

5-2007

Attitudes of Counselor Educators Toward Persons with Disabilities

Adrienne Johnson
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>



Part of the [Counselor Education Commons](#), [Disability Studies Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Citation

Johnson, A. (2007). Attitudes of Counselor Educators Toward Persons with Disabilities. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/2957>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact uarepos@uark.edu.

ATTITUDES OF COUNSELOR EDUCATORS TOWARD
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

ATTITUDES OF COUNSELOR EDUCATORS TOWARD
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

By

ADRIANNE LYNN JOHNSON, B.S., M.S.
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, 2000
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, 2003

May 2007
University of Arkansas

©2007 by Adrienne L. Johnson
All Rights Reserved

Attitudes of Counselor Educators toward Persons with Disabilities

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship of nine variables with attitudes of Counselor Educators toward persons with disabilities. The objective was to identify several potential variables that may influence attitudes. Nine variables were examined to test their relationship with attitude among the participants. An analysis was completed of the significance between each of the factors and attitude as measured by the SADP (Antonak, 1981). The independent variables were: a) age; b) gender; c) ethnicity; d) amount of contact with disabled persons; e) knowledge of disability legislation; f) comfort with type of disability; g) theoretical orientation; h) years of experience as a Counselor Educator; and i) one's discipline/specialty within Counselor Education.

The participants in this study were a convenience sample of Counselor Educators who were members of the Counselor Education and Supervision listserv (CESNET-L). Of the approximate 900 members invited to participate, 6% of the members volunteered to participate (n= 56; 22 (39%) males, 34 (61%) females). Each participant electronically completed a demographics questionnaire and the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons (SADP; Antonak, 1981).

Overall, two hypotheses were supported by the data collected from this study. It was found that comfort level was correlated with higher scores on the SADP (Antonak, 1981); and, higher levels of knowledge of disability legislation are also associated with higher scores on the SADP. With these exceptions, the data did not support the hypotheses which stated there were significant differences or relationships between the stated variables and attitude toward persons with disabilities among Counselor Educators.

This dissertation is approved for
Recommendation to the
Graduate Council

Dissertation Director:

Roy C. Farley, Ed.D.

Dissertation Committee:

George Denny, Ph.D.

Barbara Shadden, Ph.D.

Brent Williams, Ph.D.

I hereby authorize the University of Arkansas Libraries to duplicate this dissertation when needed for research and/or scholarship.

Agreed _____

Refused _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful to Roy Farley, George Denny, Barbara Shadden, and Brent Williams for their continued support, encouragement, and commitment to my personal and professional growth.

Thank you to Ben Armstrong for his continued patience and time in managing my survey data.

Thank you to the following people for their continued support and encouragement: Jacob George; Steven Seward; David Capuzzi; Mark Stauffer; Dept. of Computing Services, UA; Collette Dollarhide; Trudy Gilbert; Teresa and “Hawkeye” Haven; Steven Naymick; Donald Norman; Brenda O'Beirne; Aneneosa Okocha; Stanley Rest; Nancy Schmall-Scharfenberg; William Symes; Linda Tramonte; and Kathleen Wong.

My sincerest thanks to my friend David Delgado, and to my friend and colleague Jose Maldonado and his wife Aileen Berrios-Saez, for their continued support and encouragement.

To my father-in-law Monty and mother-in-law Kuei: Thank you for your continued love, support, and encouragement.

To my husband and soulmate Kory: Thank you for your endless love and faith during our journey together. You are my heart.

To my mom Susan and dad Robert: Everything I am and all my successes are because of you. Your love inspired me to do great things, and your strength and faith showed me how to achieve them. Thank you for everything. I love you so much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Tables	viii
Introduction	1
Review of the Literature.....	7
Procedures	56
Statistical Analysis	66
Discussion.....	77
References.....	88
Appendixes.....	102
SADP Personal Information Form.....	103
Invitation to Participants.....	107
Informed Consent.....	109
Institutional Review Board Approval.....	111
Permission from to Administer SADP (Letter).....	113
Permission from to Administer SADP (Electronic).....	114

List of Tables

Table 1	Summary of Literature by Variable.....	46
Table 2	Statistical Analysis Categories by Variable.....	58
Table 3	Frequencies and Valid Percentages by Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Amount of Contact with Disabled Persons, Knowledge of Disability Legislation, Theoretical Orientation, Years of Experience as a Counselor Educator, and One's Discipline/Specialty within Counselor Education.....	67
Table 4	Frequencies and Valid Percentages by Comfort with Type of Disability	68
Table 5	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Age and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators.....	70
Table 6	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Gender and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators.....	70
Table 7	Summary of t-test results for Ethnicity and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators.....	71
Table 8	Summary of t-test for Amount of Contact and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators.....	72
Table 9	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Knowledge of Legislation and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators	72
Table 10	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Theoretical Orientation and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators.....	74

Table 11	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Years of Experience as a Counselor Educator and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators.....	75
Table 12	Summary of Analysis of Variance for Discipline/Specialty Area and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators.....	76

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

The increase in the enrollment of students with disabilities in postsecondary institutions requires faculty to become familiar with the issues that emerge during the educational career of students with disabilities (Lynch & Gussel, 1996). It is especially important for Counselor Educators to fully understand the interplay of dynamics of this population so that their educational experience can be maximized. Often, these dynamics include attitudinal barriers toward persons with disabilities. This study is designed to identify several potential variables that may influence attitudes. They are: a) age; b) gender; c) ethnicity; d) amount of contact with disabled persons; e) knowledge of disability legislation; f) comfort with type of disability; g) theoretical orientation; h) years of experience as a Counselor Educator; and i) one's discipline/specialty within Counselor Education.

Statement of the Problem

The enrollment of students with disabilities is increasing in higher education, due in part to strict federal laws such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA; 1990) regarding the right to accessibility, political support, work of disability groups, as well as media coverage (Hirschhorn, 1992). Medical and technological breakthroughs, along with laws requiring equal access and attitudinal changes in society, have allowed people with disabilities to become more active and visible, and have given them greater access to educational and counseling services (Corrigan, 1998). English (1993), however, conducted a survey and found that students with disabilities did not feel as integrated into

their social systems, and institutions' support services did not contribute to social integration.

Despite the passing of laws such as ADA (1990) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which have increased postsecondary enrollment and graduation rates of students with disabilities, current literature and research suggest a relationship between attitudes of faculty and educational success of students with disabilities (Lynch & Gussel, 1996). It is necessary, therefore, to assess the attitudes of Counselor Educators toward students with disabilities and identify variables contributing to any observed attitude. Attitude awareness and contributing variables should lead to comprehensive training curricula and education on this topic for Counselor Educators.

Purpose of the Study

This study explored the relationship of nine variables with attitudes of Counselor Educators toward persons with disabilities. The results of this study are expected to contribute to better practices and improved services to this population by encouraging as well as aiding in the development of more comprehensive training curricula for counselors-in-training.

Research Question and Hypotheses

Research Question

The research question was to what extent do the attitudes of counselor educators toward persons with disabilities relate to the following variables: a) age; b) gender; c) ethnicity; d) frequency of contact with disabled students; e) knowledge of disability legislation; f) comfort with type of disability; g) theoretical orientation; h) years of

experience as a Counselor Educator; and i) one's discipline/specialty within Counselor Education.

Research Hypotheses

Among Counselor Educators, there is a significant difference on the following variables in attitude toward persons with disabilities:

- 1) Age;
- 2) Gender;
- 3) Ethnicity;
- 4) Frequency of contact;
- 5) Knowledge of disability legislation;
- 6) Comfort with type of disability;
- 7) Primary theoretical orientation;
- 8) Years of experience;
- 9) Discipline/specialty.

Significance of the Study

Research shows that persons with disabilities who successfully complete college can expect careers and incomes comparable to those of their non-disabled peers, and it is even suggested that educational achievement is the most effective means for individuals with disabilities to achieve financial independence and equality (Task Force on Post Secondary Education, 2002). Literature suggests, however, that students with disabilities in the postsecondary environment encounter biases, stereotypes, and a lack of social support that impede their educational achievement (Lynch & Gussel, 1996). Therefore, it is important that attitudes of Counselor Educators toward persons with disabilities and the

contribution of relevant variables to these attitudes be assessed to more fully understand the need for training, awareness, and education on this topic among those preparing to be Counselor Educators.

Delimitations

The sample used in this study was delimited to Counselor Educators within the United States.

Definitions

1) Auxiliary Aids and Services

The term 'auxiliary aids and services' includes: "qualified interpreters and other effective methods of making aurally delivered materials available to individuals with hearing impairments; qualified readers, taped texts, or other effective methods of making visually delivered materials available to individuals with visual impairments; acquisition or modification of equipment or devices; and other similar services and actions" (ADA, 1990, 42 U.S.C. 12102).

2) Barrier

The term 'barrier' refers to a) an agency policy, principle or practice that limits or tends to limit opportunities for members of a particular sex, race, or ethnic background, or based on an individual's disability status; and b) a fence, wall, or other physical obstruction built to bar passage (e.g. a site that requires all individuals to climb stairs because it lacks ramps and elevators) (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2004).

3) Disability

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 defines ‘disability’ as “(a) physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, (b) a record of such impairments, or (c) being regarded as having such an impairment” (ADA, 1990, 42 U.S.C. 12101 [2]).

4) Handicap

The World Health Organization defines ‘handicap’ as “a disadvantage for a given individual resulting from an impairment or a disability that limits or prevents the fulfillment of a role that is normal for that individual. Handicap is a classification of role reduction resulting from circumstances which place an impaired or disabled person at a disadvantage compared to other persons” (World Health Organization, 1995).

5) Reasonable Accommodation

The term ‘reasonable accommodation’ means “making existing facilities readily accessible and usable by individuals with disabilities and is the principle by which employment and public accommodations are made accessible to qualified individuals with disability” (ADA, 1990, 42 U.S.C. 12102 [2]).

Summary

Chapter one provided the foundation for the need to explore the relationship between nine variables and general attitudes of Counselor Educators toward persons with disabilities. Students with disabilities in higher education are growing in numbers but continue to face unique issues and barriers in the postsecondary educational environment, and the literature, discussed in Chapter two, addresses how research supports the need for

exploration into how faculty attitudes, and the influence of various factors on these attitudes, impact this issue.

Chapter Two

LITERATURE REVIEW

With students with disabilities now comprising a substantial population on college campuses, it is of growing interest to professionals in the postsecondary environment as to determine how students with disabilities are being perceived by faculty in this environment. Chapter two will provide a review of the literature relevant to this topic. Particular attention will be focused on attitudes of faculty in higher education toward students with disabilities and the variables that influence attitude.

General Background Information

Smith, Polloway, Patton, and Dowdy (1998) defined students with disabilities as those who exhibit one of several specific conditions that result in their need for special education and related services to facilitate academic, social, and emotional development. According to the American Council on Education's HEATH Resource Center, the proportion of first-time, full-time freshmen with disability attending college increased more than threefold between 1978 and 1994, from 2.6 percent to 9.2 percent (Henderson, 1995). Wilson (1992) estimates that disabled students now account for 10.5 percent of the entire college student population, and estimates that nearly 40 percent of the 10.5 overall percentage are reported as having visual impairments and 20 percent are reported as being deaf or hard of hearing. In a random sampling of 434 four-year public and independent institutions, the proportion of students reporting disabilities averaged between six and eight percent between 1988 and 2000 (Henderson, 1992).

Further studies support this substantial growth in the numbers of students with disabilities in postsecondary education. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (1999) and Thomas (2000) report an increase from 29 percent in 1986 to 45 percent in 1994 of persons 16 years old or older with a reported disability that had either attended some college or had completed a bachelor's degree or higher. In 1996, roughly 6% of all undergraduates reported having a disability (NCES, 1999). The different disabilities reported were learning disabilities (29%), orthopedic impairments (23%), hearing impairment (16%), vision impairment (16%), and speech impairment (3%). In addition, one in five undergraduates with disabilities reported having an additional "health-related" disability or limitation (NCES, 1999, p. 7). Hebel (2001a) asserts that these numbers are due mostly in part to the enrollment of students with learning disabilities; the U.S. Department of Education (2000) reports that the 1995-1996 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study found that of all students with disabilities, 29 percent reported having a learning disability.

In Rehabilitation Education Programs specifically, the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) reports that of the 3,301 students enrolled in accredited programs, 19.8% (655) report having disabilities ("Profile of CORE-Accredited RCE Programs," 1999; Glover-Graf & Janikowski, 2001). This percentage is somewhat higher than the estimated 14.7% rate of disability believed to exist in the general U.S. population (LaPlante, 1992). CORE does not report statistics regarding disability type, severity of limitations, or the nature or extent of educationally related accommodations of rehabilitation counseling students with disabilities.

Legislation

Several pieces of legislation now influence students with disabilities in higher education. The Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments Act of 1954 was originally created to provide services for disabled veterans of war, and was among the first of many federal grants to assist individuals with physical disabilities (Chronology, n.d.). Public Law 90480, titled the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, followed the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments Act and was the first federal law mandating all federally funded entities be accessible to individuals with disabilities (Chronology, n.d.).

Public Law 93-112, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 serves as an umbrella of important disability legislation consisting of a variety of regulations. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act in particular was credited for targeting discrimination against individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability (Chronology, n.d.).

Public Law 94-142, Education for all Handicapped Children Act, was credited with mandating “free and appropriate education” for all children with disabilities (Chronology, n.d.). The Act later became known as IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act). Concepts created under IDEA include least restrictive environment and IEP. Both concepts are used to ensure students with disabilities are receiving education appropriate for their individual needs (Chronology, n.d.).

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which went into effect in 1977, prohibits discrimination based on disability in all institutions that receive federal funds, including most colleges and universities. Buildings constructed or altered after June 3, 1977, have had to comply with the relevant accessibility code required by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and, after January 26, 1992, by ADA (Stodden & Dowrick, 1999).

This code mandates that all programs within existing facilities must be accessible, and all new construction must be built accessible to all persons with disabilities. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 states that “no otherwise qualified individual in the United States shall, solely by reason of disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance” (Rehabilitation Act, 1973, 29 U.S.C. 794).

Public Law 101-336, or the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), was signed into law in 1990 and extends the mandate for nondiscrimination on the basis of disability to the private sector and the nonfederal public sector (i.e. state and local governments). The ADA definition of a person with a disability refers to “someone with a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities. A person is considered to be a person with a disability if he or she a) has a disability as documented by a physician; b) has a record of the disability; or c) is regarded as having the disability” (Lynch & Gussel, 1996, p. 352). The ADA is considered thus far to be the most significant disability legislation for mandating that all public programs, regardless of funding, provide “reasonable accommodations” for individuals with disabilities (Schriner & Scotch, 2001). According to the ADA (1990), all public services including restaurants, libraries, hotels, employment, transportation, stores, and the like, are to be accessible for individuals with disabilities. The ADA was strongly influenced by previous legislation as well as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and as a minority group, disability is perceived as a discriminatory factor such as race, gender, and religion (Schriner & Scotch, 2001).

The ADA and Section 504 in Postsecondary Education

Colleges are required under the Americans with Disabilities Act to provide equal opportunities for students with disabilities; the institutions typically agree to pay for many academic-specific accommodations, such as removing architectural barriers from classrooms and providing computer software designed to assist disabled students on campus (Hebel, 2001b). Benham (1997) asserts that passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act “has and will continue to impact institutions of higher learning in regards to funding, services provided, and entrance requirements” (p. 124).

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is a civil rights law designed to prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability in programs and activities, public and private, that receive federal financial assistance, such as postsecondary institutions (Kidsource Online, Inc., 1997). Section 504 mandates the following requirements regarding postsecondary education institutions and students with disabilities: a) access to facilities and activities; b) admission policies and practices that do not discriminate on the basis of disability, c) testing procedures with appropriate accommodations, and d) provision of auxiliary aids and services (Jarrow, 1993).

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 strengthened Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and extended the protection of civil rights of people with disabilities to include public and private entities (Henderson, 1992). Over the last few decades, Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and ADA of 1990 have ensured that people with disabilities who traditionally had limited access to means to making choices for themselves are now able to speak for themselves or have advocates

for support (Rao, 2004). Additionally, they have increased access to services, more visibility, and more opportunities for participation and inclusion.

Paul (2000) asserts that as the number of students with disabilities seeking to complete their college education increases across the country, these students still face both physical and attitudinal barriers within the university environment. Katz, Haz, and Bailey (1988) concluded that there is still a strong societal conflict in the majority's feelings and beliefs about persons who have disabilities, which points up the potential that exists for either support or opposition by public with respect to government policies for ensuring equality of opportunity for disabled people in employment, education, and housing.

Attitudinal Barriers in the Postsecondary Environment

The successful integration of college students with disabilities requires receptive attitudes of members in the entire college community (Fichten, 1988). Benham (1997) suggests that these attitudes often reflect preconceived opinions as to what a person with a disability can and cannot do, and are often based on societal biases regarding that individual's ability and stability. Deshler, Ellis, and Lenz (1996) further assert that the increased presence of students with disabilities in postsecondary education has also exposed the existence of faculty-student perceptual divides within the classroom, and suggest that while universities often profess to encourage a diverse student population, the reality as experienced by students with disabilities is somewhat different.

Rao (2004) states that "attitudinal barriers are recognized widely as an impediment to success of persons with disabilities" (p. 191). Zascavage and Keefe (2004) go on to say that attitude barriers are exhibited via reduced expectations and limiting of

opportunities, and this can be assumed to greatly impact the student's self-esteem and self-efficacy within the classroom. In the higher education arena, faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities may be a determining factor in the success of these students, and negative faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities could be detrimental to the faculty-student relationship (Nathanson, 1982). Attitudes that persons with disabilities need assistance in all areas, or that physical disabilities imply mental limitations, are potentially the most hazardous barriers for integration of students with disabilities in postsecondary educational settings (Lynch & Gussel, 1996). Rauscher and McClintock (1997) define these attitudes as "ableism," and give an explanation of the term:

Ableism is a pervasive system of discrimination and exclusion that oppresses people who have mental, emotional, and physical disabilities. Like racism, sexism and other forms of oppression, ableism operates on individual, institutional, and societal/cultural levels. No word perfectly describes what the range of people with disabilities experience. We use the terms ableism or disability oppression because they reflect the viewpoint that people with disabilities or physical or mental limitations are considered to be inadequate in meeting social and economic roles. (p. 198)

This definition helps to explain the negative attitudes of faculty, officials, and peers perceived by students with both visible and invisible disabilities, which ultimately may impact their adjustment in the postsecondary environment. For example, a study by Bailey (1994) surveyed 45 disabled and 33 nondisabled college students to assess whether the way disabled students value college education differs from that of nondisabled college students. The results showed that the disabled students were more eager to improve their value to society through successful involvement in college education than their nondisabled counterparts. The need to "improve one's value in society" in reaction to a disability may be due in part to ableism, biases, and attitudes.

A study by the Institute for Higher Education Policy found that students with disabilities face serious obstacles in college toward achieving their educational goals (Bagnato, 2002). Gearheart, Gearheart, and Weishahn (1996) suggest that students with disabilities have certain limitations as a result of their disabilities that may give rise to some special needs, e.g. visual impairment, hearing impairment, and physical disability. Hebel (2001a) states that “services for those students have improved [over time], although some faculty members and officials remain skeptical about accommodating them” (p. 24). Even at large public universities, Hebel (2001a) suggests that progress has been varied, depending on the level of student activism, campus approaches to compliance, and specific challenges faced, including topography and historical campus attitudes toward fostering diversity. West et al. (1993) surveyed 40 college and university students with disabilities to identify potential barriers to higher education and improvements in services. They found that the majority of the students surveyed indicated they had encountered barriers to their education, including a lack of understanding and cooperation from administrators, faculty, staff, and other students; lack of adaptive aids and other accommodations; and inaccessibility of buildings and grounds.

General attitudes of health professionals.

Research shows that the attitudes held by rehabilitation professionals and mental health counselors (Chubon, 1982; Cook, Kunce, & Getsinger, 1976; Holmes & Karst, 1990) may have a limiting effect on the person's occupational and social success. In a study examining entry-level occupational therapists' equal status contact with and attitudes toward persons with disabilities, respondents exhibited generally positive

attitudes toward persons with disabilities (Eberhardt & Mayberry, 1995). The researchers concluded that entry-level occupational therapists' attitudes toward persons with disabilities may be influenced not only by parameters of the contact variable but also by the profession's holistic philosophy, the occupational therapy educational curricula, and the personal characteristics of those who choose to pursue a career in occupational therapy (Eberhardt & Mayberry, 1995).

In a study designed to explore the attitudes of rehabilitation nurses, occupational therapists, and physical therapists toward people with disabilities, White and Olson (1998) found that the majority (67%) of these healthcare professionals had positive attitudes toward people with disabilities. The researchers found that occupational therapists had significantly higher scores than the rehabilitation nurses and physical therapists, but an analysis of the rehabilitation nurses' attitude scores showed that practice setting, age, and educational level had no significant effect.

A study by Paris (1993) investigated differences in attitudes toward individuals with physical disabilities among first-year and fourth-year medical students and healthcare professionals. Of approximately 310 surveys analyzed, results indicated that the fourth-year medical students had significantly more positive attitudes toward people with physical disabilities when compared to the first-year medical students. The researcher found that across the sample, females, compared to groups of males, whites, and Asians, were found to hold significantly more positive attitudes toward people with physical disabilities (1993).

General faculty attitudes.

Faculty attitudes toward students with learning disabilities are an important influence in students' adjustment to college. Although staff may not overtly express negativity toward these students, they may at the same time lack adequate understanding of specific needs (Satcher, 1992). As with all students, students with disabilities have concerns about how to relate to their professors. Students who have disabilities, however, may experience such concerns more frequently and the problems they encounter with courses may relate to their specific impairments. Barnes (1994) asserts that faculty with positive attitudes toward students with disabilities are more readily able to accommodate to the students' needs. Further research findings indicate a positive connection between faculty awareness and accommodation, their familiarity and experience with students with disabilities and their knowledge about disability laws and rights (Bowman & Marzonk, 1990).

Askamit, Morris, and Luenberger (1987) found in a study examining attitudes of student affairs personnel and faculty toward students with disabilities that although student affairs professionals and faculty members had predominately positive attitudes toward college students with learning disabilities, both groups had a somewhat limited knowledge base regarding the specific needs of this population, but those faculty and staff with a stable knowledge base had significantly more positive attitudes toward students with learning disabilities. The researchers also found that faculty members had predominately positive attitudes toward students with learning disabilities but had limited knowledge about how to best accommodate this population of students. Results indicated that faculty members who had more information about disabilities appeared to have more

positive attitudes than those faculty members with less information (1987). However, Farrell and Hareckham (1988) found in a survey study of 21 faculty members and 58 student services personnel that student affairs personnel had a more favorable attitude than faculty members did.

The awareness of professors regarding the special needs of students' disabilities and professor's responses to the concerns of students are vital to students' success (Fonosch & Schwab, 1981). Fichten and Goodrick (1990) found that some professors were enthusiastic and optimistic when they first found out that they would be teaching a student with a disability. Most, however, were somewhat dismayed; they worried about how to talk to the student, wondered if they would be able to teach the student effectively, and were concerned about the impact of the student with a disability on the rest of the class.

Lack of understanding of reasonable accommodations and self-doubt among instructional staff can become barriers to educational participation for students with disabilities (Enright, Conyers & Szymanski, 1996). Faculty may find it difficult to accommodate students simply because they lack an understanding of these students' needs or familiarity with campus services. It is students' responsibility to inform school officials of their disability, provide documentation of the disability and propose viable options for meeting the unique accommodation needs specific to their disability (Stodden & Dowrick, 1999), but Junco (2002) asserts that negative attitudes of instructors may prevent students with disabilities from using those very self-advocacy skills required to disclose a disability and request the appropriate reasonable accommodations.

Some faculty question the nature of reasonable accommodations and doubt their ability to teach effectively to students with disabilities (Fichten & Goodrick, 1990). In a survey of faculty's academic expectations regarding perceived student ability, researchers concluded that university faculty may be susceptible to frequently held stereotypes, which may in turn be a barrier for students' success (Minner & Prater, 1984; Houck, Asselin, Troutman, & Arrington, 1992). Hill (1996) reported that, on the average, students rated their instructor's level of willingness to make accommodations as high, and found that students perceived their instructors as being very willing to make some accommodations while they were less supportive of others, such as allowing students to do an extra credit assignment, allowing misspelling and incorrect punctuation without penalty, and allowing students to give oral/tape recorded presentations rather than written presentations. Additionally, in a survey conducted by Norton (1997) investigating feelings of faculty and students regarding examination accommodations, faculty were receptive to a variety of accommodations and were sensitive to students' feelings. Norton found that although students used the exam accommodations, many reported being apprehensive about asking for accommodations. It was concluded that the professors' level of acceptance of the students and their requests was greater than the students' level of comfort in asking for accommodations (1997).

Beilke and Yssel (1998) studied the relationship between faculty and students with disabilities and assert the importance of the faculty-student relationship as a means of establishing one's identity within the classroom and university. The researchers found that this relationship was instrumental to establishment of caring, mentoring, relationships within the context of the classroom. The researchers later interviewed ten

students with disabilities to investigate students' perceptions of faculty members' attitudes, and it was concluded by the researchers that students often found faculty willing to make instructional accommodations, but encountered a negative classroom climate (1998).

The Institute for Higher Education Policy (Bagnato, 2002) found in a recent study that faculty often resented being told how they had to meet the needs of a disabled student, and may not have the training necessary to deal effectively and fairly when faced with such a situation. Many faculty are also concerned about the extra time and work involved. Beilke and Yssel (1999) suggest that postsecondary institutions may be willing to make physical accommodations for students with disabilities, but this does not necessarily translate into positive attitudes on the part of faculty members in higher education.

Bento (1996) surveyed 35 faculty members to explore the barriers to understanding that arise when students with disabilities request classroom accommodations. Results indicated that faculty members often felt that their academic freedom was constrained by the student requests for accommodations, and faculty indicated that they struggled with the question of whether the accommodation was fair to the other members of the class as well as to the student with the disability. The study also indicated that the same faculty respondents were characterized as ambivalent regarding the classroom needs of students with disabilities, and alternately gave assistance and expressed concern or gave little assistance and expressed disregard (1996).

Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, and Brulle (1999) have concluded the following in their research: a) faculty indicated a slightly greater willingness to provide teaching

accommodations as compared to examination accommodations; b) faculty members were least willing to provide supplementary materials such as an outline of their lecture or to provide assignments in an alternative format; c) faculty members were most willing to allow extended time for exams and to allow exams to be proctored in the office of support services for students with disabilities; d) faculty were least willing to alter the format of examinations; and e) factors that may have influenced faculty attitude include age, academic discipline, experience teaching students with learning disabilities, years of teaching experience, and professional rank. Strohmer, Grand, and Purcell (1984), however, previously found that demographic variables of faculty and academic staff including respondents' age, educational level, socioeconomic status, gender, and religion accounted for only limited variance in attitudes toward persons with disabilities.

Attitudes and age of faculty. Some (Baggett, 1993; Benham, 1995; McGee, 1989; Schoen et al., 1987; Williamson, 2000) studied the effect of age of faculty on their attitude towards persons with disabilities. However, these studies did not find any significant effect of age on faculty attitudes. Fonosch and Schwab (1981) also reported no significant findings regarding the relationship of age of faculty and attitudes of faculty toward students with disabilities.

Kelly (1984), however, found in a study of attitudes of student affairs professionals toward students with disabilities that female coordinators under age 40 had more positive attitudes than their older female counterparts, indicating more accepting attitudes toward persons with disabilities among females below the age of 40. Williamson (2000) also found that younger faculty held generally more positive attitudes toward serving students with disabilities when based on age.

Attitudes and gender of faculty. Previous research indicates that female faculty express more positive attitudes toward individuals with disabilities than male faculty members (Aksamit et al., 1987; Baggett, 1994; Fonosch & Schwab, 1981; Leyser, Vogel, Wyland, & Brulle, 1998), but some studies yielded mixed results. In a survey of approximately 400 student affairs professionals, Kelly (1984) reported higher mean scores for females than for males, denoting more favorable attitudes among the female participants. A study by Kleinsasser (1999) examining the attitude and knowledge concerning learning disabilities held by faculty and student services staff revealed that female faculty reported a significantly higher level of knowledge concerning learning disabilities than combined male faculty and student services staff.

A study by Askamit et al. (1987) was conducted to investigate the attitudes and knowledge of approximately 700 faculty members related to the issues of students with learning disabilities. Results indicated that women had more positive attitudes than did their male counterparts. Similarly, Fonosch and Schwab (1981) found in a study of factors contributing to attitudes of faculty at the University of Nebraska that of approximately 409 respondents, female faculty indicated more positive attitudes than male faculty toward students with disabilities in the classroom.

In a study examining faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities, Benham (1997) found that male faculty in higher education indicated more negative attitudes toward students with disabilities. Consistent with this finding, Leyser et al. (1998) found that significantly more female faculty report having training in the area of disabilities as well as familiarity with Section 504, and more female faculty express an interest in participating in future workshops on topics of classroom accommodations and available

programs and services on campus. Additionally, female faculty indicated that they had more training in the area of disabilities, more knowledge of legislation and familiarity with Section 504, and expressed more willingness to participate in additional training such as workshops on topics of classroom accommodations and available programs and services on campus (1998).

Leyser (1989) found, however, that male faculty more than female faculty indicated that they had made accommodations in their classes, and Leyser et al. (1998) found that significantly more male faculty than female faculty reported teaching experience with some groups of students with disabilities, such as those with orthopedic impairments and with visual impairments, and expressed an overall stronger willingness to provide accommodations than did female faculty. Leyser et al. (1998) also found that more male faculty expressed a stronger overall willingness to provide accommodations to students with disabilities. However, Williamson (2000) examined faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities at Troy State University Dothan and found no significant differences were found in attitude between gender of faculty.

Attitudes and ethnicity of faculty. Unfortunately, there is a paucity of research in the specific area of ethnicity of faculty and attitudes toward persons with disabilities, and only one relevant study addressing this relationship was found in the literature. Jordon and Friesen (1968) found in a multicultural study of attitudes toward disabled persons that cultural factors weighed significantly among attitudinal determinants of their rehabilitation worker samples from several countries. This finding provides reason to suspect the existence of regional and perhaps, institutionally biased differences in attitudes toward disability (Chubon, 1982; Jordon & Friesen, 1968).

Attitude and faculty contact with persons with disabilities. Ten studies (Askamit et al., 1987; Baggett, 1993; Benham, 1995; Fonosch & Schwab, 1981; Kleinsasser, 1999; Lewis, 1998; McGee, 1989; Rao, 2002; Schoen, Uysal, & McDonald, 1986; Williamson, 2000) specifically included experience as a variable in their study. The variable 'experience' included previous or current experience teaching students with disabilities, and/or previous contact with people with disabilities in terms of having a relative, close friend, and/or colleagues with disabilities. Six studies (Askamit et al., 1987; Baggett, 1993; Benham, 1995; Fonosch & Schwab, 1981; Kleinsasser, 1999; Rao, 2002) reported a significantly more positive attitude of the 'experienced' faculty, while the others failed to find a significant effect of experience on faculty attitude. Kelly (1984) also found no significant differences in attitudes based on frequency of interaction with students with disabilities.

Yuker (1988) suggested that more positive attitudes could result from increased contact, interaction, and experience with persons with disabilities, and specifically, that contact under favorable conditions may increase positive attitudes while contact under less favorable conditions may result in more negative attitudes. Schoen et al. (1987) reported from their research that faculty members' academic area and whether they had instructed students with learning disabilities were related to their attitude toward the treatment of these students.

Fonosch and Schwab (1981) found that faculty members experiencing frequent contact with persons with disabilities indicated a more positive attitude than those faculty reporting less frequent contact. The researchers also found that faculty members who had experienced contact in the classroom with greater numbers of students with disabilities in

their classrooms (more than five students) during their teaching careers had more positive attitudes than faculty who had taught fewer students with disabilities during their careers (1981). In the same survey, the researchers found that approximately 60 percent of the faculty members responding to the survey reported previous interaction with and exposure to disabled persons; the most frequently reported contact was through friendships and moderate professional contact. About half of the subjects had had interaction with “severely disabled persons” (1981, p. 95).

In a study which evaluated the knowledge, experience and attitudes, that faculty at a private four-year institution have towards students with disabilities, Vasek (2005) found that many of the faculty had little or no contact with this particular student population, and many had no experience working with these students and were less willing to accommodate them, but Fichten and Goodrick (1988) found that after talking to students, professors' thinking was generally much more positive about the prospective of teaching them. Leyser (1989) found that a large percentage of the faculty indicated that they had contact with individuals with disabilities as well as experience in teaching college students with disabilities, and approximately 80% surveyed were familiar with resources and services available on campus.

Baggett (1994) found that many faculty in a large state university often reported a lack of familiarity with disability laws and university support services and had limited experience in teaching students with disabilities. Results of the study by Fonosch and Schwab (1981) indicated that faculty members who had experienced a greater degree of contact with individuals with disabilities had more positive attitudes toward students with disabilities than those with little or no contact experience.

Morris, Leuenberger, and Askamit (1987) designed a study to increase the information about students with learning disabilities with the intent of decreasing faculty members' discomfort and to foster positive interactions with students with learning disabilities. The researchers found a significant relationship between faculty attitudes toward and knowledge about students with learning disabilities and the in-service activities delivered over a nine-month period of time. The researchers concluded that without in-service training, faculty attitudes become significantly less positive and that multiple in-service contacts over a period of time are necessary to have an impact on faculty attitudes and knowledge (1987).

Leyser et al. (1998) found that approximately two thirds of faculty surveyed reported having limited contacts with individuals with disabilities. A large majority of faculty in this study also noted that they had no or little contact or experience in teaching students with disabilities; those who had teaching experience with students with disabilities reported having more experience with students with learning disabilities and students with visual, hearing, and orthopedic impairments, and faculty had the least amount of experience with students with psychiatric disabilities and chronic illnesses. Additionally, faculty with higher levels of personal contact compared to those with limited contact with individuals with disabilities such as experience with an immediate family member reported having more teaching experiences with students with disabilities in higher education, having more knowledge and skills in making accommodations and spending significantly more extra time making accommodations, having more familiarity with Section 504, and having more frequently communicated with service providers (1998).

Palmerton and Frumkin (1969a) found "enjoyable contacts" to be associated with more positive attitudes, and frequency of contacts was associated with intensity of college counselors' attitudes, irrespective of direction (Chubon, 1982; Palmerton & Frumkin, 1969b). Evans (1976) has also reported that interaction with disabled persons which was structured to alleviate interpersonal discomfort was effective in enhancing the attitudes of psychology students, and Hersh, Carlson and Lossino (1977) found that social work students' attitudes toward persons with developmental delays seemed to be enhanced by interaction with families having children with delays.

Leyser et al. (1998) also found that that personal contact with individuals with disabilities was associated with increased knowledge of teaching accommodations, available services, and of disability legislation, as well as with willingness to spend more time in making needed adaptations. The researchers suggest that this finding is consistent with previous research showing a relationship between personal contact and attitudes defined as faculty level of comfort and/or willingness to provide accommodations (Aksamit et al., 1987; Fichten et al., 1988; Fonosch & Schwab, 1981; Satcher, 1992) and between contact and knowledge of disabilities, legislation, and services (Aksamit et al., 1987).

In a study of faculty awareness about students with disabilities, Baggett (1994) found that 77% of the faculty had taught five or fewer students with disabilities during the last four years. Faculty additionally indicated that they could identify only students who disclosed their disability, and lacked experience teaching students with disabilities, were unfamiliar with the various disability rights and laws, and were unfamiliar with the various university-wide services available to these students with disabilities. Among the

disability groups, the faculty were more familiar with teaching learning disabilities than the other groups of disabilities (1994).

Elacqua (1996) surveyed 37 college students with various disabilities to assess their perceptions of the accommodation process at a medium-sized Midwestern university and found that while the majority of students felt satisfied with the accommodations they received, they felt that requesting a classroom accommodation was often stressful. Further, while the students surveyed felt they were familiar with the referral procedures and support services available, they felt that their professors were not familiar with their disabilities or available services to aid in the referral process (1996).

A previous and similar qualitative study by Farbman (1983) explored the experiences of a select group of science faculty members from a large urban university. Analysis of in-depth interviews revealed that the faculty members had contact with mostly mobility impaired or visually impaired students. The approaches of the faculty members appeared to be polarized; some faculty were willing to modify their teaching styles, to give out copies of their notes, and to spend extra time outside of class, while other professors refused to do those things. Accommodations seemed to be related directly to how the students approached the faculty members, and the more articulate and precise the student was about his or her needs, the better he or she fared. Based on the findings, the researcher concluded that the degree of autonomy afforded to professors by academic freedom may be detrimental to students with disabilities and preparing these students with advocacy and negotiation skills would best enhance their educational opportunities (1983).

Similarly, Fichten and Goodrick (1988) examined behaviors which promote effective teaching and learning and facilitate problem-free interaction between professors and students with disabilities. The researchers found that faculty often feel uncomfortable approaching students with disabilities and prefer that students initiate dialogue, and faculty were found more likely to provide the assistance needed when students state their needs in a precise and articulate manner. Sadlick and Penia (1975) found that exposure of nursing students to successfully rehabilitated persons by means of videotaped programs may be an effective means of enhancing attitudes, somewhat discounting the need for actual contact with disabled persons. In one instance, rehabilitation counselor interaction with disabled persons may have had detrimental effects (Chubon, 1982; Cobun, 1972).

Attitude and faculty knowledge of disability legislation. Benham (1997) suggests that faculty knowledge of the needs of disabled students, knowledge of the legal requirements of the ADA, and willingness to make the necessary accommodations have not been adequately addressed in legislation. Some research findings, however, indicate a positive connection between faculty awareness and accommodation, their familiarity and experience with students with disabilities and their knowledge about disability laws and rights (Bowman & Marzonk, 1990).

Schoen et al. (1987) surveyed 270 faculty members at Clemson University and found that faculty members held generally positive attitudes toward the treatment of students with disabilities in relation to classroom management issues and compliance with Section 504. Leyser (1989) found that 85% of faculty members surveyed were familiar with special education legislation pertaining to the rights of individuals with disabilities.

Aksamit et al. (1987), however, found that while faculty with more information about disabilities had more positive attitudes than those with less information, faculty members surveyed had limited knowledge about students with learning disabilities. Consistently, Leyser et al. (1998) found that a large percent of faculty surveyed expressed unfamiliarity with disability rights laws, and more than one-half had limited knowledge of university support services for students with disabilities. They also found that a large majority reported having no or little contact with service providers, had no or very limited training in the area of disabilities, and almost half indicated they had limited knowledge and skills for making requested educational accommodations for students with disabilities (1987).

Thompson and Leslie (1997) surveyed 400 faculty members in a survey designed to measure their knowledge of disability laws; of faculty respondents, less than 18 percent indicated that they were familiar with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, while only 50 percent said that they were familiar with the Americans with Disabilities Act. It was concluded that the majority of the faculty were only marginally aware of their rights and the legal rights of students with disabilities to reasonable accommodations and modifications of institutional policies.

In a study which evaluated the knowledge, experience and attitudes, that faculty at a private four-year institution have towards students with disabilities, Vasek (2005) found that approximately one-half of the respondents acknowledged that they possess little or no knowledge regarding Federal laws pertaining to students with disabilities in higher education. The author reports that a substantial number of the 208 respondents acknowledged that there were a number of areas in which their knowledge about

disabilities was lacking, and additionally reported that they did not feel a strong need for obtaining such information.

Thompson, Bethea, and Turner (1997) surveyed 400 faculty members at a southeastern research and teaching university to measure their knowledge of disability laws and recent court decisions that affected higher education. The majority of the participants held the rank of professor and had more than 15 years of experience in higher education. Less than 18% of the faculty members stated that they were familiar with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and only half of the faculty members were familiar with the Americans with Disabilities Act. In 17 of the 25 survey items, 30% or more of the faculty members in this survey responded incorrectly or did not know what the laws mandate regarding students with disabilities. One finding of the Thompson et al. (1997) study reported that although 80% of the participants understood that academic freedom does not supersede the rights of the student, only 57% knew that they could be held personally liable for failure to provide documented reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities. Another finding of the Thompson et al. study stated that 56% of the faculty knew that a disability had to be documented before any accommodations were provided. Only 46% of the faculty understood that they did not have the right to access the student's diagnostic information. Approximately 66% of the faculty knew what the law required in regard to course waivers and alternate assignments. Sixty percent of the faculty knew that requests that resulted in fundamental alterations of a course do not have to be provided. Contrary to the laws, nearly 60% of the faculty believed they had to provide an accommodation even if the student had not requested it. Over half of the

faculty was unaware that materials must be provided in alternate format if a student with a visual impairment requests it (1997).

Attitude of faculty and type of disability. Loewen (1993) asserts that many students have experienced frustration with their postsecondary experiences stemming from attitudes, a lack of appropriate services, programs, and funding, and the nature of the disability which impacts attitudes, services, and accommodations in the postsecondary environment. Often, those students who request accommodations and have physical disabilities or have disabilities that can be seen are often accommodated more than those students with "hidden disabilities" (Vasek, 2005). Hidden disabilities can include attention deficit disorder, learning disabilities, and psychological disorders (Fichten, 1990). Yunker (1988) suggested that persons with visible disabilities tend to be viewed more negatively than persons with nonvisible disabilities. Strohmer, Grand, and Purcell (1984) examined demographic variables, social context, and specific disability characteristics in relation to attitudes toward persons with disabilities in faculty and staff. They found that of 250 respondents at a large Northeastern university, attitudes toward persons with disabilities vary depending on the social situation and for different disability groups.

Mowbray and Megivern (1999) suggest that students who struggle with mental illness in particular, a prolific invisible disability on campuses today, may not be finding the specific supports they need to overcome barriers to the completion of their education. Further, Loewen (1993) found in her research that this population of students faced a lack of awareness or understanding of mental illness by faculty and peers which contributed to their struggle in the postsecondary environment. Moreover, institutional discrimination

exists on some campuses in the form of mandatory psychiatric withdrawal policies (Hoffman & Weiss, 1987).

Cook, Yamaguchi, and Solomon (1993) offered a training seminar for faculty working with students who had psychiatric disabilities. Results indicated that scores of faculty attitudes toward these students improved after the training. Following the training, faculty members were more likely to disagree with the statement, "Students with psychiatric disabilities also have lower IQs than other students." Following the training, faculty members were less likely to agree with the statement, "I am concerned about whether students who have psychiatric disabilities will act appropriately in class." Faculty summary scores improved significantly from pretest to posttest following the training.

A study by the Institute for Higher Education Policy (as cited in Bagnato, 2002) found that approximately 40 percent of first-year students with disabilities have learning disabilities, and thus have the benefit of special accommodations. The report found that faculty and administrators often resisted helping these students with their disability, however, because the disabilities were invisible. Beilke and Yssel (1999) suggest that students with learning disabilities or psychiatric disabilities often encounter resistance based on the perception that such students use their diagnosis as an excuse for poor performance. Fichten, Amsel, Bourdon, and Creti (1988) found that professors had a clear hierarchy of preference regarding teaching students with disabilities; the majority preferred students with orthopedic disabilities to all the other categories of disabilities.

Hart and Williams (1995) suggest that often, students with physical disabilities are treated differently in the classroom, and thus receive a different level of education. It

may be inferred that students with physical impairments encounter additional postsecondary issues, including both topographical and attitudinal barriers. For example, Anderson (1993) surveyed 26 students with disabilities and 66 non-disabled students regarding social support and barriers to higher education, and found that students with disabilities on average expressed concerns related to physical barriers within the university which were not readily identified by the non-disabled students.

A survey by Singh (2003) sent to directors of services for disabled students of 137 randomly selected institutions of higher learning resulted in only seven percent of the institutions of higher learning provide total or full accessibility as defined by this study to the students who have orthopedic disabilities, and it was concluded that it is only a small minority of sample institutions who offer structural, academic, and dorm accessibility as well as recreational opportunities for students with orthopedic disabilities. The following results were also indicated: a) academic accessibility provided by institutions of higher learning is significantly greater than any other types of accessibility investigated by this study; b) size of an institution of higher learning has nothing to do with its structure accessibility; c) only a small proportion of the institutions of higher learning offer structural academic, recreational and residential life accessibility to students with orthopedic disabilities; d) it is only a small proportion of the sample institutions that have entrance ramps, elevators, and automatic doors and other accessibility features in all the campus buildings. Most of the institutions are not structurally accessible; e) only a small proportion of the sample institutions have wheelchair accessible dorm rooms and other accessible residential facilities and services for students with orthopedic disabilities.

Newman (1976) surveyed 464 full-time teaching faculty members in all units of the University of Pittsburgh to examine policies and issues regarding admissions procedures of students with disabilities. Results indicated that 78% of the professors stated that the university should have an unrestricted admission policy. However, when admission to their own department was at issue, only 60% stated that an unrestricted admission should apply. Eighty-six percent of the responding faculty members selected blindness as the most restricting disability, followed by deafness (59%), paralysis (58%), cerebral palsy (54%), muscular dystrophy (51%), body deformations (12%), and skin disorders (5%).

Theoretical orientation. Yuker (1988) suggested that the belief systems and value structures on the part of individuals without disabilities also influence attitudes and reactions toward persons with disabilities. He suggested that persons who place great importance on a disability may ignore individual characteristics and focus only on the level of difference or inferiority.

The Psychodynamic approach theorizes that chronic diseases, physical traumas, and disabling conditions provoke abnormal sensations that interfere with the image of an intact body (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991). Likewise, disability may produce regression that rekindles childhood conflicts related to body perception (Menninger, 1953). Because the primary causes of behavior are regarded by psychoanalytic formulations as internally determined and because the loss of physical integrity is theorized to have a negative impact on the body image, attitudes toward oneself and others are also adversely influenced (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991).

The overriding goal of Adlerian therapy is assisting clients to develop their life-style so that they will be able to direct a more socially useful and productive style of life (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991). Accordingly, life-style counseling, as applied to a client with disability, seek to enable the client to move from a position of noncoping to that of coping through striving toward a subjectively determined sense of significance (Rule, 1987). In this capacity, life-style information often broadens the counselor's understanding of how the client might cope with physical disability (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991).

The central constructs of Person-Centered therapy as applicable to disability include a) the salience of the phenomenological field, b) the self-concept, and c) the denial and distortion of threatening experiences. The concept of counselor-produced facilitative conditions is also of significant importance (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991). The proponents of this theory suggest that individuals experience reality only as it is filtered through their phenomenological field, and that it is not the disability which psychologically affects the person but rather the subjective meaning and personal attitudes associated with it (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991).

The primary concepts in the Behavioral approach are a) the principles of operant conditioning and reinforcement, punishment, extinction, and shaping; b) classical conditioning; c) modeling; and d) social-cognitive principles focusing on behavioral management (Skinner, 1953). Proponents of this theory emphasize that all human behavior is learned, and an emphasis is placed on the role of the environment in maintaining behavior (Duval, 1982). Disability is viewed as operating on the same learning principles that govern all other human behaviors, and the disability may create

several obstacles which contribute to a lack of appropriate coping mechanisms (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991).

Counselors practicing Rational Emotive Behavioral Therapy (REBT) regard people as having the inherent capacity to think and act rationally and irrationally, and rational thinking is seen as leading to appropriate emotional and adaptive behaviors (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991). Alternatively, irrationality results in unhealthy and self-defeating functioning (Ellis, 1973). From this orientation, people with disabilities are perceived no differently than people experiencing any other issue, and disabilities are regarded as noxious events experienced by the individual (Ostby, 1985).

The most critical concepts of Gestalt theory for application to disability are: a) the holistic view of the individual, b) the emphasis on awareness and the present, c) personal responsibility, and d) the principles of polarities and closure (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991). In Gestalt theory (Perls, Hefferline, & Goodman, 1951) the person is viewed as a composite whole, which is composed of connected, integrated parts. Integration of fragmented components to a unified whole is the driving force behind the transition from dependency to self-sufficiency. As applied to disability, the holistic approach to therapy is emphasized and counselors utilizing this theory specifically address the physical, psychosocial, and vocational aspects of the person (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991).

Reality Therapy (RT) counselors promote the concepts of success identity and social responsibility (Glasser, 1965). Proponents of RT perceive people as possessing a need for personal and social identity. This identity can be classified as either success or failure identity, and is formed during early childhood. Glasser (1984, 1985) maintained that people are required to fulfill their basic needs to form a success identity. When

applied to disability, RT counselors view disability as only one of a multitude of variables which may interfere with the development of a success identity, and clients are ultimately responsible for their lives, their goals, and for reaching their life desires to achieve adjustment (Livneh & Sherwood, 1991).

In a survey study designed to examine types of therapeutic interventions utilized by rehabilitation counselors in the State of Wisconsin, Fier (1999) found that 26% of the counselors prefer an eclectic or general theoretical orientation, 24% prefer a behavioral approach, and 22% favor a client-centered orientation. Bishop and Richards (1984) suggest from their research that mental health counselors who are humanistically oriented judged their clients as having more severe educational problems and were more anxious than did counselors who were cognitively oriented.

A study of self-efficacy expectations of college professors suggested that cognitive factors constituted an important aspect in interactions with students with disabilities and those without disabilities (Fichten, Bourdon, Amsel, & Fox, 1987). This study reported that weak expectations of being able to interact effectively with students who have a physical disability are related to discomfort level, lack of knowledge about appropriate behavior, and negative attitudes in general toward people with disabilities.

Frye (2005) reports that school counselors indicate choosing activities from any of the existing counseling theories, such as Adlerian/play (Corey, 1996; Seligman, 2001), brief/solution focused (Amatea, 1989; Thompson & Littrell, 1998), person-centered (Goor, McKnab, & Davison-Aviles, 1995; Williams & Lair, 1991), or reality choice theories (Garcia et al., 1998), but maintained that they were choosing counseling activities based on the activity specifically, and not based on reliance on a particular

counseling theory. Each of the school counselors surveyed in the study advocated the use of an eclectic approach when working with students with disabilities. Frye concludes that in general, school counselors meet the personal/social needs of students with disabilities through an eclectic counseling approach, and they use classroom guidance and both individual and group counseling activities that focus on teaching students how to improve behavior and social skills and increase their self-esteem. The researcher also suggests that counselors help students by going against the status quo, providing activities that help the students feel better about themselves, and teaching students coping skills (2005).

Attitude and faculty experience in teaching. While research is limited investigating the relationship between attitude toward persons with disabilities and faculty experience in teaching, some investigations into the origins of negative attitudes suggest that negative attitudes are developed over the course of many years (Livneh, 1982). Previous research suggests that faculty with more contact and teaching experience with students with disabilities have more positive attitudes and are more comfortable allowing accommodations than those with less experience (Fichten et al., 1988; Fonosch & Schwab, 1981; Leyser et al., 1998; Satcher, 1992). Williamson (2000) found that faculty held generally positive attitudes toward serving students with disabilities when based on years of experience in teaching.

Benham (1997), however, found that years of teaching experience in higher education affected faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities. Specifically, the researcher found that faculty members with 11-20 years of teaching experience in higher education seemed to have a more negative attitude toward students with disabilities.

Fichten et al. (1988) found that experienced professors were more willing than

inexperienced professors to teach students with a disability and experienced professors were more comfortable with students with disabilities in general.

Discipline and specialty area. Due to the paucity of research in the area of attitudes toward persons with disabilities and various disciplines within the field of Counseling, research discussed here will include those studies available.

Efforts to enhance attitudes of teachers and students majoring in various areas of education toward disabled students have yielded mixed results (Chubon, 1982). Although some attitude change programs seemed to produce the desired results (Chubon, 1982; Harasymiw & Home, 1975; Kiernan, 1974; Lazar, Orpet & Demos, 1976; Morton, 1977; Shaw & Gillung, 1975), others have produced no changes (Kuhn, 1971; Parish, Eads, Reece & Piscitello, 1977; Wilson & Alcorn, 1969; Zukerman, 1975), and in some instances, mixed and negative changes (Chubon, 1982; Fenton, 1974; Martinez, 1977; Shotel, Iano & McGettigan, 1972; Warren, Turner & Brody, 1964). Chubon (1982) suggests that there is also some indication that teacher attitudes may vary with different disabilities, and, therefore, differences in focus among the studies may explain some of the variation in outcomes.

In 1993, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) issued position statements on school counselor involvement with students with disabilities and suggested the following school counselor roles in working with students with disabilities: (a) advocacy, (b) transition planning, (c) behavior modification, (d) counseling parents, (e) making referrals to specialists, (f) improving self-esteem, (g) working as part of the school multidisciplinary team, (h) teaching social skills, and (i) serving as consultants to parents and school staff (ASCA, 1993). Despite the acknowledged need for education to

increase school counselor competence, most school counselor education programs in the early 1990s did not require either specific coursework related to students with disabilities or practical experiences with those students (Korinek & Prillaman, 1992).

To investigate this, Milsom (2002) surveyed approximately 400 members of the American Counseling Association (ACA) who indicated that they were employed in schools (elementary, middle, or high) to examine how prepared school counselors felt overall to provide services to students with disabilities. Results indicated that in general, the school counselors indicated feeling “somewhat prepared” overall to provide services to students with disabilities and to perform specific activities for those students. Additionally, Hitchings et al. (2001) found only 8% of the participating college students with learning disabilities indicated having met with a school counselor during high school to discuss coursework and requirements for applying to college.

Furthermore, Korinek and Prillaman (1992) found that while most respondents (68%) indicated that their school counselor education programs would have to be altered to better prepare graduates to work with students with disabilities, only 11% had plans to make changes. Milsom (2002) also found many school counselors reported not being involved in providing transition planning services for students with disabilities. Of participants in her national study, only 68% of high school counselors reported assisting with transition plans for students with disabilities.

Frye (2005) examined how three elementary school counselors met the personal/social needs of students with disabilities using an ethnographic interview method of qualitative inquiry. The school counselors in this study reported actively seeking out ways that students with disabilities could participate in counseling activities

that would be helpful to them. Grigsby (1990), however, found in an evaluation of school counselors' involvement with students with disabilities that school counselors felt they were important in meeting the personal/social needs of students with disabilities, but reported having limited involvement and desire to work with these students.

In a study that required rehabilitation counselors to form a positive or negative judgment about a client based on select information from a client narrative and rate either positive or negative factors, Strohmer and Pellerin (1995) found that participants tended to favor negative client factors over positive ones based on the information presented. In addition, more experienced counselors tended to note less positive client information.

Schofield and Kunce (1971) studied rehabilitation counselors' reactions to physically disabled, developmentally delayed, and emotionally disturbed disability groups. The researchers found that the counselors tended to stereotype clients in terms of the services they needed as well as in terms of probably personality characteristics. They also found that these stereotypes influenced the counselor-client interaction.

Krauft, Rubin, Cook and Bozarth (1976) found that the ability of clients in a rehabilitation center to complete their rehabilitation program was related to counselor attitudes toward them, and that counselors who held more favorable attitudes toward people with disabilities experienced a greater number of successful closures than counselors with less favorable attitudes.

In a study investigating the relationship between knowledge of disability issues and attitude toward persons with disabilities among college counselors, knowledge about disability was not found to correlate positively with college counselors' attitudes toward disabled persons (Chubon, 1982; Palmerton & Frumkin, 1969). On the other

hand, Thams (1975) found seminars to be effective in enhancing the attitudes of school counselors toward disability, while LeMay (1968) found that a group of counselor education trainees held "enlightened" attitudes toward mental illness.

Theoretical Framework

The guiding theoretical framework for this research study is conceptualized from the viewpoint of critical theory. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) define critical theory:

A critical social theory is concerned in particular with issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy, matters of race, class, and gender, ideologies, discourses, education, religion, and other social institutions, and cultural dynamics interact to construct a social system. It analyzes competing power interests between groups and individuals within a society—identifying who gains and who loses in specific situations (p. 281).

This theory focuses on how injustice and subjugation shape people's experiences and understandings of the world, and maintains that the material world is structured from that subjective reality based on the imposed structures of those who have power, and those who are perceived as powerless. Critical theory assumes that the researcher's values shape the frame of inquiry in the research being conducted, and it is the researcher's position that students with disabilities are historically underserved by postsecondary institutions. Therefore, this theoretical framework conceptualizes this study in terms of power structures and biases which currently impact the postsecondary success of students with disabilities.

Review of the Literature on the Instruments

The instrument used in this study was the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons (SADP; Antonak, 1981). This scale is a 24-item summated rating scale requiring the respondent to rate agreement on each statement about persons with disabilities on a six-point Likert-type scale, ranging from -3, to signify "I disagree very much," through

+3, to signify "I agree very much." Although no studies have been conducted using this or similar instruments to specifically examine the attitudes of Counselor Educators toward persons or student with disabilities, the following studies have been conducted to investigate attitudes toward persons with disabilities broadly among service professionals.

In a study which investigated health professional student attitudes toward people with disability, Tervo, Palmer, and Redinius (2004) utilized the SADP (Antonak, 1982) to examine whether factors such as gender and background in disability would influence these attitudes and their ease in dealing with difficult encounters in rehabilitation. Results indicated that all students' attitudes were less positive than SADP norms and nursing students held the least positive opinions; No attitudinal differences by gender were observed. Those with a background in disability held more positive attitudes. Years of experience and hours per week employed predicted comfort with challenging rehabilitation situations. Inconsiderate treatment by staff, inappropriate sexual overtures and aggressive behavior by patients were stated to be most challenging. Tervo et al. concluded that work experience was important for enhancing comfort in challenging rehabilitation situations, and educational experiences are needed to promote more positive attitudes in the health professions (Tervo, Palmer, & Redinius, 2004).

Chenoweth, Pryor, Jeon, and Hall-Pullin (2004) conducted a study using the SADP (Antonak, 1982) to explore the effect of a clinical placement in a rehabilitation setting on nursing students' attitudes towards, and effectiveness in caring for, adult patients with acquired disabilities from head and spinal injuries. The researchers found that attitudes of nursing students towards persons with a disability remained positive

throughout their clinical placement. The researchers suggest that the students' participation in a disability-specific preparation program prior to the placement may explain these findings.

Blanchard (2001) used the SADP (Antonak, 1982) in a study investigating employer attitudes toward individuals with disabilities in Berlin, Germany, and Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Results from the study indicated that the aggregate attitude of employers surveyed was favorable toward people with disabilities. Male participants from the United States displayed the most favorable attitude, and males from Germany displayed the least favorable attitude toward people with disabilities. Age did not appear to have an impact on the reported attitude of the participants from Germany. However, the data collected from the participants from the United States showed that as age decreased, many of the resultant scores of the revised SADP increased, indicating that among the employers surveyed in the United States, those in the younger age groups showed a more favorable attitude toward people with disabilities (Blanchard, 2001).

The SADP (Antonak, 1982) was used in a study specifically designed to examine the effects of acculturation as an influencing factor on attitudes toward people with disabilities (Choi & Lam, 2001). The study examined the effects of perception of physical versus mental disabilities between two student samples, Korean-American and Korean, as a culture-mediating variable. The results of this study indicate that Korean-American students showed more positive attitudes toward people with mental disabilities than the Korean students, and in Korean-American students, mental and physical disabilities are rated with no significant differences. It was also found that Korean

students possess consistent Asian values that favor people with physical disabilities over those with mental disabilities (Choi & Lam, 2001).

In a study researching the attitudes toward disabilities among residents in rural and urban areas, Palmer, Redinius, and Tervo (2000) utilized the SADP (Antonak, 1982) in conjunction with the ATDP (Antonak, 1980) to assess attitudes among undergraduate and graduate students in the Midwest. The researchers found that persons who come from urban areas had significantly more positive attitudes than those individuals who have home communities in rural areas, and the researchers suggest that individuals in urban areas might have broader exposure to persons with disabilities than persons who lived in rural areas and therefore have more positive views toward persons with disabilities (Palmer, Redinius, & Tervo, 2000).

Gilbride (1993) utilized the SADP (Antonak, 1982) to examine the attitudes and expectations of parents with a child with a disability and the effect which their attitudes might have on their child. Results indicated that parents of children with disabilities who (a) did not view their child's disability as central, (b) did not view their child as different or inferior, and (c) did feel able to cope with their child's special needs were found to have more positive attitudes toward people with disabilities and higher expectations for their child than control groups in comparison. Gilbride (1993) suggests that these results indicate that even the parents with positive attitudes, and positive contact with their child, hold some stereotypical beliefs, and that parents' attitudes and expectations may be shaped by the stereotypes of the treatment professionals with whom they come in contact (Gilbride, 1993).

In a study investigating the attitudes of occupational therapy personnel toward persons with disabilities (Benham, 1988), the SADP (Antonak, 1982) was used to measure beliefs concerning the importance of favorable attitudes toward patients, and beliefs concerning the role of the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA) in the development of ethical guidelines for the delivery of health care services. The scale was used specifically to measure the attitudes of approximately 619 occupational therapists toward infants with Down's syndrome, and results indicated a very favorable attitude toward persons with disabilities and a general belief that a negative attitude would adversely affect the therapeutic relationship (Benham, 1988).

Summary

Chapter provided the foundation for this study by discussing research on faculty attitudes toward persons with disabilities and variables that influence these attitudes, as well as the theoretical framework on which the study is based. Chapter three discusses how this study explored the relationship between nine specific variables and general attitudes of Counselor Education faculty toward persons with disabilities.

Table 1

Summary of Literature by Variable

Variable	Author	Sample	Findings
Age of Faculty	Fonosch & Schwab (1981)	Randomly selected faculty at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln	No relationship between age of faculty and attitude toward disability
	Kelly (1984)	409 faculty at the University of Nebraska	Females under age 40 had more positive attitude than their older female counterparts

	Schoen, Uysal, & McDonald (1987)	270 faculty at Clemson University	No relationship between age of faculty and attitude toward disability
	Williamson (2000)	Randomly selected faculty employed at Troy State University Dothan	Younger faculty hold more positive attitudes toward students with disabilities
Gender of Faculty	Aksamit, Morris, & Luenberger (1987)	Randomly selected faculty, student services professionals at mid-sized university	Female faculty hold more positive attitudes than their male counterparts
	Baggett (1994)	A survey of 422 faculty at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst	Female faculty hold more favorable attitudes than male counterparts
	Fonosch & Schwab (1981)	Randomly selected faculty at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln	Female faculty hold more favorable attitudes than male counterparts
	Kelly (1984)	409 faculty at the University of Nebraska	Female faculty hold more favorable attitudes than male counterparts
	Kleinsasser (1999)	Randomly selected faculty and students at the University of South Dakota	Female faculty report more knowledge of disability legislation
	Leyser, Vogel, Wyland, & Brulle (1998)	420 faculty at a large Midwestern university	Female faculty hold more favorable attitudes than male counterparts

	Williamson (2000)	Randomly selected faculty employed at Troy State University Dothan	No relationship between gender of faculty and attitude toward disability
Ethnicity of Faculty	Jordon & Friesen (1968)	Randomly selected among international rehabilitation professionals	Cultural factors are strong determinants of attitudes toward persons with disabilities among Rehabilitation professionals
Amount of Contact with Disabled Persons	Aksamit, Morris, & Luenberger (1987)	Randomly selected faculty, student services professionals at mid-sized university	Positive correlation between experience with students with disabilities and attitudes of faculty
	Baggett (1994)	A survey of 422 faculty at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst	77% have taught five or fewer students with disabilities over past four years
	Elacqua (1996)	37 college students at a mid-sized Midwestern University	Students report high levels of stress associated with requesting disability accommodations
	Farbman (1983)	Faculty at a large urban university	Faculty reported most contact with mobility and visually impaired students compared to other groups
	Fichten & Goodrick (1988)	Randomly selected students at mid-sized university	Faculty are more likely to provide assistance to students with disabilities who initiate contact

Fonosch & Schwab (1981)	Randomly selected faculty at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln	Faculty instruction of five or more students during their teaching career is positively associated with positive attitudes toward students with disabilities
Kelly (1984)	409 faculty at the University of Nebraska	No relationship between attitude of faculty and faculty contact with persons with disabilities
Leyser (1989)	Randomly selected faculty from mid-sized university	Approximately 80% of faculty reported experience teaching students with disabilities in college
Morris, Leuenberger, & Askamit (1987)	Randomly selected faculty, student services professionals at mid-sized university	In-service training for faculty improves faculty attitude toward persons with disabilities
Sadlick & Penia (1975)	Randomly selected nurses at public health facility	Training programs enhances attitude toward persons with disabilities
Schoen, Uysal, & McDonald (1986)	270 faculty at Clemson University	Faculty reported little or no contact with students with disabilities in their classrooms

	Vasek (2005)	Private 4 year institution	Faculty reported little or no contact with students with disabilities during their teaching career
Faculty Knowledge of Legislation	Aksamit, Morris, & Luenberger (1987)	Randomly selected faculty, student services professionals at midsized university	Over 60% of respondents are unfamiliar with disability legislation
	Baggett (1994)	A survey of 422 faculty at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst	Approximately 85% of faculty report familiarity with disability legislation
	Leyser (1989)	Randomly selected faculty from midsized university	Approximately 50% of faculty reported unfamiliarity with disability legislation
	Leyser, Vogel, Wyland, & Brulle (1998)	420 faculty at a large Midwestern university	Faculty generally hold positive attitudes toward compliance with Section 504 (1973)
	Schoen, Uysal, & McDonald (1987)	270 faculty at Clemson University	Approximately 30% of faculty were not familiar with disability legislation
	Thompson, Bethea, & Turner (1997)	400 faculty at a Southeastern research University	Less than 18% of faculty were familiar with Section 504 (1973); less than 50% were familiar with the ADA (1990)

	Thompson & Leslie (1997)	400 faculty members at a southeastern university	Less than 50% have familiarity with disability legislation
	Vasek (2005)	Private 4 year institution	Faculty reported limited knowledge of disability legislation
Comfort with Types of Disabilities	Beilke and Yssel (1999)	32 undergraduate students at a large midwestern university	Learning and psychiatric disabilities encounter the most resistance among faculty accommodations
	Cook, Yamaguchi, & Solomon (1993)	Randomly selected students at mid-sized university	Training improves attitudes and knowledge of psychiatric disabilities
	Fichten, Amsel, Bourdon, & Creti (1988)	Randomly selected faculty at a mid-sized university	Most faculty prefer to teach students with orthopedic disabilities above all other disability types
	Hart & Williams (1995)	Randomly selected faculty at a mid-sized university	Able-bodied instructors communicate differently with disabled students than with their non-disabled counterparts
	Newman (1976)	464 faculty at the University of Pittsburgh	86% of faculty believe blindness is the most restricting disability

	Singh (2003)	137 randomly selected Universities within the United States	7% of institutions nationwide provide full accessibility for students with physical disabilities
	Strohmer, Grand, & Purcell (1984)	250 faculty at a large Northeastern University	Attitudes of faculty are influenced by type of disability and social context
Theoretical Orientation	Bishop & Richards (1984)	12 randomly selected counselors at mid-sized university	Humanistically- oriented mental health counselors have less positive attitudes than those who are cognitively- oriented
	Fichten, Bourdon, Amsel, & Fox (1987)	Randomly selected students at mid-sized university	Self-efficacy regarding ability to communicate with persons with disabilities is a strong determinant of attitude
	Frye (2005)	School counselors employed in a large metropolitan school system on the East Coast of the United States	School counselors tend to favor an eclectic approach
Years of Faculty Experience	Fichten, Amsel, Bourdon, & Creti (1988)	Randomly selected students at mid-sized university	More experience is positively correlated with comfort with and willingness to teach students with disabilities

	Fonosch & Schwab (1981)	Randomly selected faculty at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln	More teaching experience is positively correlated with attitude toward students with disabilities
	Williamson (2000)	Randomly selected faculty employed at Troy State University Dothan	More teaching experience is positively correlated with attitude toward students with disabilities
Discipline/Specialty	Frye (2005)	School counselors employed in a large metropolitan school system on the East Coast of the United States	School counselors actively sought out ways to include students with disabilities in school activities
	Grigsby (1990)	Stratified random sample in mid-sized elementary school	School counselors have limited desire to work with students with disabilities
	Hitchings (2001)	97 students with learning disabilities at three Midwestern universities	Approximately 8% of students with learning disabilities report having met with a school counselor

Korinek & Prillaman (1992)	Randomly selected school counselors enrolled in school counselor preparation programs	Approximately 11% of school counselor education programs have plans to make changes to better prepare graduates to work with persons with disabilities
Krauft, Rubin, Cook & Bozarth (1976)	Randomly selected rehabilitation counselors	Attitudes of rehabilitation counselors are positively correlated with successful case outcomes
LeMay (1968)	Randomly selected Counselor Education trainees	Counselor Education trainees demonstrate "enlightened" attitudes regarding persons with disabilities
Milsom (2002)	400 members of the American Counseling Association self-identified as school counselors	School counselors reported feeling "somewhat prepared" to work with students with disabilities
Palmerton & Frumkin (1969)	Randomly selected college counselors	College counselors' knowledge of disability issues is not correlated with attitude toward persons with disabilities

Strohmer & Pellerin (1995)	Master's level rehabilitation counselors enrolled in college internship	More experienced rehabilitation counselors note less positive client information
Schofield & Kunce (1971)	Randomly selected rehabilitation counselors	Rehabilitation counselors tend to stereotype clients in terms of services needed and personality characteristics
Thams (1975)	Randomly selected school counselors in Michigan	Training seminars are effective in enhancing attitudes of school counselors toward persons with disabilities

Chapter Three

PROCEDURES

Chapter one provides background information and a framework for this study. Chapter two provides a review of the pertinent literature related to general disability issues and the relationship between nine variables and faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities, as well as the theoretical framework from which this study was conducted. Chapter three discusses the research methodology, the population utilized, a description of the sample, the research instruments used, and the methods for data analysis used to answer the research question.

Research Design

The research design for this study was an ex post facto survey design with nine research hypotheses. An ex post facto study “refers to any non-experimental research strategy in which subjects are singled out because they have already been exposed to a particular condition or they exhibit a particular characteristic” (Kirk, 1995, p.9). This study intended to assess the relationship between nine variables and attitudes of Counselor Educators toward students with disabilities. This design examined the research questions by testing the significance between six categorical and three continuous independent variables and one dependent continuous variable. The probability level was set at .05.

Participants

A convenience sample of Counselor Educators was taken from the Counselor Education and Supervision listserv (CESNET-L), which services approximately 900

members at current. An incentive for the participants was the participation in a research project designed to increase knowledge, diversity, and multicultural awareness within Counselor Education Programs, as well as information that can be utilized in further developing educational training, course development, and comprehensive assessment techniques.

Sampling Procedure

Participants for this study were invited to participate by formal invitation letter sent electronically on the CESNET-L listserv. This invitation letter (Appendix B) described the details of the research study. An informed consent (Appendix C) was sent electronically, and informed participants that participation in the survey served as implied consent. The research question was to what extent the attitudes of counselor educators are related to the following variables:

- a) Age;
- b) Gender;
- c) Ethnicity;
- d) Amount of contact with disabled persons;
- e) Knowledge of disability legislation;
- f) Comfort with type of disability;
- g) Theoretical orientation;
- h) Years of experience as a counselor educator;
- i) Discipline/specialty within counselor education.

Variable List

The dependent variable was Counselor Educator attitude as measured by the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons (SADP; Antonak, 1981). There were three continuous independent variables: a) amount of contact with disabled students; b) knowledge of disability legislation; c) comfort with type of disability. There were six categorical independent variables: a) age; b) gender; c) ethnicity; d) theoretical orientation; e) years of experience as a Counselor Educator; and f) discipline within Counselor Education. All variables were categorized as follows:

Table 2

Statistical Analysis Categories by Variable

Variable	Survey Category	Statistical Category
Age	Under 30	Under 40
	30-39	
	40-49	40-49
	50-59	50 and Above
	60+	
Gender	Male	Male
	Female	Female
Ethnicity	African American	White Nonwhite
	Latin American	
	Asian American	
	Biracial	
Contact	Daily	Daily/Weekly
	Weekly	
	Monthly	Monthly/Yearly
	Yearly	
Knowledge	None	Some or Less
	Little	
	Some	
	Much	Much
	Expert	
Comfort	Mostly Uncomfortable	Mostly Uncomfortable
	Somewhat Comfortable	Somewhat Comfortable
	Mostly Comfortable	Mostly Comfortable
	Completely Comfortable	Completely Comfortable

Theoretical Orientation	Psychodynamic	
	Adlerian	Adlerian
	Gestalt	
	REBT	Person-Centered
	Person-Centered	
	Cognitive Behavioral Systems	Cognitive Behavioral Systems
	Reality	
Years of Experience	0 Months to 1 Year	0 Months to 1 Year
	1 to 2 Years	1 to 2 Years
	3 to 5 Years	3 to 5 Years
	6 to 10 Years	6 to 10 Years
	11 to 15 Years	11 to 15 Years
	16 Years or More	16 Years or More
Discipline/Specialty	School	School
	Career	Community
	Marriage and Family	
	College	
	Community	
	Rehabilitation	

Note: Combinations and omissions were used for analysis due to lack of responses in some categories.

Instruments

The researcher used the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons (SADP; Antonak, 1981). Antonak and Livneh (1988) suggest that the convenience of the SADP, together with the available data on its validity, reliability, and structure, support the usefulness of the scale by researchers and practitioners in rehabilitation and related fields. With permission from the author, the SADP-R Personal Information Form (Antonak, 1981) was modified to incorporate the demographic variables of the participants in the current study.

Counseling practitioners may find the SADP useful for investigations of the formation, structure, and correlates of attitudes toward disabled people, and related fields

may find the SADP useful in applied settings such as measuring the effectiveness of professional training programs and attitude change programs (Antonak & Livneh, 1988).

Norming

The SADP, a 24-item summated rating scale, requires the respondent to rate each statement on a six-point Likert-type scale, ranging from -3, to signify "I disagree very much," through +3, to signify "I agree very much." No neutral response option is provided. Directions to the respondent are printed on the questionnaire form together with a response key (Antonak & Livneh, 1988).

Analyses of SADP data collected from 1981 to 1983 from new samples of respondents were conducted by Antonak (1985a, 1985b) to confirm and clarify the reliability, validity, and utility of the scale. These samples included high school students, undergraduate and graduate majors in human services, nonmatriculated professionals in courses for continuing educational purposes, and participants at workshops and conferences in several New England states (Antonak & Livneh, 1988).

The scale was designed to be administered to groups, but may also be used with individuals either directly or by mail. Respondents are encouraged to respond to every item on the scale. The results of reliability analyses yielded Spearman-Brown corrected reliability coefficients ranging from +.81 to +.85, and alpha coefficients ranging from +.88 to +.91. Preliminary investigation of the validity of the SADP included analyses of the relationship between the scores on the SADP and other attitude scales (Antonak & Livneh, 1988).

Scores on an 18-item reduced version of the SADP Form-O were found to correlate moderately ($r = +.54$) with SADP scores, and with scores on each of the three

SADP subscales ($r = +.47, +.33, \text{ and } +.31$, respectively). Support for the criterion-related validity of the SADP was found using the known-groups technique. Multiple regression analyses of the relationship between the scale scores and the respondent demographic and experiential variable showed that SADP scores were partially attributed to differences in the subjects' characteristics (Antonak & Livneh, 1988).

Data Collection

Dillman (2000) found that electronic surveys offer the elimination of paper, postage, mail out, and data entry costs, making an internet survey a logical choice in this particular study given the large sample size. The researcher electronically distributed both a letter inviting participants to participate in research (Appendix B) and an informed consent document (Appendix C) on the selected listserv in October 2006. The participants were invited to respond between October 1 and 31, 2006. Participants were directed in the letters to a specific website which hosted the survey. The participants were informed that they would give their implied consent to participate in the study by navigating to the internet survey, which included a statement about confidentiality and results. All results were electronically submitted and stored securely in the SNAP 8 software system.

The participants had the opportunity to give the following demographic information (Appendix A): a) age; b) gender; c) ethnicity; d) amount of contact with disabled persons; e) knowledge of disability legislation; f) comfort with type of disability; g) theoretical orientation; h) years of experience as a Counselor Educator; and i) one's discipline/specialty within Counselor Education. The participants then completed the SADP by selecting the appropriate box which best describes their agreement about

persons with disabilities. The response choices ranged from -3, to signify "I disagree very much," through +3, to signify "I agree very much" on a six-point Likert-type scale. The participants had the option to discard their responses and discontinue the survey at any time. Once completed, the participants had the option to submit the data by clicking on the submit box. The responses were automatically transitioned into a secure database stored in the SNAP 8 survey software system. Only the researcher had access to the responses. The responses were converted into an SPSS statistical format for analysis.

Statistical Analysis

According to Newman and Newman (1994), descriptive statistics are used to describe the population on which one has data. In this study, descriptive statistics summarized the questionnaire responses and organized the data obtained from the sample, including the mean, standard deviation, and frequency. In addition to descriptive statistics, inferential statistics were used with a probability level of .05.

A specific statistical procedure or set of procedures were utilized to test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1

There is a difference by age group and attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Statistical Analysis

To test this hypothesis, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. If the statistical test revealed significance, a polynomial trend test would be used to clarify the age group difference in attitude.

Hypothesis 2

There is a difference by gender in attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Statistical Analysis

To test this hypothesis, an independent-samples t -test was used to clarify the gender group difference in attitude.

Hypothesis 3

There is a difference by ethnicity in attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Statistical Analysis

To test this hypothesis, an independent-samples t -test was used to clarify the ethnicity group difference in attitude.

Hypothesis 4

There is a difference by frequency of contact and attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Statistical Analysis

To test this hypothesis, an independent-samples t -test was used to clarify the frequency of contact group difference in attitude.

Hypothesis 5

There is a difference by knowledge of disability legislation and attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Statistical Analysis

To test this hypothesis, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. If the statistical test revealed significance, a polynomial trend test would be used to clarify the knowledge group difference in attitude.

Hypothesis 6

There is a relationship between comfort with type of disability and attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Statistical Analysis

A Pearson's correlational analysis was used to evaluate the relationship between the independent and dependent variable.

Hypothesis 7

There is a difference by primary theoretical orientation in attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Statistical Analysis

To test this hypothesis, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. If the statistical test revealed significance, an independent samples *t*-test would be used to clarify the primary theoretical group difference in attitude.

Hypothesis 8

There is a difference by years of experience and attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Statistical Analysis

To test this hypothesis, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. If the statistical test reveals significance, a polynomial trend test would be used to clarify the years of experience group difference in attitude.

Hypothesis 9

There is a difference by discipline/specialty in attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Statistical Analysis

To test this hypothesis, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. If the statistical test revealed significance, an independent samples *t*-test would be used to clarify the discipline/specialty group difference in attitude.

Limitations

The limitations of this study may related to the method of sampling; convenience sampling offers no control group with which to compare data in this study.

Summary

Chapter three addressed the methodology and procedures for the study. The researcher used a convenience sample of Counselor Educators subscribing to one listserv serving Counselor Educators. The Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons (SADP; Antonak, 1981) were accessed by participants in the form of computer survey. Responses had no identifying information so as to protect confidentiality of participants. All procedures met and followed IRB ethical criteria. Data were gathered using SNAP 8 software and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical tests on the SPSS statistical analysis program.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis

This chapter reports the results of the data analyzed for this study. The first section includes the demographic information. The second section includes the results of the analyses of variance and correlations used to test the hypotheses under study.

Demographic Data

All participants in this study were Counselor Educators employed in CACREP accredited counselor education programs and members of the CESNET-L listerv. Of the 900 Counselor Educators invited to participate, there was a response rate of 6% (n= 56).

Tables 2 and 3 present detailed information about the participants' age; gender; ethnicity; amount of contact with disabled persons; knowledge of disability legislation; comfort with type of disability; theoretical orientation; years of experience as a Counselor Educator; and one's discipline/specialty within Counselor Education.

Table 3

Frequencies And Valid Percentages By Age, Gender, Ethnicity, Amount Of Contact With Disabled Persons, Knowledge Of Disability Legislation, Theoretical Orientation, Years Of Experience As A Counselor Educator, And One's Discipline/Specialty Within Counselor Education

Variable	Group	N	Percent
Age	Under 30	8	14%
	30-39	16	29%
	40-49	17	30%
	50-59	10	18%
	60+	4	7%
Gender	Male	22	39%
	Female	34	61%
Ethnicity	White American	47	84%
	African American	2	4%
	Latin American	2	4%
	Asian American	1	2%
	Bi-Racial	4	7%
Amount of Contact	None	4	7%
	Daily	19	34%
	Weekly	28	50%
	Monthly	6	11%
	Yearly	3	5%
Amount of Knowledge	None	1	2%
	Little	3	5%
	Some	22	40%
	Much	30	54%
	Expert	0	0%
Theoretical Orientation	Psychodynamic	3	5%
	Adlerian	7	13%
	Gestalt	1	2%
	REBT	1	2%
	Person-Centered	11	20%
	Cognitive Behavioral	18	32%
	Systems	10	18%
	Reality	2	4%
Years of Experience	0 Months to 1 Year	7	13%
	1 to 2 Years	18	32%
	3 to 5 Years	9	16%
	6 to 10 Years Taken	9	16%
	11 to 15 Years	4	7%
	16 Years or More	9	16%

Discipline/Specialty	Career	2	4%
	School	20	36%
	Marriage and Family	5	9%
	College	6	11%
	Community	21	38%
	Rehabilitation	1	2%
Total		56	100%

Table 4

Frequencies and Valid Percentages by Comfort with Type of Disability

Variable	Group	N	Percent
Mobility Impairment	Mostly Uncomfortable	3	5%
	Somewhat Comfortable	11	20%
	Mostly Comfortable	28	50%
	Completely Comfortable	14	25%
Auditory Impairment	Mostly Uncomfortable	5	9%
	Somewhat Comfortable	14	25%
	Mostly Comfortable	26	46%
	Completely Comfortable	11	20%
Visual Impairment	Mostly Uncomfortable	4	7%
	Somewhat Comfortable	18	32%
	Mostly Comfortable	20	36%
	Completely Comfortable	14	25%
Learning Impairment	Mostly Uncomfortable	3	5%
	Somewhat Comfortable	8	14%
	Mostly Comfortable	24	43%
	Completely Comfortable	21	38%
Psychiatric Impairment	Mostly Uncomfortable	2	4%
	Somewhat Comfortable	9	16%
	Mostly Comfortable	25	45%
	Completely Comfortable	20	36%
Total		56	100%

Reliability of Instruments

The instrument used in this study was the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons (SADP; Antonak, 1981). The SADP, a 24-item summated rating scale, requires the respondent to rate each statement on a six-point Likert-type scale, ranging from -3, to signify "I disagree very much," through +3, to signify "I agree very much." No neutral

response option is provided. For this research study, the scale reliability was estimated at a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of $\alpha=.77$.

A scale was also developed for variable Comfort with Type of Disability for use in the correlational analysis for Hypothesis 6. The five categories were averaged based on responses to comfort level. Based on that average, scale reliability was estimated at a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of $\alpha=.64$.

Research Hypotheses Results

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that there is a difference by age group in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine significant differences by age group. Due to the frequency of responses in each category, responses were categorized into the following categories: under 40; 40-49; and 50 and above. ANOVA results did not reveal a significant difference by age group and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. Therefore, the data do not support Hypothesis 1. Table 5 presents a summary of analysis of variance for age and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Table 5

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Age and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators

Age	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Under 40	24	5.29	.41			
40-49	17	5.33	.48			
50 and Above	14	5.38	.33			
	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> -value	<i>P</i> -value	<i>Eta</i> ²
Between Groups	.07	2	.04	.21	.81	.01
Within Groups	9.02	52	.17			
Total	9.09	54				

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that there is a difference by gender in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. An independent samples *t* test was conducted to determine significant differences by ethnicity. Results of the *t*-test indicated that respondents who identified themselves as male did not have significantly different attitude scores than those who identified themselves as female, $t(54)=-1.19$, $p>.05$. Therefore, the data do not support Hypothesis 2. Table 6 presents a summary of *t* test results for gender and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Table 6

Summary of t-test results for Gender and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators

Gender	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i> -value	<i>P</i> -value	<i>d</i>
Male	22	5.24	.50	54	-1.19	.24	.38
Female	34	5.40	.33				

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that there is a difference by ethnicity in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. An independent samples *t* test was

conducted to determine significant differences by ethnicity. Due to the limited responses in most categories, responses were categorized into White and Nonwhite (African American, Latin American, Asian American, and Biracial). Results of the *t*-test indicated that respondents who identified themselves as White did not have significantly different attitude scores than those who identified themselves as Nonwhite, $t(54)=1.33, p>.05$. Therefore, the data do not support Hypothesis 3. Table 7 presents a summary of *t* test results for ethnicity and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Table 7

Summary of t-test results for Ethnicity and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators

Ethnicity	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i> -value	<i>P</i> -value	<i>d</i>
White	47	5.31	.43	54	1.33	.20	.41
Nonwhite	9	5.45	.25				

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that there is a difference by frequency of contact in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. To test this hypothesis, an independent samples *t* test was used to clarify the frequency of contact group difference in attitude. Due to the frequency of responses in each category, responses were categorized into daily or weekly contact and monthly or yearly contact. Results of the *t*-test indicated that those respondents who reported daily or weekly contact did not have significantly different attitude scores than those who reported monthly or yearly contact, $t(50)=.95, p>.05$. Therefore, the data do not support Hypothesis 4. Table 8 presents a summary of *t* test results for frequency of contact and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Table 8

Summary of t-test for Amount of Contact and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators

Contact	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i> -value	<i>P</i> -value	<i>d</i>
Daily or Weekly	25	5.30	.43	50	.95	.35	.26
Monthly or Yearly	27	5.40	.35				

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that there is a difference by knowledge of disability legislation in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine significant differences by knowledge rating. ANOVA results revealed a significant difference by knowledge rating and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Increasing levels of knowledge are positively associated with positive attitudes on the outcome measure. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was supported by the data. Table 9 presents a summary of analysis of variance for knowledge of disability legislation and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Table 9

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Knowledge of Legislation and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators

Knowledge	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Some or Less	26	5.21	.41			
Much	30	5.43	.39			
	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> -value	<i>P</i> -value	<i>Eta</i> ²
Between Groups	.66	1	.66	4.19	.05	.07
Within Groups	8.5	54	.16			
Total	9.16	55				

Note: * $p < .05$

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 stated that there is a relationship between comfort with type of disability in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. A correlational analysis was conducted to determine whether a relationship between the variables exists. A Pearson's correlation revealed statistical significance at the .01 level for degree of comfort and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators, $r(55) = .63, p < .01$. There is a positive correlation between level of comfort and positive attitude. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was supported by the data.

Hypothesis 7

Hypothesis 7 stated that there is a difference by primary theoretical orientation in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine significant differences by theoretical orientation. Categories which received fewer than five responses were omitted from analysis (Psychodynamic; Gestalt; REBT; Reality). ANOVA results did not reveal a significant difference by theoretical orientation and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. Therefore, the data do not support Hypothesis 7. Table 10 presents a summary of analysis of variance for theoretical orientation and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Table 10

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Theoretical Orientation and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators

Theoretical Orientation	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Adlerian	7	5.48	.17			
Person-Centered	11	5.26	.57			
Cognitive Behavioral Systems	18	5.24	.46			
	10	5.42	.22			
	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F-value</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>Eta²</i>
Between Groups	.43	3	.14	.81	.50	.05
Within Groups	7.50	42	.18			
Total	7.91	45				

Hypothesis 8

Hypothesis 8 stated that there is a difference by years of experience in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine significant differences by years of experience. ANOVA results did not reveal a significant difference by years of experience and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. Therefore, the data do not support Hypothesis 8. Table 11 presents a summary of analysis of variance for years of experience and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Table 11

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Years of Experience as a Counselor Educator and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators

Years of Experience	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
0 Months to 1 Year	7	5.27	.32			
1 to 2 Years	18	5.33	.46			
3 to 5 Years	9	5.22	.29			
6 to 10 years	9	5.51	.38			
11 to 15 Years	4	4.92	.56			
16 Years or more	9	5.50	.32			
	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> -value	<i>P</i> -value	<i>Eta</i> ²
Between Groups	1.35	5	.27	1.72	.15	.15
Within Groups	7.81	50	.16			
Total	9.16	55				

Hypothesis 9

Hypothesis 9 stated there is a difference by discipline/specialty in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine significant differences by discipline/specialty. Categories which received fewer than ten responses were omitted from analysis (Career; Marriage and Family; College; Gerontology; Rehabilitation). ANOVA results did not reveal a significant difference by discipline/specialty and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. Therefore, the data do not support hypothesis 9. Table 12 presents a summary of analysis of variance for discipline/specialty and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Table 12

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Discipline/Specialty Area and Attitude toward Persons with Disabilities among Counselor Educators

Discipline/Specialty	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
School	20	5.30	.48			
Community	21	5.38	.35			
	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i> -value	<i>P</i> -value	<i>Eta</i> ²
Between Groups	.06	1	.06	.34	.56	.01
Within Groups	6.75	39	.17			
Total	6.81	40				

Summary

This chapter presented an analysis of the data along with demographic information about the participants of this study. Several analyses of variance, *t* tests, and a correlational analysis were conducted to determine whether differences or relationships exist between the nine independent variables and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. Overall, two hypotheses were supported by the data collected from this study. It was found that comfort level was correlated with higher scores on the SADP (Antonak, 1981); and, higher levels of knowledge of disability legislation are also associated with higher scores on the SADP.

Chapter Five

Discussion

This chapter provides an overview of the results, limitations of the study, implications for higher education and counseling professionals, and recommendations for future research. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship or differences between nine variables with attitudes of Counselor Educators toward persons with disabilities. The goal was to identify potential variables which may influence these attitudes. These variables included a) age; b) gender; c) ethnicity; d) amount of contact with disabled persons; e) knowledge of disability legislation; f) comfort with type of disability; g) theoretical orientation; h) years of experience as a Counselor Educator; and i) one's discipline/specialty within Counselor Education.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there is a difference by age group and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The analysis did not reveal a significant difference by age group and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. These results support studies (Baggett, 1993; Benham, 1995; Fonosch & Schwab, 1981; McGee, 1989; Schoen et al., 1987) which have found no relationship between age of faculty and attitude towards persons with disabilities. Williamson (2000) found, however, that younger faculty held generally more positive attitudes toward serving students with disabilities when based on age. Based on conflicting results in the literature regarding this variable on attitude toward persons with disabilities among faculty, and counselor educators specifically, the results of this study elucidate the need for further exploration into the effect of age on attitude, and under

what circumstances age becomes a factor in predicting, impacting, and determining attitudes.

Hypothesis 2 stated that there is a difference by gender in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The analysis did not reveal a significant difference by gender and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. These findings are consistent with those of Williamson (2000) who examined faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities at Troy State University-Dothan and found no significant differences between gender of faculty and attitude. Additionally, other studies have also consistently found no significant relationship between gender of faculty and attitude toward students with disabilities (Lewis, 1998; McGee, 1989; Schoen et al., 1987). In other research, however, female faculty have been found to hold more favorable attitudes than their male counterparts (Aksamit, Morris, & Luenberger, 1987; Baggett, 1994; Fonosch & Schwab, 1981; Kelly, 1984; Kleinsasser, 1999; Leyser, Vogel, Wyland, & Brulle, 1998). It is important to recognize that among conflicting results in studies examining gender differences in counselor educators toward persons with disabilities, further research is needed to establish under what conditions gender may influence attitude and how training courses and programs may address the relationship between gender and attitude, if a relationship does exist.

Hypothesis 3 stated that there is a difference by ethnicity in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The analysis did not reveal a significant difference by ethnicity and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. These findings are consistent with those of Friesen (1968) who found in a multicultural study of attitudes toward disabled persons that cultural

factors weighed significantly among attitudinal determinants of their rehabilitation worker samples from several countries. While there remains a paucity of literature in this area, Chubon (1982) and Jordon and Friesen (1968) suggest the existence of regional and perhaps institutionally-biased differences in attitudes toward disability. These results may highlight a continued collaborative effort among counselor educators and higher education professionals to advocate tolerance in both venues and lend direction to further areas of study in the area of diversity and attitudes.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there is a difference by frequency of contact and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The analysis did not reveal a significant difference by frequency of contact and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. These results are consistent with findings by Kelly (1984) which indicate no relationship between attitude of faculty and faculty contact with persons with disabilities. However, the results of this study contradict findings by Aksamit, Morris, and Luenberger (1987) and Fonosch and Schwab (1981) which suggest a positive correlation between experience with students with disabilities and attitudes of faculty. Due to the inconsistencies in the literature, the results of this study support the need for further research into additional factors, influences, and contextual circumstances which may contribute to findings of significance and no significance regarding faculty contact with persons with disabilities on attitudes.

Hypothesis 5 stated that there is a difference by knowledge of disability legislation and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The analysis revealed that counselors with greater knowledge of disability legislation had a

more positive attitude toward persons with disabilities. Therefore, this hypothesis is supported by the data. While there are conflicted findings on the level of estimated knowledge of disability legislation held by faculty at postsecondary institutions, there is no research relating knowledge to attitudes toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The findings of this study contribute to existing literature and elucidate the need for further research in this area.

Hypothesis 6 stated that there is a relationship between comfort with type of disability and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The analysis revealed a significant relationship between comfort with type of disability and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. These results are consistent with existing literature which suggests that attitudes of faculty are influenced by type of disability and social context (Beilke & Yssel, 1999; Cook, Yamaguchi, & Solomon, 1993; Fichten, Amsel, Bourdon, & Creti, 1988; Hart & Williams, 1995; Newman, 1976; Singh, 2003). Loewen (1993) asserts that many students have experienced frustration with their postsecondary experiences stemming from attitudes, a lack of appropriate services, programs, and funding, and the nature of the disability which impacts attitudes, services, and accommodations in the postsecondary environment. These results may encourage Counselor Educators and counselors-in-training to increase their understanding of the relationship between awareness of disability issues and attitude.

Hypothesis 7 stated that there is a difference by primary theoretical orientation in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The analysis did not reveal a difference by primary theoretical orientation in attitude toward persons with

disabilities among counselor educators. Due to limited responses in some categories, only the following theories were incorporated into analysis: Adlerian; Person-Centered; Cognitive Behavioral; and Systems. Among those theoretical orientations included in the analysis, no one theory was more influential than the others on attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The results of this analysis conflict with findings of Bishop and Richards (1984) who report that mental health counselors with a humanistic-oriented approach have less positive attitudes than those who are cognitively-oriented. Again, there is a paucity of research in this area, and these findings encourage future research in this area to establish under what circumstances a difference may exist.

Hypothesis 8 stated that there is a difference by years of experience and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The analysis did not reveal a difference by years of experience and attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. Contrary to the results of this analysis, existing research suggests that more years of experience in teaching positively influences (Williamson, 2000; Fichten, Amsel, Bourdon, & Creti, 1988; Fonosch & Schwab, 1981) or negatively influences (Strohmer & Pellerin, 1995) attitude toward persons with disabilities among faculty and rehabilitation counselors. This conflict suggests that further research is needed to explore this area.

Hypothesis 9 stated there is a difference by discipline/specialty in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. The analysis did not reveal a difference by discipline/specialty in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators. These results are consistent with findings by Palmerton and Frumkin (1969) who found that college counselors' knowledge of disability issues is

not correlated with attitude toward persons with disabilities. Other research, however, indicates conflicting findings. For example, LeMay (1968) found that Counselor Education trainees demonstrate “enlightened” attitudes regarding persons with disabilities, and attitudes of rehabilitation counselors were found to be positively correlated with successful case outcomes (Krauft, Rubin, Cook & Bozarth, 1976), though Grigsby (1990) reports that school counselors have limited desire to work with students with disabilities. Since research in this area does not specifically address the impact of discipline/specialty on attitude, future research may include focus in this area.

The findings of this analysis invite further research to explore if differences truly exist among disciplines in attitude toward persons with disabilities among counselor educators.

Implications for Counselor Educators

It is important for counselor educators to note the factors suggested by research that are influential for counselor education students and their attitudes toward persons with disabilities. Counselor education programs may want to encourage further exploration into this topic to increase awareness of this issue among counselor educators and practitioners, and to contribute to better practices and improved services to this population by encouraging as well as aiding in the development of more comprehensive training curricula for counselors-in-training.

Overall, two hypotheses were supported by the data collected from this study. It was found that: a) comfort level was correlated with higher scores on the SADP (Antonak, 1981), and b) higher levels of knowledge of disability legislation are related to positive attitudes toward persons with disabilities. This may be indicative of the training

base of Counselor Educators; having exposure to disability issues in training programs may increase general awareness of and sensitivity to these issues, and may positively impact attitudes of Counselor Educators toward persons with disabilities.

Limitations of the Study

The researcher followed all ethical IRB ethical criteria in the implementation of this research study. Because this research study utilized computer technology to administer and collect data, this procedure may have produced several limitations. Web-based surveys limit responses to those participants who have access to a computer and the Internet, and any technical problems associated with the Internet server or computer may cause problems in the completion of the survey or submitting of responses.

Additionally, the response rate of this study is low at 6%. This may be due in part to the lack of continued solicitation of responses from participants by the researcher. Due to this limitation, the external validity of the study may be limited. Due to the homogenous demographics and limited number of respondents, results may not generalize to other contexts.

Another limitation of this research study is that the responses are self-reported by the participants. There are several disadvantages to self-report research studies. Heppner, Kivlighan, and Wampold (1999) included among the disadvantages: (a) biased responses, (b) unawareness of the characteristic being measured, and (c) that self-reports are less valued by other theoretical perspectives. Dillman (2000) reports further disadvantages relating to biased responses, suggesting that the following characteristics are predominant in survey participants: social desirability; question order effects; and primacy or regency effects.

In conjunction, Rosenthal and Rosnow (1975) report the following characteristics commonly found in volunteers, which may impact the results of a study: a) volunteers tend to be more unconventional than nonvolunteers; b) volunteers tend to be higher in need for social approval than nonvolunteers; c) volunteers tend to have higher social-class status than nonvolunteers; d) volunteers tend to be more sociable than nonvolunteers; and e) volunteers tend to be less authoritarian than nonvolunteers. These characteristics may impact the representativeness of the responses, and may not accurately reflect the views of the population.

Suggestions for Future Research

Additional research involving a larger sample of Counselor Educators may enhance a more representative sample, and future researchers are encouraged to expand the sampling population to include other databases, Counselor Education organizations, and counseling practitioners. It is also recommended that researchers broaden the categories used in this study to address a wider and more accurate representation of the population under study, including those in ethnicity and gender. Future investigations may include correlates and investigations of the relationships among attitude components and sets of sociodemographic (e.g. age, gender, educational level, profession), personality (e.g. anxiety, hostility, stress level, locus of control) and situational variables (e.g. social context, family dynamics).

The researcher used the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons (SADP; Antonak, 1981) to assess attitude on a unidimensional scale. Antonak and Livneh (1988) suggest that the convenience of the SADP, together with the available data on its validity, reliability, and structure, support the usefulness of the scale by researchers and

practitioners in rehabilitation and related fields. This scale, however, is a self-report measure and is therefore subject to social-desirability responses. Antonak and Livneh (2000) suggest that traditional overt and obtrusive methods used to measure targeted attitudes may interfere with responses when the attitude referent is socially sensitive and where conscious or unconscious mechanisms may impact those responses. Antonak and Livneh also suggest that, due to the lack of existing psychometrically sound instruments which are reliable, valid, and multidimensional, the investigation of attitudes towards persons with disabilities requires innovative experimental methods with such instruments. They suggest the following methods to explore this issue, but suggest no specific measurement scales: ranking, adjective checklist, paired comparisons, semantic differential scales, projective measures, and summated rating scales.

The low response rate may be indicative of a lack of interest in this issue among the invited participants or factors associated with the characteristics of the sample population. It may be appropriate for future studies to explore the depth of interest in this topic and associated issues among Counselor Educators, and to what extent their academic and professional training may have impacted their level of interest. It is also strongly recommended that future researchers attempt several contacts during the course of data collection to solicit responses from participants so that the response rate and external validity are increased. It should also be noted that respondents' reactions, products and manners of response are vulnerable to interpersonal variables (i.e. experimenter characteristics such as age, sex, race and appearance), variables inherent in the experimental situation (e.g. temperature, noise, room arrangement and decoration, methods of instruction and administration) and variables related to the respondent's

psychological (e.g. stress, motivation, response set, expectations) and physiological (e.g. medications, hunger, fatigue) attributes (Antonak & Livneh, 2000). The research recommends replication of the current study to establish reliability across circumstances.

It may be appropriate to explore to what extent this issue was included for exploration among diversity and multicultural topics in core training courses, which may serve to generate further ideas for inclusivity in training programs. Future researchers may include regional differences, specific training experiences, and organizational memberships into analysis in attempt to identify the impact of moderator or extraneous variables on the effect between the variables included in this study and attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Lastly, it is strongly suggested that future research combine factors to analyze multiple relationships between independent variables and attitudes. For example, Kelly (1984) found in a study of attitudes of student affairs professionals toward students with disabilities that female coordinators under age 40 had more positive attitudes than their older female counterparts, indicating more accepting attitudes toward persons with disabilities among females below the age of 40. Kelly's study examined age and gender simultaneously; the current study examined only simple relationships between the nine factors and attitude, but not interactions.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship of nine variables with attitudes of Counselor Educators toward persons with disabilities. The goal was to identify several potential variables that may influence attitudes. Nine variables were examined to test their relationship with attitude among the participants. The data from

this study supported two of the hypotheses, which stated that among Counselor Educators: a) there is a relationship between comfort with type of disability and attitude toward persons with disabilities, and b) there is a difference by knowledge of disability legislation and attitude toward persons with disabilities.

Because of the importance of diversity issues and educational curricula within accredited Counselor Education programs, it is necessary to assess the attitudes of Counselor Educators toward persons with disabilities as an essential part of this curricula. The results of this study heighten the awareness of factors which influence attitude among Counselor Educators, and generate directions for future research in the area of disability issues and attitudes. This study also contributes to better practices and improved services to this population by encouraging and aiding the development of comprehensive training curricula for counselors-in-training. The results of this study are expected to assist Counselor Educators, CACREP coordinators, student service and postsecondary educational personnel, students, and other stakeholders of the counseling profession.

References

- Amatea, E. S. (1989). *Brief strategic intervention for school problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *The diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed. rev.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (1993). *Position statement: Students with disabilities*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Public Law 101-336, 42 U.S.C., 12101-12132.
- Anderson, M. P. I. (1993). *Social support and barriers to higher education: Experience of students with physical disabilities*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta at Edmonton.
- Anderson, R. J., & Antonak, R. F. (1992). The influence of attitudes and contact on reactions to persons with physical and speech. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 35(4), 240-248.
- Antonak, R. F. (1980). Psychometric analysis of the Attitude Toward Disabled Persons Scale, Form-O. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 23, 169-176.
- Antonak, R. F. (1982). Development and psychometric analysis of the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, 13(2), 22-29.
- Antonak, R. F. (1985). Societal factors in disablement. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 28, 188-201.
- Antonak, R. F., & Livneh, H. (1988). *The measurement of attitudes toward people with disabilities*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Antonak, R. F., & Livneh, H. (2000). Measurement of attitudes towards persons with disabilities. *Disability & Rehabilitation*, 22(5), 211-224.
- Aksamit, D., Morris, M., & Leuenberger, J. (1987). Preparation of student services professionals and faculty for serving learning-disabled college students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28, 53-59.
- Baggett, D. (1994). *A study of faculty awareness of students with disabilities*. Washington, DC: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED369208.
- Bagnato, K. (2002, August 2). Disabled students must self-advocate. *Community College Week*, 16(26), 2, 12.

- Bailey, J. (1994). Do students with disabilities value college education? *Journal of College Student Development*, 35, 494-495.
- Barnes, S. G. (1994). *The interrelationships between self-esteem, utilization of support services, academic progress, and academic achievement for college students with disabilities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of the four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226-245.
- Beilke, J. R., & Yssel, N. (1998). Personalizing disability. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, 4(2), 212-223.
- Beilke, J. R., & Yssel, N. (1999). The chilly climate for students with disabilities in higher education. *College Student Journal*, 33 (3), 364-372.
- Benham, N. E. (1997). Faculty attitudes and knowledge regarding specific disabilities and the Americans with Disabilities Act. *College Student Journal*, 31(1), 124-129.
- Benham, P. K. (1988). Attitudes of occupational therapy personnel toward persons with disabilities. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 42(5), 305-311.
- Bento, R. (1996). Faculty decision-making about "reasonable accommodations" for disabled college students: Informational, ethical and attitudinal issues. *College Student Journal*. 30, 494-501.
- Beutler, L. E., Crago, M., & Arizmendi, T. G. (1986). Therapist variables in psychotherapy process and emotions. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (pp. 257-310). New York: John Wiley.
- Bishop, J. B., & Richards, R. F. (1984). Counselor theoretical orientation as related to intake judgment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31(3), 398-401.
- Blanchard, K. L. (2001). *Attitudes of employers toward people with disabilities: A comparison of Berlin, Germany and Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin at Stout.
- Bowman, O. J., & Marzouk, D. K. (1990). Using the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to empower university students with disabilities. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 46, 450-456.

- Brown, J. T. (1992). *Access to equity: The next step for women students with disabilities on the college campus*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Chenoweth, L., Pryor, J., Jeon, Y., & Hall-Pullin, L. (2004). Disability-specific preparation programme plays an important role in shaping students' attitudes towards disablement and patients with disabilities. *Learning in Health and Social Care* 3(2), 83-91.
- Choi, G., & Lam, C. S. (2001). Korean students' differential attitudes toward people with disabilities: An acculturation perspective. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*, 24, 79-81.
- Christenson, R. M., & Wilson, W. P. (1985). Assessing pathology in the separation-individuation process by means of an inventory: A preliminary report. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 173, 561-565.
- Chronology of the disability rights movements. (n.d.). Retrieved June 30, 2006, from <http://www.sfsu.edu/~hrdpu/chron.htm>
- Chubon, R. (1982). An analysis of research dealing with the attitudes of professionals toward disability. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 48(1), 25-30.
- Cobun, J. M. (1972). *Attitude changes in vocational rehabilitation counselors related to the physically disabled during induction training*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The American University.
- Cook, D., Kunce, J., & Getsinger, S. (1976). Perceptions of the disabled and counseling effectiveness. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 19, 470-475.
- Cook, J., Yamaguchi, J., & Solomon, M. (1993). Field-testing a postsecondary faculty in-service training for working with students who have psychiatric disabilities. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, 17(3), 157-169.
- Corey, G. (1996). *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Corrigan, M. J. (1998). Counseling college students with disabilities: Legal, ethical, and clinical issues. *Journal of College Counseling*, 1, 181-189.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Deshler, D. D., Ellis, E. S., & Lenz, B. K. (1996). *Teaching adolescents with mild disabilities*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.

- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. (2nd ed.). New York: J. Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Duval, R. J. (1982). Psychological theories of physical disability: New perspectives. In M. G. Eisenberg, C. Griggins, & R. J. Duval (Eds.), *Disabled people as second-class citizens* (pp. 173-192). New York: Springer.
- Eberhardt, K., & Mayberry, W. (1995). Factors influencing entry-level occupational therapists' attitudes toward persons with disabilities. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 49(7), 629-36.
- Elacqua, T. (1996). *Perceptions of classroom accommodations among college students with disabilities*. Washington, DC: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED400640.
- Ellis, A. (1973). *Humanistic psychotherapy: The Rational-Emotive approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- English, K. M. (1993). *The role of support services in the integration and retention of college students who are hearing-impaired*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School and San Diego State University.
- Enright, M. S., Conyers, L. M., & Szymanski, E. M. (1996). Career and career-related educational concerns of college students with disabilities. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 75(2), p. 103-115.
- Evans, J. H. (1976). Changing attitudes toward disabled persons: An experimental study. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 19, 572-579.
- Fairweather, J. S., & Shaver, D. M. (1991). Making the transition to postsecondary education and training. *Exceptional Children*, 57, 264-70.
- Farbman, A. H. (1983). *Case studies of university science faculty: Experiences with students with disabilities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University.
- Farrell, M., & Harckham, L. (1988). Attitude of college personnel toward learning disabled college students. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 6(4), 7-13.
- Fenton, T. L. (1974). *The effects of inservice training on elementary classroom teachers' attitudes toward and knowledge about handicapped children*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.

- Fichten, C. S. (1988). Students with physical disabilities in higher education: Attitudes and beliefs that affect integration. In H. E. Yuker (Ed.), *Attitudes toward disabled persons* (pp. 171-186). New York: Springer.
- Fichten, C. S., Amsel, R., Bourdon, C. V., & Creti, L. (1988). Interaction between college students with a physical disability and their professors. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 19*, 13-21.
- Fichten, C., Bourdon, C., Amsel, R., & Fox, L. (1987). Validation of the College Interaction Self-Efficacy Questionnaire: Students with and without disabilities. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*(5), 449-458.
- Fichten, C. S., & Goodrick, G. (1990). Getting along in college: Recommendations for college students with disabilities and their professors. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 34*(2), 103-126.
- Fier, T. D. (1999). *Vocational rehabilitation counselors in the state of Wisconsin: Their theoretical orientation, the types of therapeutic intervention they purchase, and the usage and value of these techniques*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin at Stout.
- Finkelstein, V. (1980). Attitudes and disabled people: Issues for discussion. In V. Finkelstein (Ed.), *Attitudes and disabled people*, (pp. 1-42). New York: World Rehabilitation Fund.
- Fonosch, G. G., & Schwab, L. O. (1981). Attitudes of selected university faculty members toward disabled students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 22*, 229-235.
- Frye, H. N. (2005). How elementary school counselors can meet the needs of students with disabilities. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(5), 442-450.
- Garcia, J. G., Krankowski, T., & Jones, L. L. (1998). Collaborative interventions for assisting students with acquired brain injuries in school. *Professional School Counseling, 2*, 33-39.
- Gartin, B. C., Rumrill, P., & Serebrini, R. (1996). The higher education transition model: Guidelines for facilitating college transition among college-bound students with disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 29*(1), 30-40.
- Gearheart, B., Gearheart, C., & Weishahn, M. (1996). *The exceptional student in the regular classroom* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Simon & Schuster Company.
- Gilbride, D. D. (1993). Parental attitudes toward their child with a disability: Implications for rehabilitation counselors. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 36*(3), 139-150.

- Glasser, W. (1965). *Reality therapy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Glasser, W. (1984). Reality therapy. In R. J. Corsini (Ed.), *Current psychotherapies* (3rd ed., pp. 320-353). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.
- Glasser, W. (1985). *Control theory: A new explanation of how we control our lives*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Glover-Graf, N. M., & Janikowski, T. P. (2001). Career selection and use of accommodations by students with disabilities in rehabilitation education programs. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 44*(4), 222-229.
- Goor, M. B., McKnab, P. A., & Davison-Aviles, R. (1995). Counseling individuals with learning disabilities. In A. F. Rotatori, J. O. Schween, & F. W. Litton (Eds.), *Advances in special education: Counseling in special populations: Research and practice perspectives* (Vol. 9, pp. 98-118). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Grigsby, D. A. (1990). Dialogue: Cross cultural counseling for exceptional individuals and their families. *National Forum of Special Education Journal, 1*, 67-69.
- Harasymiw, S. J., & Home, M.D. (1975). Integration of handicapped children: Its effect on teacher attitudes. *Education, 96*, 153-158.
- Hart, R. D., & Williams, D. E. (1995). Able-bodied instructors and students with physical disabilities: A relationship handicapped by communication. *Communication Education, 44*, 140-154.
- Hebel, S. (2001a). How a landmark anti-bias law changed life for disabled students. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 47* (20), 23-26.
- Hebel, S. (2001b). Who pays the costs to help students with disabilities? *Chronicle of Higher Education, 47*(43), 19-21.
- Henderson, C. (1992). *College freshmen with disabilities*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. Retrieved February 17, 2005, from <http://www.heath.gwu.edu/PDFs/collegefreshmen.pdf>
- Henderson, K. (1995). *College freshmen with disabilities: A triennial statistical profile*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and HEATH Resource Center. Retrieved February 17, 2005, from <http://www.heath.gwu.edu/PDFs/collegefreshmen.pdf>
- Hersh, A., Carlson, R. W., & Lossmo, D. A. (1975). Normalized interaction with families of the mentally retarded. *Mental Retardation, 15*, 32-33.

- Hill, J. L. (1996). Speaking out: Perceptions of students with disabilities regarding adequacy of services and willingness of faculty to make accommodations. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 12*(1), 22-43.
- Hirschhorn, B. E. (1992). *The relationship among school accessibility, student locus of control and the satisfaction of New York City high school wheelchair users*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Hitchings, W. E., Luzzo, D. A., Ristow, R., Horvath, M., Retish, P., & Tanners, A. (2001). The career development needs of college students with learning disabilities: In their own words. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 16*(1), 8-17.
- Hoffman, J. A. (1984). Psychological separation of late adolescents from their parents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 170-178.
- Hoffman, J. A., & Weiss, B. (1987). Family dynamics and presenting problems in college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*, 157-163.
- Holmes, G., & Karst, R. (1990). The institutionalization of disability myths: Impact on vocational rehabilitation services. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 56*(1), 20-27.
- Houck, C. K., Asselin, S. B., Troutman, G. C., & Arrington, J. M. (1992). Students with learning disabilities in the university environment: A study of faculty and student perceptions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 25* (10), 678-684.
- Jarrow, J. (1993). Beyond ramps: New ways of viewing access. *New Directions for Student Services, 64*, 5-16.
- Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. (1958). Some factors in self-disclosure. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56*, 91-98.
- Jordan, J. E., & Friesen, E. W. (1968). Attitudes of rehabilitation personnel toward physically disabled persons in Columbia, Peru, and the United States. *Journal of Social Psychology, 74*, 151-156.
- Junco, R. (2002). *Assessing an online training program's ability to change attitudes towards students with disabilities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.
- Katz, I., Hass, R. G., & Bailey, J. (1988). Attitudinal ambivalence and behavior toward people with disabilities. In H. E. Yuker (Ed.), *Attitudes toward persons with disabilities* (pp. 47-57). New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Kelly, B. A. (1984). Attitudes toward disabled persons of selected collegiate coordinators for disabled students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(3), 255-259.

- Kidsource Online, Inc. (1997, June 15). *Overview of ADA, IDEA, and Section 504*. Retrieved March 20, 2005, from <http://www.kidsource.com/kidsource/content3/ada.idea.html#credits>
- Kiernan, W. E. (1974). *Attitude change in beginning education students resulting from exposure to the vocational and social capabilities of the disabled adult*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston College.
- Kirk, R. E. (1995). *Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Kleinsasser, C. L. (1999). *College faculty's and staff's attitude and knowledge concerning learning disabilities: Implications for staff development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota.
- Korinek, L., & Prillaman, D. (1992). Counselors and exceptional students: Preparation versus practice. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 32*, 3-11.
- Krauft, C., Rubin, S., Cook, D., & Bozarth, J. (1976). Counselor attitudes toward disabled persons and client program completion: A pilot study. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 7*, 50-54.
- Kuhn, J. A. (1971). Comparison of teachers' attitudes toward blindness and exposure to blind children. *The New Outlook for the Blind, 65*, 337-340.
- LaPlante, M. E. (1992). *How many Americans have a disability?* Disability Statistics Abstract, 5.
- Lazar, A. L., Orpet, R., & Demos, G. (1976). The impact of class instruction on changing student attitudes. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 1976, 20*, 66-68.
- LeMay, M. L. (1968). Counselor candidates' attitudes and opinions about mental illness. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 8*, 51-54.
- Lewis, M. L. (1998). *Faculty attitudes toward persons with disabilities and faculty attitudes toward to accommodate students with learning disabilities in the classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University.
- Leyser, Y. (1989). A survey of faculty attitudes and accommodations for students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 7* (3&4), 97-108.
- Leyser, Y., Vogel, S., Wyland, S., & Brulle, A. (1998). Faculty attitudes and practices regarding students with disabilities: Two decades after implementation of Section 504. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 13*(3), 5-19.

- Livneh, H. (1982). On the origins of negative attitudes toward people with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Literature*, 43(11, 12), 338-347.
- Livneh, H., & Sherwood, A. (1991). Application of personality theories and counseling strategies to clients with physical disabilities. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 69(6), 525-539.
- Loewen, G. (1993). Improving access to post-secondary education. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, 17(1), 151-155.
- Lynch, R. T., & Gussel, L. (1996). Disclosure and self-advocacy regarding disability-related needs: Strategies to maximize integration in postsecondary education. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 74(4), 352-357.
- Martinez, M. (1977). *An examination of the effects of three conditions on components of attitudes of student teachers toward selected types of disability*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Menninger, K. A. (1953). Psychiatric aspects of physical disability. In J. F. Garrett (Ed.), *Psychological aspects of physical disability* (pp. 8-17). Washington, DC: Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Merriam-Webster's Medical Desk Dictionary*. (1986). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Milsom, A. S. (2002). Students with disabilities: School counselor involvement and preparation. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(5), 331-339.
- Minner, S., & Prater, G. (1984). College teachers' expectations of LD students. *Academic Therapy*, 20, 225-229.
- Morris, M., Lauenberger, J., & Aksamit, D. (1987). Faculty inservice training: Impact on the postsecondary climate for learning disabled students. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 5(2), 58-66.
- Morton, L. A. (1977). *Effecting attitudinal change toward physical disabled students in higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Mowbray, C. T., & Megivern, D. (1999). Higher education and rehabilitation for people with psychiatric disabilities. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 65(4), 31-39.
- Nathanson, R. (1982). *Faculty attitudes and behaviors toward physically disabled students: An exploratory/descriptive study with proposals for faculty development programming*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College.

- National Center for Education Statistics (1999). *Students with disabilities in postsecondary education: A profile of preparation, participation, and outcomes*. NCES 1999-187, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Newman, I., & Newman, C. (1994). *Conceptual statistics for beginners* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Newman, J. (1976). Faculty attitudes toward handicapped students. *Rehabilitation Literature*, 37, 194-197.
- Norton, S. M. (1997). Examination accommodations for community college students with learning disabilities: How are they viewed by faculty and students? *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 21 (1), p. 57-70.
- Nutter, K. J., & Ringgenberg, L. J. (1993). Creating positive outcomes for students with disabilities. *New Directions for Student Services*, 64, 45-58.
- Ostby, S. S. (1985). A Rational-Emotive perspective. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, 16(3), 30-33.
- Palmer, G., Redinius, P., & Tervo, R. C. (2000). An examination of attitudes toward disabilities among college students: Rural and urban differences. *Journal of Rural Community Psychology*, E3(1), 2000.
- Palmerton, K. E. & Frumkin, R. M. (1969a). College counselor knowledge about and attitudes toward disabled persons. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 28, 657-658.
- Palmerton, K. E. & Frumkin R. M. (1969b). Contact with disabled persons and intensity of counselors' attitudes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 28, 434.
- Paris, M. J. (1993). Attitudes of medical students and health-care professionals toward people with disabilities. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 74(8), 818-825.
- Parish, T. S., Eads, G. M., Reece, N. H., & Piscitello, M.A. Assessment and attempted modification of future teachers' attitudes toward handicapped children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 44, 540-542.
- Paul, S. (2000). Students with disabilities in higher education: A review of the literature. *College Student Journal*, 34 (2), 200-211.
- Perls, F., Hefferline, R. F., & Goodman, P. (1951). *Gestalt therapy*. New York: Julian Press.
- Profile of CORE-Accredited RCE Programs. (1999, November). *CORE NEWS*, 11(1), 2-3.

- Quick, D., Lehmann, J., & Deniston, T. (2003). Opening doors for students with disabilities on community college campuses: What have we learned? What do we still need to know? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 27, 815-827.
- Rao, S. (2004). Faculty attitudes and students with disabilities in higher education: A literature review. *College Student Journal*, 38(2), 191-199.
- Rauscher, L., & McClintock, M. (1997). Ableism curriculum design. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 198-225). New York: Routledge.
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Public Law 93-112, title V, Sec. 504, 29 U.S.C., 794.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1975). *The volunteer subject*. New York: Wiley.
- Rothstein, L. (2003). Disabilities and higher education: A crystal ball? *Change*, 35 (3), 38-40.
- Rule, W. R. (1987) Acceptance and adjustment to disability: An Adlerian orientation. In G. L. Gandy, E. D. Mertin, R. E. Hardy, & J. G. Cull (Eds.), *Rehabilitation counseling and services: Profession and process* (pp. 219-233). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Sadlick, M., & Penta, F. B. (1975). Changing nurse attitudes toward quadriplegics through use of television. *Rehabilitation Literature*, 36, 274-278.
- Satcher, J. (1992). College students with learning disabilities: Meeting the challenge. *College and University*, 67(2), 127-132.
- Schoen, E., Uysal, M., & McDonald, C. D. (1987). Attitudes of faculty members toward treatment of disabled students reexamined. *College Student Journal*, 21, 190-193.
- Schofield, L. F., & Kunce, J. (1971). Client disability and counselor behavior. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 14(3), 158-165.
- Schriner, K., & Scotch, R. K. (2001). Disability and institutional change. [Electronic version]. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 12(2), 100.
- Seligman, L. (2001). *Systems, strategies, and skills of counseling and psychotherapy*. Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Shaw, S. F., & Gillung, T. B. (1975). Efficacy of a college course for regular class teachers of (he mildly handicapped. *Mental Retardation*, 13, 3-6.

- Shotel, J. R., Lano, R. P., & McGettigan, J. F. (1972). Teacher attitudes associated with the integration of handicapped children. *Exceptional Children*, 38, 677-683.
- Singh, D. K. (2003). Students with disabilities and higher education. *College Student Journal*, 37 (3), 367-375.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and human behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Smith, E. C., Polloway, E. A., Patton, J. R., & Dowdy, C. A. (1998). *Teaching students with special needs in inclusive settings* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Stodden, R. A., & Dowrick, P. W. (1999, 2000). Postsecondary education and employment of adults with disabilities. *American Rehabilitation*, 25 (4), 19-24.
- Strohmer, D. C., Grand, S. A., & Purcell, M. J. (1984). Attitudes toward persons with a disability: An examination of demographic factors, social context, and specific disability. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 29, 131-145.
- Strohmer, D. C., & Pellerin, M. F. (1995). Rehabilitation counselor hypothesis testing: The role of negative information, client disability, and counselor experience. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 39(2), 82-94.
- Tervo, R. C., Palmer, G., & Redinius, P. (2004). Health professional student attitudes towards people with disability. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 18(8), 908-915.
- Thams, G. M. (1975). *The effects of a professional development seminar on the attitudes, knowledge, and behavioral strategies of counselors toward handicapped students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University.
- Thomas, S. B. (2000). College students and disability law. *Journal of Special Education*, 33, 248-257.
- Thompson, A., Bethea, L., & Turner, J. (1997). Faculty knowledge of disability laws in higher education: A survey. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 40(3), 166-180.
- Thompson, R., & Littrell, J. M. (1998). Brief counseling for students with learning disabilities. *Professional School Counseling*, 2, 60-68.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *Postsecondary students with disabilities: Enrollment, services, and persistence* (NCES Publication No. 2000-092). Jessup, MD: Education Publications Center.
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2004). *Instructions to Federal agencies for EEO MD-715 Section II barrier identification and elimination*. Retrieved March 20, 2005, from <http://www.eeoc.gov/federal/715instruct/section2.html>

- Vasek, D. (2005). Assessing the knowledge base of faculty at a private, four-year institution. *College Student Journal, 39*(2), 307-315.
- Vogel, S. A., Leyser, Y., Wyland, S., & Brulle, A. (1999). Students with learning disabilities in higher education: Faculty attitude and practices. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 14* (3), 173-186.
- Warren, S. A., Turner, D. R., & Brody, D. S. (1964). Can education students' attitudes be changed? *Mental Retardation, 2*, 235-241.
- West, M., Kregel, J., Getzel, E. E., Zhu, M., Ipsen, S. M., & Martin, E. D. (1993). Beyond Section 504: Satisfaction and empowerment of students with disabilities in higher education. *Exceptional Children, 59*, 456-467.
- White, M. J., & Olson, R. S. (1998). Attitudes toward people with disabilities: A comparison of rehabilitation nurses, occupational therapists, and physical therapists. *Rehabilitation Nursing, 23*(3), 126-131.
- Williams, W. C., & Lair, G. S. (1991). Using a person-centered approach with children who have a disability. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 25*, 194-204.
- Williamson, P. T. (2000). *Attitudes of the Troy State University Dothan faculty toward students with disabilities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University.
- Wilson, D. L. (1992). New federal regulations on rights of the handicapped may force colleges to provide access to technology. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 38*, A1, A21.
- Wilson, E. D., & Alcorn, D. (1969). Disability simulation and development of attitudes toward the exceptional. *Journal of Special Education, 3*, 303-307.
- World Health Organization. (1995). *UNESCO, world education report*. Retrieved on March 20, 2005, from http://w3.who.sea.org/health_situt_94-97/pdfs/definitions.pdf
- Yuker, H. E. (1988). The effects of contact on attitudes toward disabled persons: Some empirical generalizations. In H. E. Yuker (Ed.), *Attitudes toward persons with disabilities* (pp. 262-274). New York: Springer.
- Zascavage, V. T., & Keefe, C. H. (2004). Students with severe speech and physical impairments: Opportunity barriers to literacy. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 19* (4), 223-234.

Zukerman, R. A. (1975). *Changes in knowledge and attitudes as a result of participation in a teacher education game on the labeling of handicapped children*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

APPENDIX A

SADP - Form R Personal Information Form
--

Age: Under 30
 30—39
 40—49
 50—59
 60+

Gender: Male Female

Ethnicity: White American Biracial
 African American Asian American
 Latin American

Primary Theoretical Orientation:

Psychodynamic REBT Systems
 Adlerian Person-Centered Reality
 Gestalt Cognitive Behavioral

Years Practicing as a Counselor Educator:

0 Months to 1 Year 6 to 10 years
 1 to 2 Years 11 to 15 Years
 3 to 5 Years 16 Years or more

Primary Counseling Discipline/Specialty:

Career MFT Community Rehabilitation
 School College Gerontological

The ADA (1990) definition of a person with a disability refers to “someone with a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities”. A person is considered to be a person with a disability if he or she: a) has a disability as documented by a physician; b) has a record of the disability; or c) is regarded as having the disability.

Please rate the frequency of your contact with a student(s) with a disability as identified by the ADA (1990):

None	Yearly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
1	2	3	4	5

Please rate your level of knowledge of disability legislation:

None = No knowledge

Little = I know legislation exists, but I have no familiarity with it

Some = Have some familiarity, but don't know specifics

A lot = I have had trainings/courses on this topic and am familiar with most specifics

Expert = I could provide trainings on this topic based on my extensive knowledge of legislative specifics

None	Little	Some	Alot	Expert
1	2	3	4	5

The ADA (1990) defines the following disabilities:

Mobility Impairment – A condition limiting physical ability; generally considered to include lack of a limb or loss of limb use due to disease, amputation, paralysis, injury, or developmental condition; or limitation of movement due to cardiovascular or other disease

Auditory Impairment – A condition causing partial or total deafness

Visual impairment - Loss or partial loss of vision

Learning Impairment – Limitation of the ability to perceive, recognize, understand, interpret, and/or respond to information.

Psychiatric Impairment – Individuals with psychiatric diagnoses such as major depression, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia may be covered, depending on how the condition affects their functioning. Individuals with other psychiatric conditions (such as anxiety, personality, dissociative, or post-traumatic stress disorders) may also be included in the ADA definition.

Please rate your comfort level with the following types of disabilities:

Mobility:

Completely Uncomfortable	Mostly Uncomfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Mostly Comfortable	Completely Comfortable
1	2	3	4	5

Auditory:				
Completely Uncomfortable	Mostly Uncomfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Mostly Comfortable	Completely Comfortable
1	2	3	4	5
Visual:				
Completely Uncomfortable	Mostly Uncomfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Mostly Comfortable	Completely Comfortable
1	2	3	4	5
Learning:				
Completely Uncomfortable	Mostly Uncomfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Mostly Comfortable	Completely Comfortable
1	2	3	4	5
Psychiatric:				
Completely Uncomfortable	Mostly Uncomfortable	Somewhat Comfortable	Mostly Comfortable	Completely Comfortable
1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Dear Counselor Educator,

My name AdriAnne L. Johnson and I am a Doctoral Candidate in the Counselor Education Program at the University of Arkansas. I would like to invite you to voluntarily participate in my dissertation research study: ATTITUDES OF COUNSELOR EDUCATORS TOWARD STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. The purpose of the study is to provide useful and relevant information for Counselor Educators regarding how to better address the needs of students with various types of disabilities in Counselor Education training programs, thereby increasing the likelihood of success of these professionals-in-training.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary and your responses will be kept strictly confidential. This Internet-based study allows participants to complete the survey in approximately 10 minutes. This study may guide Counselor Education programs to design courses, enhance recruitment strategies, and enrich academic experiences. Additionally, you may request that a personal confidential report of your results be sent to you.

The principal investigator, AdriAnne L. Johnson, will answer any further questions about this research at any time. If you would like to participate, click onto the direct link provided below to complete the survey. By entering into the site, it will serve as an informed consent to participate in this research study. As Counselor Educators, I understand your time is extremely valuable. Thank you for your time and support for dissertation research. This study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Arkansas.

<http://comp.uark.edu/~ajohnso/>

Sincerely,

AdriAnne L. Johnson, M.S., NCC, LAC
Ph.D. Candidate, Counselor Education
University of Arkansas
479/935-8560
ajohnso@uark.edu

Appendix C

INFORMED CONSENT

Title: Attitudes of Counselor Educators Toward Students with Disabilities

Investigator(s): AdriAnne L. Johnson, M.S., NCC, LAC, Doctoral Candidate
Roy C. Farley, Ed.D., Faculty Advisor
University of Arkansas
Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling & Foundations
Counselor Education Program
234 Graduate Education Building
Fayetteville, AR 72701
(479) 935-8560 ajohnso@uark.edu

Description: The present study will investigate the relationship between various factors and attitudes of Counselor Educators toward students with disabilities. You are asked to complete a survey that is designed to measure general attitudes toward persons with disabilities. This dissertation research is concerned with identifying attitudes and influential factors on those attitudes in Counselor Educators in various disciplines. It is the researcher's intention that this study will contribute to the existing educational literature about students with disabilities in Higher Education. The results of this study will assist with information for counselor education programs, governing institutions, and universities.

Risks and Benefits: The benefits of this study include a contribution to the knowledge base for understanding the attitudes and attitudinal barriers toward students with disabilities. There are no anticipated risks to participating in the study.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You reserve the right to refuse and decline participation in this research at any time.

Confidentiality: All information including all results pertaining to this study will be recorded anonymously and will be reviewed, stored, and analyzed in strict confidence. Only the researcher will have access to the results of the survey and will be used only for the purposes of this study. Results from this survey will be reported as summative data.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked complete the survey which will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. You are free to complete it any time between October 1 and 31, 2006. If you have any questions concerning this study, you may contact AdriAnne L. Johnson at (479) 935-8560 or at ajohnso@uark.edu. You may also contact the Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, Rosemary Ruff at (479) 575-3845. or rruff@uark.edu.

The researcher greatly appreciates your participation and support for this dissertation research. By clicking on to the survey link below, you are indicating that you have read and understood these terms and that you are employed as a Counselor Educator in a CACREP accredited counselor education program.

<http://comp.uark.edu/~ajohnso/>

Appendix D

September 18, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: AdriAnne L. Johnson
Primary Investigator
Dr. Roy Farley
Faculty Advisor

FROM: Rosemary Ruff
Director, Research Support and Sponsored Programs

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #: 06-09-088

Protocol Title: *Attitudes of Counselor Educators Toward Students with Disabilities*

Review Type: EXEMPT EXPEDITED FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 09/14/2006 Expiration Date: 09/13/2007

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Administrator or on the Compliance website (<http://www.uark.edu/admin/rsspinfo/compliance/human-subjects/index.html>). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol, you must seek approval *prior* to implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact Rosemary Ruff, Director, Research Support and Sponsored Programs, IRB Coordinator, 120 Ozark Hall, 5-2105.

Appendix E



UNIVERSITY of
 MASSACHUSETTS BOSTON
 100 Morrissey Blvd.
 Boston, MA 02125-3393

Office of the
 Vice Provost for Research
 617.287.5600
 Fax: 617.287.5616

Dear Inquirer:

Thank you for your inquiry about the *Scale of Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons*. I have enclosed with this letter a copy of the most recent version of the *SADP* in two formats and a scoring key for your use.

You may reproduce the *SADP* in any form that suits your research needs. The only requirement that I have for the use of the instrument is that you ascribe authorship to me somewhere on the instrument and acknowledge me as the author of the instrument, using one of the citations below, in any publication that may arise from your use of it.

Good luck with your research. Please call or write if I can assist you further.

Very truly yours,

s/Richard F. Antonak

Vice Provost for Research

RFA/hs

Appropriate citations:

Antonak, R. F. (1982). Development and psychometric analysis of the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 13(2), 22-29.

Antonak, R. F. (1985). Construct validation of the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 16(1), 7-10, 48.

Antonak, R. F., & Livneh, H. (1988). The measurement of attitudes toward people with disabilities: Methods, psychometrics, and scales. Springfield, IL: C C Thomas.

Mail Calendar more »

adriennejohnson@gmail.com | Settings | Help | Sign out

Search Mail

Search the Web

Show search and
Create a filter

antonak

is Mail

Dissertation Help - affordable-dissertation-writing.com - Custom Written Dissertations

« Back to Search results

Report Spam

Delete

More actions...

« Newer 3 of

New window
Print
Expand all
Turn on hi

Use of ATDS in Dissertation Research Inbox

Adrienne L. Johnson <ajohnso@ua> May 29

Richard F. Antonak <Richard.Antonak> May 31

☆ AdriAnne Johnson to Rich More options Jun 16

Dr. Antonak,

Thank you sincerely for granting me permission to utilize the ATDS in my dissertation research! Upon further refining of my material, I have found that your Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons (SADP) would be more appropriate for my topic. May I have your permission to utilize that instrument instead?

Thank you so very much!

AdriAnne Johnson
- Show quoted text -

AdriAnne L. Johnson, M.S., NCC, LAC
Doctoral Candidate, University of Arkansas
Mental Health Provider, NW Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72702

Reply Forward

☆ Richard F. Antonak <Richard.Antonak> More options Jun 18

AdriAnne,

I am attaching the SADP together with a scoring key and a letter granting permission to use the instrument in your research. Best wishes for success.

Richard

—Original Message—

Sponsored

Emergency Sta
Dissertation - C
The Right Stat -
www.dreamstar

Original Dissar
Premier disserta
Money back & s
www.MasterPap

Free List of Bai
Our free list has
pay you cash to
www.FreeToJoi

more sponsors

Related

Online Ethics C
Not To Control
Cases and com
from a series of
onlineethics.org

About

Q1

Contacts

add, or invite

ine Johnson
atus here ▾

-L

Edit labels

Show all

friend

all to:

100 list
ite

