through reading, lecture, movie, or observation, but I didn't know any of them.

2. Those subjects who chose items concerning a friend or relative were regarded as having moderate contact with disabled persons.

3. Those subjects who chose the item regarding immediately family were regarded as having high contact with disabled persons.

4. Those subjects who themselves are physically disabled persons.

The percentage of subjects in each group was calculated. The mean and standard deviation of ATDP scores in each group were calculated.

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) method was used to compare means among the five groups with different amounts of contact with disabled persons, and among the four groups with varying closeness of contact with disabled persons.

The subjects were categorized into two groups according to their majors. One group was the students who major in a health science, the other group was the students with other majors besides health science. The percentage of subjects in each group was calculated. The mean and standard deviation of scores for each group were calculated. The t-test method was used to compare means between these two groups.

The t-test method was used to determine whether the present sample differed significantly in ATDP-B scores from the normative sample.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

#### RESULTS

Sixty-nine subjects responded to the questionnaire. The response rate was 57.5%. Raw score of ATDP and responses to the amount of contact and closeness of relationship with disabled persons appear in Appendix E. Subjects are grouped according to their major.

#### Amount of Contact

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GROUPS WITH DIFFERENT AMOUNTS OF CONTACT, THEIR MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION IN ATDP SCORE

Amount of Contact	N	%	Means	S.D.	F	p
Less than 10	14	20.3	109.57	22.53	2.11	ns
11-50	17	24.6	109.59	23.33		
51-100	14	20.3	122.86	19.20		
101-500	12	17.4	127.25	19.03		
More than 500	12	17.4	127.50	19.17		

All subjects responded to the question on amount of contact with disabled persons. Table I lists the number

and percentage of respondents in five groups with different amounts of contact. The mean and standard deviation in ATDP score for each group are listed.

Analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of 2.11 indicating that there is no significant differences in attitudes toward disabled persons among the five groups. This result supported null hypothesis 1 that there is no relationship between amount of contact with disabled persons and attitudes toward disabled persons.

#### Closeness of Relationship

TABLE II

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GROUPS WITH VARYING CLOSENESS OF RELATIONSHIP WITH DISABLED PERSONS AND THEIR MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION IN ATDP SCORE

Closeness of relationship	N	%	Means	S.D.	F	p
Little contact	23	33.3	103.17	21.14	7.70	.001
Moderate contact	31	44.9	120.35	19.25		
High contact	5	7.2	138.40	8.02		
Personally disabled	4	5.8	136.25	13.23		

Six respondents didn't respond to the question on closeness of relationship with disabled persons. The responses totalled sixty-three. If the subjects chose

more than one response, the one indicating the closest relationship with disabled persons was counted. Table II lists the number and percentage of respondents in four groups of varying closeness of relationship with disabled persons. The mean and standard deviation in ATDP scores for each group are listed.

Analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of 7.70 indicating that there is significant difference at the .001 level between the respondents based upon closeness of the relationship. A Newman-Keuls multiple range comparison found that the respondents who had little contact had significant lower scores than the other three groups. No significant difference was found among respondents who had moderate or high contact or who were themselves disabled.

Null hypothesis 2 was rejected in this study.

In order to investigate whether multiple relationships might influence attitudes toward the disabled, the mean of ATDP scores for twelve respondents who chose two or three relationships was calculated and listed in Table III. Using ANOVA to compare with other groups who had only one relationship, it was found that this group had no significant difference in attitudes.

TABLE III

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GROUPS WITH ONE RELATIONSHIP OR MULTIPLE RELATIONSHIPS WITH DISABLED PERSONS AND THEIR MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION IN ATDP SCORES

Closeness of relationship	N	%	Means	S.D.	F	p
Moderate contact	23	33.3	120.96	20.86	1.49	ns
High contact	3	4.5	135.00	8.89		
Personally disabled	2	3.0	145.50	9.19		
Multiple relation- ships	12	17.9	127.08	16.05		

TABLE IV

ATDP SCORES FOR NONDISABLED AND DISABLED RESPONDENTS

Sample	N	Means	S.D.	<u>t</u>	p
Disabled	4	136.25	13.23	1.88	ns
Nondisabled	59	115.19	21.99		

Using t-test to compare the ATDP scores between non-disabled respondents and disabled respondents showed there was no significant difference between two groups. Table IV lists the mean ATDP score for each group.

#### Health Science Versus Other Majors

All subjects responded to the question regarding their major. Table V lists number and percentage of two groups,

those with a health science major and those with other majors. The mean and standard deviation of ATDP scores for each group are listed.

TABLE V

COMPARISON BETWEEN HEALTH SCIENCE MAJOR AND OTHER  
MAJORS IN ATDP SCORES

Majors	N	%	Means	S.D.	<u>t</u>	p
Health Science	32	46.4	116.88	22.62	0.19	ns
Other	37	53.6	117.89	21.06		

Using a t-test to compare mean ATDP scores indicated there was no significant difference between the students who selected a health science major and those who selected other majors.

The null hypothesis 3 must be accepted.

#### Comparison of Normative Data

Because the disabled group in this sample was so small, no comparison with the normative ATDP scores for disabled groups was made. Table VI lists the mean and standard deviation of ATDP scores in the present sample and the normative sample for nondisabled respondents.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF ATDP SCORES OF THE NONDISABLED IN PRESENT  
SAMPLE AND ATDP NORMATIVE SAMPLE

	N	Means	S.D.	<u>t</u>	p
Present sample	59	115.19	21.09	-1.41	ns
ATDPnorms	549	113.45	22.02		

Using a t-test to compare the difference between the present sample and the ATDP normative sample for nondisabled groups in ATDP scores, it was found that there was no significant difference between the groups.

#### DISCUSSIONS

Since no significant relationship was found between amount of contact with the disabled and attitudes toward disabled persons, it seems that amount of contact is not a critical factor for developing attitudes.

Respondents who had a physically disabled friend, relative or immediate family member had significantly more favorable attitudes toward disabled persons than those who did not know any disabled persons. This result does correspond to the conclusion of Allport (1958) that people in our society who know the physically disabled will show less prejudice toward them. Since no



significant differences were found between those who had moderate contact and high contact with disabled persons, it might be suggested that closer relationships did not lead to more favorable attitudes.

Hypothesis 1 predicting no relationship between amount of contact and favorability of attitudes was supported.. Hypothesis 2 predicting no difference between closeness of relationship and favorability of attitudes was not supported. This is an area needing further investigation. The type of information about the disability given might be an important factor. The nature of the contact might influence the attitudes.

No significant difference was found between the health science majors versus other majors in attitudes toward disabled persons. This result suggested that experience in a health science curriculum was not necessarily more conducive to accepting attitudes toward the disabled than was experience in other academic disciplines. Perhaps exposure to the numerous physically disabled students in Texas Woman's University influenced both groups. Scores of both health science majors and other majors were slightly above the normative mean.

The mean of ATDP scores in nondisabled respondents was not statistically different from that of the ATDP

normative sample. This suggests that the present sample was representative of the general population.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate:

1. The relationship between amount of contact with disabled persons and attitudes toward the disabled.
2. The relationship between closeness of relationship with disabled persons and attitudes toward the disabled.
3. The comparison of attitudes toward disabled persons between the students who selected a health science major and those who selected other majors.

One hundred and twenty students were selected through a random sample from 4,443 students enrolled in Summer Session I of 1982 in Texas Woman's University. Sixty-nine subjects responded to the questionnaire. The response rate was 57.5%. They were mailed a cover letter, the ATDP scale, and a personal data sheet. As one envelope was returned by the post office, the sample size was reduced to one hundred and nineteen.

The major findings of this study were described as follows:

1. The students who had higher amounts of contact did not have more positive attitudes toward disabled persons than those who had lower amounts of contact.
2. Respondents who had little contact with the disabled had more negative attitudes toward the disabled than did those who had moderate or high contact or those who were themselves disabled.
3. No significant difference in attitudes toward disabled persons was found among those who had moderate or high contact with the disabled or who were themselves disabled.
4. There was no significant difference in attitudes toward disabled persons between students who selected a health science major and those who selected other majors.
5. No significant difference was found between the present sample and the normative sample in the ATDP scores of the nondisabled.

### Conclusion

Among many determinants of attitudes, the amounts of contact itself does not lead to favorable attitudes toward disabled persons. Knowing disabled persons can result in an accepting attitude toward the disabled. Any personal relationship, regardless of its degree of

closeness, seemed to be linked to favorable attitudes. Lack of a personal relationship was accompanied by less favorable attitudes.

The students who selected a health science major showed neither more favorable attitudes nor more negative attitudes toward disabled persons than those who selected other majors. They were slightly above the ATDP norm.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations were suggested by this study:

1. Further research concerned with additional factors that may influence the attitudes toward disabled persons is needed.
2. A larger sample of those in the high contact category and those who are themselves disabled should be studied.
3. Replication of the study, using a larger and more heterogeneous sample including a wider range of educational level and occupation as well as male subjects, would permit generalization of research findings.
4. Further research to investigate methods of fostering positive attitudes toward the disabled in educational or experiential settings would be beneficial.

## APPENDIX A

# RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AMOUNT OF CONTACT AND ATTITUDES TOWARD DISABLED

Study	N	Sample	Contact measure	Attitude measure	Results
Baskin, Herman, 1951	45	nondisabled college students	2 point contact scale	Questionnaire on Attitude toward Cerebral Palsy	ns
Bateman, 1962	232	nondisabled children	2 point contact scale	Children rating scale of blind capacity to perform	contact group mo more positive than no contact. Attitude became more positive with number of blind child known.
Chesler, 1965	320	nondisabled college students	2 point contact scale	ATDP-O	positive relation- ship
Coggin, 1969	68	"	4 point contact scale	ATDP-O	ns
Connine, 1969	473	nondisabled public school teachers	Checklist of self-described pertaining to personal and educational characteristics	ATDP-O	ns
Cowen, Underberg, & Verillo, 1958	68	nondisabled adults	2 point contact scale	Questionnaire measuring attitudes toward blindness	ns

Study	N	Sample	Contact measure	Attitude measure	Results
Fischbein, 1962	30	nondisabled college students & clerical workers	4 point contact scale	ATDP-O	positive relationship
Higgs, 1962	300	disabled & nondisabled students & parents	contact rating index	ATDP-A Or B	positive relationship
Human Resources Center, 1962	139	nondisabled adult female	2 point contact scale	ATDP-B	positive relationship
Rusalem, 1950	130	nondisabled graduate psych. students	2 point contact scale	Adjective check- list of traits of the deaf-blind ness rating scale	ns
Semmel & Dickson, 1966	426	nondisabled college students	4 point contact scale	Connotative Reaction Inventory	positive relationship
Siller, 1964	235	nondisabled college students	3 point contact scale	General acceptan- ce measurement #1	positive relationship



Study	N	Sample	Contact measure	Attitude measure	Results
Siller & Chipman, 1965	65	nondisabled adult & adol.	3 point contact scale	ATDP-0	ns
"	"	"	"	General Acceptance measurement #1	ns
"	"	"	"	General Acceptance measurement #2	ns
"	"	"	"	Feeling Checklist	ns
"	"	"	"	Social distance scale	ns
Szuhay, 1961	144	nondisabled grammar sch. children	2 point contact scale	children's picture socio-metric attitude scale	ns
Voeltz, 1980	1310	nondisabled adult	3 point contact scale	acceptance scale	positive relationship
Whiteman, Lukoff, 1962	109	nondisabled adult	not discribed	attitude to blindness scale, Emotional attitude scale	positive relationship

Study	N	Sample	Contact measure	Attitude measure	Results
William & Guney, 1966	212	Turkish college students	5 point contact scale	ATDP-O	ns
Yuker, Block, & Campbell, 1960	107	nondisabled college students	amount of contact scale	ATDP-O	ns

APPENDIX B

## ATDP-B

Please read each statement carefully and do not omit any statement. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements about disabled people in front of each statement. Think of disabled persons as those at a disadvantage because of physical defects regardless of the specific kind. Put the number from +3 to -3 depending on how you feel in each case.

- |                         |                            |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| +3: I agree very much   | -1: I disagree a little    |
| +2: I agree pretty much | -2: I disagree pretty much |
| +1: I agree a little    | -3: I disagree very much   |

Please answer every item

---

Response Item

No.

- |       |  |
|-------|--|
| _____ | 1. Disabled persons are usually friendly.  |
| _____ | 2. People who are disabled should not have to pay income taxes.                  |
| _____ | 3. Disabled people are no more emotional than other people.                      |
| _____ | 4. Disabled persons can have a normal social life.                               |
| _____ | 5. Most physically disabled persons have a chip on their shoulder.               |
| _____ | 6. Disabled workers can be as successful as other workers.                       |
| _____ | 7. Very few disabled persons are ashamed of their disabilities.                  |
| _____ | 8. Most people feel uncomfortable when they associate with disabled people.      |
| _____ | 9. Disabled people show less enthusiasm than nondisabled people.                 |
| _____ | 10. Disabled people do not become upset any more easily than nondisabled people. |
| _____ | 11. Disabled people are often less aggressive than normal people.                |

- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Most disabled persons get married and have children.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Most disabled persons do not worry any more than anyone else.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Employers should not be allowed to fire disabled employees.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Disabled people are not as happy as non-disabled ones.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Severely disabled people are harder to get along with than are those with minor disabilities.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. Most disabled people expect special treatment.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. Disabled persons should not expect to lead normal lives.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. Most disabled people tend to get discouraged easily.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. The worst thing that could happen to a person would be for him to be very severely injured.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. Disabled children should not have to compete with nondisabled children.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. Most disabled people do not feel sorry for themselves.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. Most disabled prefer to work with other disabled people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. Most severely disabled persons are not as ambitious as other people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. Disabled persons are not as self-confident as physically normal persons.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. Most disabled persons do not want more affection and praise than other people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27. It would be best if a disabled person would marry another disabled person.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 28. Most disabled people do not need special attention.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 29. Disabled people want sympathy more than other people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30. Most physically disabled persons have different personalities than normal persons.

## APPENDIX C

Dear Student:

I am an occupational therapist currently enrolled at Texas Woman's University. As a master's candidate, I am writing a thesis about attitudes toward disabled persons among TWU female students.

I would appreciate your help demonstrated by filling out the attached questionnaire and demographic data sheet. All information provided by your responses will remain confidential. These data will be used in aggregate form, reported in an anonymous manner.

Your informed consent is necessary for participation in this study. The Human Subjects Review Committee asked that these statement be included.

I UNDERSTAND THAT THE RETURN OF MY QUESTIONNAIRE  
CONSTITUTES MY INFORMED CONSENT TO ACT AS A SUBJECT IN  
THIS RESEARCH.

No medical service or compensation is provided to subjects by the University as a result of injury from participation in research.

Please complete the personal data sheet and the questionnaire and return in the enclosed envelope within 7 days.

Thank you for your assistance. I appreciate the time and cooperation you give by completing these forms.

Sincerely Yours,

Mei-Fen Yen.O.T.R.  
Master of Arts candidate  
Occupational Therapy  
Texas Woman's University.



## APPENDIX D

Please read question carefully and do not omit any questions. Please answer with an "x" in front of the best response.

Your major in TWU: \_\_\_\_\_

Considering all of the occasions you have talked, worked with or in some other ways had personal contact with a physically disabled person, about how many times has it been altogether? Please choose the single best answer.

- \_\_\_\_\_ Less than 10 occasions
- \_\_\_\_\_ Between 11 and 50 occasions
- \_\_\_\_\_ Between 51 and 100 occasions
- \_\_\_\_\_ Between 101 and 500 occasions
- \_\_\_\_\_ More than 500 occasions

The following questions have to do with the kinds of experiences you had with physically disabled persons. Please choose the answer of each experience that applies to you. If more than one experience applies, please indicate all that apply.

- \_\_\_\_\_ I have studied about physically disabled persons through reading, lecture, movie or observation, but I didn't know any of them.
- \_\_\_\_\_ A friend of mine is physically disabled.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Some relative is physically disabled. (except father, mother, spouse, or child, sister, brother)
- \_\_\_\_\_ My father, mother, brother, sister, spouse or child is physically disabled.
- \_\_\_\_\_ I, myself, have a physical disability.

## APPENDIX E

<u>Ss</u>	ATDP score	Amount of contact	Closeness of relationship	Major
1	61	11-50	0	H
2	100	11-50	0	H
3	110	51-100	0	H
4	139	More than 500	3	H
5	108	Less than 10	0	H
6	109	51-100	0	H
7	146	More than 500	1a, 2	H
8	111	11-50	1a	H
9	137	11-50	1a, 1b	H
10	136	101-500	1a	H
11	93	Less than 10	0	H
12	111	Less than 10	0	H
13	134	101-500	0	H
14	105	11-50	0	H
15	146	51-100	1a, 1b	H
16	96	51-100	1a, 1b	H
17	90	Less than 10	0	H
18	140	More than 500	1a, 1b	H
19	78	Less than 10	0	H
20	121	11-50	1a	H
21	159	51-100	1a	H
22	133	More than 500	1b	H
23	119	101-500	1a, 1b	H

24	114	101-500	1a	H
25	130	51-100	---	H
26	100	51-100	0	H
27	124	101-500	1a, 1b	H
28	151	More than 500	---	H
29	129	101-500	---	H
30	123	11-50	0	H
31	96	101-500	1a	H
32	91	101-500	0	H
33	118	101-500	0	NH
34	126	51-100	0	NH
35	143	101-500	1a	NH
36	112	51-100	1a, 1b	NH
37	146	11-50	0	NH
38	143	More than 500	1a	NH
39	96	11-50	1b	NH
40	117	More than 500	1b	NH
41	125	Less than 10	0	NH
42	110	Less than 10	1b, 1a	NH
43	80	101-500	0	NH
44	126	11-50	1b	NH
45	152	11-50	3	NH
46	79	Less than 10	1a	NH
47	126	More than 500	1a	NH

48	142	Less than 10	2	NH
49	94	51-100	1a	NH
50	63	11-50	0	NH
51	119	51-100	1a	NH
52	120	More than 500	1a, 3	NH
53	125	More than 500	2	NH
54	119	Less than 10	---	NH
55	114	11-50	1a	NH
56	106	11-50	0	NH
57	108	51-100	0	NH
58	116	11-50	1a	NH
59	122	11-50	1b	NH
60	142	51-100	1b	NH
61	141	Less than 10	1b, 2	NH
62	88	Less than 10	0	NH
63	99	101-500	1a	NH
64	95	More than 500	1a	NH
65	134	More than 500	1a, 1b, 3	NH
66	138	Less than 10	2	NH
67	108	11-50	---	NH
68	124	Less than 10	---	NH
69	146	51-100	1a	NH

---

"0": I have studied about physically disabled persons

through reading, lecture, movie or observation, but I didn't know any of them.

"1a": A friend of mine is physically disabled.

"1b": Some relative is physically disabled. (expect father, mother, spouse, sister, brother or child)

"2": My father, mother, brother, sister, spouse or child is physically disabled.

"3": I, myself, have a physical disability.

"H": A health science major

"NH": Not a health science major

## BIBLIOGRAPHY



- Allport, G.W. The nature of prejudice. Garden City, N.Y. Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday, 1958.
- Anderson, H.E. & Barry, J.R. Occupational choices in selected health professions. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 177-184
- Arnholter, E.G. Attitudes toward the disabled. Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin, 1963, 6, 26-30.
- Baskin, N. & Herman, R. Attitudes toward cerebral palsy. Cerebral Palsy Review, 1951, 12, 4-7,9.
- Bateman, B. Sighted children's perceptions of blind children's abilities. Exceptional Children, 1962, 29, 42-46.
- Bereiter, C. & Freedman, M.B. Fields of study and people in them. Chapter 17 in N. Sanford's: The American college. N.Y.: John Willey, 1961
- Bishop, E.S. Attitudes toward the handicapped as related to demographic variables and past experience. Honors Elementary Laboratory Course. University of Michigan, 1969.
- Chesler, M.A. Ethnocentrism and attitudes toward the physically disabled. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 877-882.
- Coggin, Personal Communication, 1964.
- Cohn, A. Personal Communication, 1964.
- Connine, T.A. Acceptance or rejection of disabled persons by teachers. The Journal of Social Health, 1969, 39,
- Connine, T.A. Teacher's attitudes toward disabled persons. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.
- Cowen, E.L; Undersberg, R.P. & Verillo, R.T. The development and testing of an attitudes to blindness scale, Journal of Social Psychology, 1958, 48, 297-304.

- Dickie, R.F. An investigation of different attitudes toward the physically disabled, blind persons, and attitudes toward education and their determinants among various occupational groups in Kansas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Duteman, G.H. & Anderson, H.E. & Barry, J.R. Characteristic of students in the health related professions. University of Florida. Research Monograph Series, No 2, June, 1966.
- Fishbein, J. An investigation into the relationship between certain social attitudes, the degree of social contact with the physically disabled. Unpublished Manuscript, Human Resources Library, 1962.
- Genskow, J.K. & Maglion, F.D. Familiarity, dogmatism and reported student attitudes toward the disabled, Journal Of Social Psychology, 1965, 67, 329-341.
- Halloran, J.D. Attitude and attitude change. Great Britain . Leicester University Press, 1967.
- Higgs, R.W. Attitude formation-contact or information. Exceptional Child, 1975, 41, 496-497.
- Helmstadter, G.C. Principles of psychological measurement. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1964.
- Himes, J.S. Changing attitudes of the public toward the blind. New Outlook for the Blind, 1958, 52, 330-335.
- Homans, G.C. The human group. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1950.
- Human Resources, Yearly Psycho-social research summary, Alberton, N.Y. Author, 1960.
- Human Resources, Yearly Psycho-social research summary, Alberton, N.Y. Author, 1962.
- Krammer, E.R. Personal communication, 1965.
- Lamers, G.J. A comparison of self attitudes and socially acceptable attitudes measured by the ATDP scale. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

- Leedy, P.D. Practical research planing and design. 2nd edition; New York: Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc, 1978.
- Roehrer, G.A. A study of certain public attitudes toward the orthopaedically disabled. Unpublixhed doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1959.
- Rusalem, H. The environmental supports of public attitudes toward the blind. New Outlook for the Blind, 1950, 44, 277-288.
- Semmel, M.I. & Dickson, S. Connotative reactions of college students to disability labels. Exceptional Child, 1966, 32, 443-450.
- Shaw, M. & Wright, J.M. Scales for measurement of attitudes . New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.
- Siller, J. Personality determinants of reaction to the physically disabled. American Foundation for the Blind Research Bulletin, 1964, 7, 37-52.
- Siller, J. & Chipman, A. A personality determinants of reaction to the physically handicapped, projective techniques. Unpublished Manuscript. Human Resources Library, 1965.
- Siller, J.; Ferguson, L.T.; Chipman, A. & Vann, D.H. Studies in reactions to disability XI: Attitudes of the nondisabled toward the physically disabled. New York University, 1967.
- Szuhay, J.A. The development of attitudes toward the physically disabled. Dissertation Abstracts, 1962, 22(3), 2641 (Abstract)
- Voeltz, L.M. Childrens' attitudes toward handicapped peers. Exceptional Child, 1980, 84, 455-464.
- Whiteman, M. & Lukoff, I.F. Public attitudes toward blindness. New Outlook for the Blind, 1962, 56, 153-158.
- William, A. L. & Guney, L. Attitudes of American and Turkish students toward disabled persons. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 45, 353-358.
- Wright, B.A. Physical disability-A psychological approach. N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1960.

Yuker, H.E.; Block, J.R.; & Campbell W.J. A scale to measure attitudes toward disabled persons. Alberton, New York: Abilities, Inc; 1960

Yuker, H.E.; Block, J. R. & Yonng, J.H. The measurement of attitudes toward disabled persons. Alberton, New York: Human Resources Center, 1966.