

**IMPLICIT ATTITUDES TOWARDS PEOPLE
WITH DISABILITIES**

ENGELLİLERE YÖNELİK ÖRTÜK TUTUMLAR

Kübra EFENDİOĞLU¹, Elif Emir ÖKSÜZ²

03

IMPLICIT ATTITUDES TOWARDS PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

ENGELLİLERE YÖNELİK ÖRTÜK TUTUMLAR

Kübra EFENDİOĞLU¹, Elif Emir ÖKSÜZ²

ABSTRACT

People with disabilities (PWDs), one of the important minority groups, are exposed to certain attitudes and prejudices causing some problems in social life. Therefore, it is important to examine the causes and consequences of prejudices and attitudes toward PWDs. Our attitudes determine how we evaluate events or people. Our ideas and behaviors about a group or person are also affected by our explicit and implicit attitudes. People have different attitudes and behaviors, either negative or positive. PWDs are considered dependent, needy, incompetent, trustworthy or innocent. They can be perceived in different ways and exposed to both positive/negative attitudes and labeling. Prejudices toward PWDs are generally not shown explicitly due to social approval, but they exist implicitly and still affect the lives of the disabled through negative behaviors they cause. Implicit biases toward PWDs, caused by existential or evolutionary factors, are often not consciously noticed. Implicit biases that are not noticed cannot be intervened and intervention strategies cannot be developed. Hereby, this review aims to examine the attitudes and prejudices toward PWDs within the scope of explicit and implicit processes and to discuss the differences between explicit and implicit prejudices as well as the social-psychological effects of implicit prejudices and different ways to measure them.

ÖZ

Önemli azınlık gruplardan biri olan engelliler, günlük yaşamlarında problemlere neden olabilen bazı olumsuz tutumlara ve önyargılara maruz kalmaktadır. Bu nedenle engellilere yönelik önyargı ve tutumların sebeplerinin ve yarattığı sonuçların incelenmesi önemli görülmektedir. Tutumlarımız olayları veya insanları nasıl değerlendirdiğimizi belirlemektedir. Bir grup veya kişi hakkındaki fikirlerimiz ve davranışlarımız da bizim açık ve örtük tutumlarımız tarafından etkilenmektedir. Kişiler negatif veya pozitif olmak üzere farklı tutum ve davranışlara sahiptirler. Engelliler toplum tarafından bağımlı, ihtiyaç sahibi, yetersiz, çalışkan, güvenilir veya masum olarak farklı şekillerde algılanabilmekte, olumlu ve olumsuz tutum ve etiketlenmelere maruz kalabilmektedirler. Engellilere yönelik önyargılar sosyal kabul edilebilirlikten de etkilendiği için genel olarak açık bir şekilde gösterilmemekte ancak örtük bir şekilde var olmakta ve engellilerin hayatını etkileyen bazı olumsuz davranışlara neden olabilmektedir. Varoluşsal veya evrimsel faktörler nedeni ile oluşan engellilere yönelik örtük önyargılar genellikle bilinçli olarak fark edilememektedir. Fark edilemeyen örtük önyargılara müdahale edilememekte, değiştirilmesi için stratejiler geliştirilememektedir. Bu sebeple bu gözden geçirme çalışmasında, engellilere yönelik tutum ve önyargıların açık ve örtük süreçler kapsamında incelenmesi, açık ve örtük önyargılar arasındaki farkların ve örtük tutum ve önyargıların yarattığı psikososyal etkilerin tartışılması ve örtük önyargıları ölçme yöntemlerinin ele alınması amaçlanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler:
Engelli Bireyler, Tutum,
Önyargı, Örtük Tutum,
Açık Tutum.

Keywords:
People with
Disabilities, Attitude,
Bias, Implicit Attitude,
Explicit Attitude.

¹ Araştırma Görevlisi, Kilis 7
Aralık Üniversitesi, İnsan ve
Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi,
Psikoloji, Kilis-Türkiye, kbra.
efendioğlu@hotmail.com,
ORCID: 0000-0002-5099-
5654

² Doktor Öğretim Üyesi, Ankara
Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi,
İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri
Fakültesi, Psikoloji, Ankara-
Türkiye, elifemiroksuz@gmail.
com, ORCID: 0000-0001-8399-
1628

Alıntılanmak için/Cite as:
Efendioğlu K. ve Emir
Öksüz E. (2024). Implicit
attitudes towards people
with disabilities, Çukurova
Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler
Enstitüsü Dergisi, 33 (1), 31-46.

INTRODUCTION

Prejudices targeting marginalized groups based on factors such as ethnic or racial origin, gender, or ability give rise to significant societal issues, leading to social exclusion and discrimination across various segments (Altman, 1981; Bastian et al., 2012; Thalhammer et al., 2001). Within this complex landscape, People with Disabilities (PWDs) emerge as one of the largest minority groups, facing the brunt of negative attitudes (Nario-Redmond, 2019). The global scale of this challenge is immense, with over 1 billion PWDs, constituting 15% of the world's population (World Health Organization- WHO, 2020). On a more localized level, Türkiye is home to almost 5 million PWDs, comprising 6% of the country's population (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu- TÜİK, 2015). Education, employment, access to health, public services, transportation, and participation in social and cultural activities constitute domains where PWDs often confront social exclusion and discrimination (Balçı, 2019; Banks et al., 2018). Despite extensive legislative efforts at both national and international levels and the optimistic discourse emanating from the public and policymakers in support of individuals with disabilities, persistent challenges endure.

In an attempt to elucidate the reasons behind the apparent discrepancy between spoken intentions and actual actions, the dual-process framework is introduced. This framework posits the presence of two discernible processes that shape human cognition and decision-making, offering insights into cognitive biases and judgment errors. Implicit and explicit attitudes and biases towards people with disabilities find their conceptualization within this framework. While studies on attitudes towards PWDs often focus on explicit attitudes, it becomes evident that individuals' actions are significantly influenced by implicit attitudes and prejudices (Wilson & Scior, 2014). Negative implicit attitudes can result in harmful behavioral, verbal, or emotional responses, contributing to societal perceptions that label PWDs as incapable, needy, or dependent (Antonak & Livneh, 2000; Karaca & Nam, 2021). These negative implicit attitudes significantly contribute to the challenges faced by PWDs across the mentioned domains.

Recognizing disability as a human rights issue becomes

paramount, prompting a critical analysis of discriminatory behaviors and negative attitudes from this broader perspective. Therefore, the primary objective of this article is to introduce the nuanced concept of implicit attitudes, delve into their profound impact on the lives of PWDs, and discuss methods for measuring implicit attitudes. In addition, our secondary aim emphasizes the critical need for tools to measure implicit attitudes specifically related to disability in the Turkish context and advocates for further research in this area

Explicit and Implicit Attitudes

What people think of others and how they adjust their behavior accordingly have been an important study area of the field of social psychology (Myers, 2022). A person's perception and evaluation in favor of or against another person, object or group is called attitude (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). When the attitude is negative, it is referred to as prejudice (Stangor, 2009). Attitudes influence what people pay attention to, how they perceive events, things, other people, and groups, and what they remember about them. So, we presume that attitudes shape decisions and behaviors (Glock & Kovacs, 2013; Maio et al., 2018). Nevertheless, the attitude and behavior relationship is not that straightforward. In some instances, expressed attitudes and behaviors may be even contradicting due to several mediating factors (Myers, 2022).

In order to uncover the intricate relationship of attitude and behavior, scholars have focused on discerning explicit and implicit attitudes and their predictive power on both spontaneous and deliberate behaviors (Maio et al., 2018). Explicit attitudes involve conscious processes that can be expressed verbally or behaviorally, while implicit attitudes are shaped by unconscious processes and might not find expression in verbal or behavioral forms (Dovidio et al., 2011). Explicit attitudes are controllable and typically reported verbally, leading to deliberate behaviors (Dovidio et al., 2011; Dovidio & Fiske, 2012). In contrast, implicit attitudes, operating outside conscious awareness, are unintentionally activated and linked to spontaneous behaviors like nonverbal actions (Dovidio et al., 1997; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995).

Research has indicated a weak correlation between implicit and explicit attitudes (Markova et al., 2015; Fazio & Olson, 2003), and this distinction is encapsulated within the dual process framework. This framework has been employed to explore the disparities between positive discourses and, in some instances, negative actions directed at PWDs, a group towards which society generally disapproves expressing negative attitudes (Crandall et al., 2002; Nosek, 2007). Notably, our explicit and implicit attitudes do not just impact interpersonal relationships but also influence broader social practices and policies. Recognizing this, it becomes important to understand the factors contributing to discriminatory actions and thoughts towards PWDs, aiming to reduce discrimination and promote social cohesion (Friedman, 2023).

Explicit and Implicit Attitudes Towards People With Disabilities

Understanding the intricacies of discrimination becomes paramount to alleviating its impact and fostering inclusivity. A crucial aspect of this understanding involves delving into the factors that contribute to discriminatory actions and thoughts directed towards PWDs (Friedman, 2023). Recognizing that attitudes play a pivotal role in shaping behaviors, both explicit attitudes—those consciously reported—and implicit attitudes—those unintentionally activated—contribute to the complex landscape of discrimination. Unraveling the connection between these attitudes and discriminatory practices is vital for devising strategies to reduce prejudice, promote equitable treatment, and enhance social cohesion starting from education and employment. People with disabilities routinely confront occurrences of social exclusion and discrimination within the realms of education and employment, a fact substantiated by various studies and readily available national statistical data (Balçı, 2019; Karakuyu, 2017; Rohmer & Louvet, 2018; Wagner and Blackorby, 1996).

Despite the protection of equal rights and opportunities in education by law, the illiteracy rate in Turkey is 4.5 percent for the total population, while it stands at 23 percent for PWDs (TÜİK, 2015). There are many studies on the difficulties experienced by PWDs in their educational lives.

An early study on this subject by Wagner and Blackorby (1996) found that children with special educational needs have worse educational outcomes than their non-disabled classmates. Teacher attitudes towards disabled people are thought to be effective in creating this result (Van Mieghem et al., 2018; Lacruz-Perez et al., 2023).

Students identified as disadvantaged and in need of special education are affected by both explicit and implicit attitudes. However, these two types of attitudes may not align when directed towards the same students with disabilities (e.g., Lacruz-Perez et al., 2023). In a meta synthesis study, it was reported that explicit attitudes towards students with disabilities were mostly positive, while implicit attitudes were negative, and the behaviors of candidate teachers were better predicted by implicit attitudes (Glock & Kovacs, 2013). These implicit biases may be why teachers move away from inclusive education and struggle to teach students with disabilities. Additionally, attitudes of teacher candidates towards the inclusion of students in need of special education and inclusive education can change positively or negatively depending on the type or severity of disability, and experience and confidence of teachers (Glock & Kovacs, 2013; Van Mieghem et al., 2018). For instance, it was reported that teachers' implicit attitudes were neutral toward students with learning disabilities but negative toward students with challenging behaviors (Krischler & Pit-ten Cate, 2018).

The limited access to educational opportunities can adversely impact the workforce participation of PWDs. Moreover, even when they engage in professional life, implicit biases contribute to workplace disadvantages (Fiske et al., 2002; Mamatoğlu & Tasa, 2018). People with disabilities who often have the same degree or occupation may face a lower chance of getting hired because they are perceived as less competent than people without disabilities (Rohmer & Louvet, 2018). This situation poses significant challenges to equal opportunities. Consequently, many countries, including Türkiye, have implemented legal measures to promote PWDs' inclusion in the workforce. For instance, Labor Law No. 4857 mandates that employers with fifty or more employees in the same provincial area, whether in state or private institutions,

must employ 3% of their current workforce as PWDs (Labour Law, 2003). Despite such efforts, TUIK (2021) data reveals a labor force participation rate of 22.1% for PWDs, considerably lower than the 50.2% recorded for the overall population.

Even when PWDs engage in professional life, challenges persist, ranging from physical accommodations to issues of accessibility (Karakuyu, 2017; Kanyılmaz Polat, 2020). Negative attitudes and stereotypes further exacerbate their work experiences, with PWDs often unfairly associated with low levels of competence (Rohmer & Louvet, 2018). These pervasive stereotypes and prejudiced attitudes may lead to the marginalization of disabled individuals in the workplace, pushing them into roles below their professional capabilities. However, this phenomenon is not always overtly evident, as individuals may refrain from explicit expressions of hatred and discrimination, contributing to a subtle but impactful form of workplace exclusion (e.g., Stier & Hinshaw, 2007).

Individuals are generally hesitant to openly articulate prejudiced attitudes and tend to avoid manifesting negative sentiments on socially sensitive matters such as racism, disability, ethnicity, and nationality (Baston & Vosgerau, 2016; Friedman, 2019; Kuklinski et al., 1997; McKenzie & Carrie, 2018). Notably, individuals without disabilities commonly refrain from explicitly expressing prejudiced attitudes towards PWDs, firmly believing in their non-prejudiced actions and appearances (Friedman, 2019). Furthermore, societal norms disapprove of the expression of negative attitudes towards PWDs. Crandall et al. (2002) conducted research revealing that overt negative attitudes towards deaf and blind individuals are deemed less acceptable compared to negative attitudes directed at other socially marginalized groups.

Explicitly positive or neutral attitudes, alongside implicitly negative ones upheld by society and professionals in educational and employment settings, significantly shape the experiences of PWDs and contribute to societal notions surrounding disability (Charlesworth & Banaji, 2019; Friedman, 2019; 2023). Friedmans's study (2023) revealed that a substantial percentage of disability professionals, 77.24% explicitly and 82.03% implicitly,

prefer non-disabled individuals, emphasizing the need for professionals to cultivate self-awareness and address their biases to mitigate social impacts of disability.

It is crucial to recognize that seemingly positive behaviors may be influenced by preconceptions such as perceiving the disability group as 'inadequate,' highlighting the importance of understanding underlying attitudes. Behavior alone is an imperfect indicator of true attitudes, as people can consciously control their actions and expressions. Bayrak (2021) emphasizes that what individuals say or do does not necessarily reflect their genuine thoughts and feelings. Implicit attitudes and biases play a significant role in shaping behaviors, and several studies (e.g., Gawronski 2007; Friedman, 2017, 2019, 2023; Lacruz-Perez et al., 2023) highlight disparities between explicit and implicit attitudes towards PWDs. Additionally, implicit attitudes towards PWDs appeared to be more persistent compared to explicit attitudes towards the same group, as well as implicit attitudes towards sexual orientation and race (Charlesworth & Banaji, 2019). While overtly people may strive to appear equal and fair, implicit biases persist, contributing to ongoing challenges faced by PWDs in various aspects of life.

How Implicit Attitudes and Biases Arise?

Many factors contribute to the formation of implicit biased attitudes towards PWDs. This process is extremely fast in our early years of life. This tacit knowledge has been present for many years (Banaji, 2001). Formation of implicit biases can be analysed from the disability models perspective, as the way people perceive disability can serve as a source of formation of implicit attitudes. For instance, the moral model encompasses numerous negative attitudes and discriminative behaviors towards PWDs, since disability is portrayed as a pathetic or dangerous thing that occurs due to the bad deeds of individuals or their families (Smart, 2018). Consequently, individuals without disabilities in this model inevitably exhibit limited understanding, harbor negative attitudes, and engage in instant labeling of PWDs. Likewise, in the biomedical model, disability is characterized as a biological, mental, and emotional pathology, deemed a deficiency necessitating medical treatment and rehabilitation (Goodley, 2014;

Smart, 2018). The biomedical model accentuates the inadequacies of PWDs, exaggerates the negative aspects of disability, views it as a dependency or tragedy, and solely focuses on addressing what is perceived as broken. This perspective fosters implicit prejudices and stereotypes, distorting perceptions and influencing social interactions (Friedman, 2019).

Another source contributing to the formation of implicit biases is attribution errors. Wright (1983) defined one of these attribution errors as "disability spread" which refers to the situation in which physical disability is ascribed by observers to the mental, social, and emotional characteristics of the person. In essence, individuals often associate a person's disability with all of their individual traits, reducing them solely to the label of a disabled person. An illustrative example of this phenomenon is observed in individuals with a physical disability that does not impact their emotional or mental state; they are frequently perceived as mentally or emotionally delayed solely due to their physical disability (Keller & Galgay, 2010). This concept aims to elucidate the widespread assumption that a person with a disability cannot meet their basic needs and succeed in areas such as education, work, and social life due to their disability (e.g., Glock & Kovacs, 2013; Rohmer & Louvet, 2018; Wagner & Blackorby, 1996). The belief in the "disability spread" is thought to be represented by both explicit and implicit attitudes and biases, manifesting in our daily lives. Perceiving PWDs as incompetent, useless, immature, and looked down upon by others is associated with the attribution of disability status to all characteristics of the person (Dunn, 2019; Keller & Galgay, 2010).

Furthermore, in alignment with the belief in the spread of disability, PWDs as a whole are seen as inadequate, leading to the perception of inadequacy and, subsequently, the perception of PWDs as children. This phenomenon is referred to as "infantilization" (Keller & Galgay, 2010). Studies reported differences in the verbal interaction patterns of people interacting with people with visible disabilities. These studies uncovered that people use a similar verbal interaction pattern with the child when interacting with a disabled person, and they use more words and speak at higher frequencies (Gouvier et al.,

1994; Liesener & Mills, 1999). In a study, medical students were observed to speak childishly when approaching cerebral palsy patient simulators (Robey, et al., 2006). Childish conversations continued, although professionals learned that patients were cognitively alert and able to fully participate in treatment processes. Robey et al. (2006) reported that these attitudes are usually caused by implicit processes, and that these attitudes underlie verbal and behavioral responses, which may explain some of the contradictions between implicit attitudes and behaviors of the person.

From an evolutionary point of view, the absence of an optimal genetic fitting for physical disabilities could affect the behavior of individuals (Neuberg & Cottrell, 2008). Physical appearance provides an important indication of bodily integrity, security, completeness and robustness, and physical disability is considered a superficial indicator that elicits thoughts about pathogens (Dovidio et al., 2011). Because of this, people without disabilities may be sensitive to "abnormal" appearance and behavioral "abnormalities," react involuntarily and produce biased responses (Dovidio et al., 2019). According to this theory, the wholeness and integrity of the body is perceived by people as a sign of physical health and could be seen as a resource that gives others a sense of security. When faced with a physical disability, people may unconsciously regard any difference in physical integrity as dangerous and develop some prejudicial attitudes (Park et al., 2003). Thus, people may physically or emotionally distance themselves from PWDs.

In addition, stigma can also arise from existential motives related to a person's existence, importance, and mortality. According to Terror Management Theory, humans have a basic instinct to protect themselves and are aware of their mortality (Greenberg et al., 1997; Solomon et al., 2004). Living with the consciousness of mortality, which is the inevitable end, is a difficult and existentially threatening situation for human beings. For this reason, cues that remind people of their mortality and frailty can be perceived as threatening, just as having a physical or mental disability that deviates from the norms of normalcy can be seen as dangerous and, consequently, stigmatized (Martens et al., 2004). Existential anxiety may be the basis

of this reaction for people who do not meet the standard of normalcy. A study by Hirschberger et al. (2005) within the framework of terror management theory examined whether the fear of death is one of the underlying causes of emotional reactions towards PWDs by assessing the effect of physical disability on death-related cognitions and personal fear of death. Researchers reported that a person with a physical disability triggers death-related cognitions in nondisabled people (Hirschberger et al., 2005). This study suggested the possibility that stigma and its causes result from an implicit existential response.

Measurement of Implicit Attitudes

The inability of participants to respond honestly to scales due to factors such as assessment anxiety or social desirability (e.g., Friedman, 2019; Lacruz-Perez et al., 2023; Nisbett & Wilson, 1977; Nosek, 2007; Rosenberg, 2009) calls into question the reliability and validity of explicit measurement techniques for attitudes. In addition, these problems may become more eminent in attitudinal measures on issues such as ethnic or racial prejudice that are relevant to social desirability (De Houwer, 2006; Şenyurt et al., 2020). According to Antonak and Livneh (2000), when the subjects are aware of the purpose of the measurement, such as attitudes towards disabled people, they try to modify their answers. Therefore, the validity and reliability of the measurements become questionable (e.g., Nisbett & Wilson, 1997). For this reason, we cannot solely rely on explicit measurement tools to measure attitudes and biases toward PWDs. However, this does not mean that there are no prejudices against PWDs. It is highly likely that implicit prejudices, whether evolutionary or existential, can operate against this minority group intensely experiencing discrimination and stigmatization. Therefore, it can be argued that it may be more useful and effective to utilize implicit rather than explicit measures to uncover the prejudice and discrimination experienced by this minority group.

In order to obtain reliable results when measuring bias, implicit measures are used to prevent the intervention of conscious processes (McKenzie & Carrie, 2018). Implicit measures are thought to involve more complex and challenging processes than explicit measures and are

frequently employed to assess controversial topics such as stigma and discrimination. Implicit measurement methods aim to gauge people's feelings, thoughts, or behaviors using various techniques that differ from self-reporting. The primary goal is to reduce the influence of external factors, such as evaluation anxiety and social desirability, to achieve more reliable results (Hofmann et al., 2005). Completion of word fragments (e.g., complete t__wb_r_y for strawberry) or word stem completion (e.g., complete ban__ for banana) are implicit test techniques that use linguistic cues (Challis & Brodbeck, 1992; Olson & Fazio, 2003). Methods involving response times are often used to measure implicit bias as well (Wilson & Scior, 2014). Semantic preparation using the "sequential firing" method; Affect Misattribution Procedure (HHAP; Payne et al., 2005), is a simpler structure of sequential priming.

Categorization-based measures such as the Implicit Association Test (IAT) (Banaji & Hardin, 1996); and the Go/No-Go association task (GNAT; Nosek & Banaji, 2001) are indirect techniques used to measure implicit attitudes. Greenwald et al. (1998) developed the IAT, which is the most widely used implicit measurement method worldwide. IAT assumes that related stimuli are encoded together in semantic memory. Participants are asked to categorize words or images, making as few mistakes as possible and as quickly as possible. IAT assesses the duration of the response to the external stimulus and the errors made. The IAT is calculated by comparing the agreement rates and error rates of pictures or words that match the stereotypes and those that do not. The IAT is used to measure bias in areas where social concerns such as racism, ethnicity, and ableism are prevalent (e.g., McKenzie & Erin, 2018; Nosek et al., 2007).

Various tests are used to measure implicit attitudes towards PWDs, but the reaction time technique is a frequently preferred one (Wittenbrink & Schwarz, 2007). The Disability Attitude Implicit Association Test (DAIAT; Pruett & Chan, 2006), the Implicit Attitudes toward Athletes with Disabilities versus Athletes without Disabilities (IATAD; White et al., 2006), Infantilization Implicit Association Test (Robey et al., 2006), Multiple Disability Implicit Association Test (MDIAT; Thomas et al., 2007), and revised MDIAT (Vaughn et al., 2011)

are some examples. The commonly used DAIAT asks participants to match and categorize categories of disabled and non-disabled people with their "good" and "bad" characteristics. DAIAT, like classical IAT techniques, is based on reaction time. A fast response time indicates that the relationship between groups and given traits or existing stereotypes is strong (Friedman, 2019). These implicit attitude tests are generally computerized and have consistent techniques and scoring. A study evaluating DAIAT, MDIAT and IATAD tests and comparing explicit and implicit measurement techniques stated that these three implicit measurement techniques provide consistent results (Thomas et al., 2014).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this comprehensive review, an examination of attitudes and prejudices towards PWDs was conducted, drawing a clear distinction between implicit and explicit attitudes. The origins of these prejudices and the measurement techniques employed were elucidated, with a particular emphasis on the social problems stemming from these biases.

Explicit biases, prevalent in the general population, are subject to controllable cognitive processes that can be consciously considered and verbally expressed. On the other hand, implicit biases represent patterns that automatically manifest during evaluations, exerting a dual influence on human behavior (Markova et al., 2015; Nosek, 2007; Olson & Fazio, 2009). The repercussions of behaviors aligned with these biases are particularly profound for certain groups, notably PWDs, who encounter pervasive prejudices and stereotypes in critical domains like education, work, and accessibility. The persistence of inequality among social groups is attributed, in part, to explicit and implicit biases, exacerbating the existing problem (Sawyer & Gampa, 2022).

It is thought that awareness about attitudes should be raised in order to reduce the exclusion and segregation practices that disabled people are exposed to. According to some models and views, implicit and explicit attitudes coexist in memory; even if one of these attitudes changes, the other cannot change, and a person may have two separate evaluations of the same attitude object (Nosek, 2007; Wilson et al., 2000). On the other hand, according

to another perspective, explicit and implicit attitudes may be related to each other in a sense, and changing the explicit attitude may cause a change in the implicit attitude (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, 2006; Lacruz-Perez et al., 2023). It is of great importance that these two perspectives are evaluated and the necessary interventions are made to ensure change.

Since the 1970s, empirical evidence has highlighted the inadequacy of relying solely on introspective reports in the field of social sciences (Baston & Vosgerau, 2016). The direct measurement of attitudes, particularly on socially sensitive issues, is susceptible to the participants' inclination to respond in a socially desirable manner (Antonak & Livneh, 2000; McKenzie & Erin, 2018; Jones & Sigall, 1971). Consequently, in addition to introspective techniques like self-report inventories and explicit measurement methods, it is imperative to adapt indirect approaches for evaluating socially sensitive issues such as attitudes and prejudices. Attitudes toward individuals with disabilities among Turkish-speaking people have predominantly been investigated using explicit measurement tools, leaving no room for exception (Ildiz & Tezel, 2018). Implicit attitude measurement techniques are relatively new in the context of attitude literature in Turkey (Korkmaz, 2017), with a focus on a limited number of groups thus far, including immigrants, women, and Kurdish people (e.g., Hürriyetoğlu, 2019; Planalı & Kırıl Uçar, 2021; Şenyurt et al., 2000). The absence of tools to assess implicit attitudes toward people with disabilities for Turkish-speaking individuals significantly hampers attitude-related research across pertinent disciplines like psychology, sociology, education, special education, and rehabilitation. Therefore, it is crucial to develop or adopt implicit measurement techniques for assessing implicit attitudes towards PWDs. This strategic move aims to elevate awareness and mitigate the discriminatory or prejudiced behaviors and stigmatization experienced by PWDs in Turkish speaking society.

In summary, tackling implicit attitudes is crucial for promoting inclusivity and diminishing prejudice. The creation or adaptation of implicit measurement instruments customized for the Turkish context has the capacity to enhance our insights into attitudes towards individuals with

disabilities, thereby aiding in the establishment of a fairer and compassionate environment. Future research initiatives should give precedence to crafting and applying these tools, thereby propelling the field of implicit attitude assessment in Türkiye and fostering positive societal transformations.

REFERENCES

- Aker, G. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının kaynaştırma eğitimi hakkındaki tutumları. [Master Thesis] Trakya University.
- Altman, B. M. (1981). Studies of attitudes toward the handicapped: *The need for a new direction. Social problems*, 28(3), 321-337.
- Antonak, F. R., & Livneh, H. (2000). Measurement of attitudes towards persons with disabilities. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 22(5), 211–224.
- Aureala, W. (2001). Battered Women in Shelters: A Comparative Analysis of the Expectations and Experiences of African American, Mexican American and Non-Hispanic White Women. Doctoral Thesis.
- Balcı, S. (2019). Engellilerin sosyal dışlanma algılarının bazı sosyodemografik değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Tibbi Sosyal Hizmet Dergisi*, (14), 59-79.
- Banaji, M. R., & Hardin, C. D. (1996). *Automatic Stereotyping. Psychological Science*, 7(3), 136–141.
- Banaji, M. R. (2001). Implicit attitudes can be measured. *The nature of remembering: Essays in honor of Robert G. Crowder*, 117-150.
- Banks, J., Grotti, R., Fahey, É., & Watson, D. (2018). Disability and discrimination in Ireland: evidence from the QNHS Equality modules, *Economic and Social Research Institute*. Retrieved from <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/2245538/disability-and-discrimination-in-ireland/3004235/> on 05 Feb 2023.
- Bastian, B., Lusher, D., & Ata, A. (2012). Contact, evaluation and social distance: Differentiating majority and minority effects. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(1), 100-107.
- Baston, R., & Vosgerau, G. (2016). Implicit attitudes and implicit prejudices. *Philosophical Psychology*, 29(6), 889-903.
- Bayrak, Y. A. (2021, August 17). Örtük Önyargı – Michael Brownstein (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)–Michael Brownstein Öncül Analitik Felsefe. <https://onculanalitikfelsefe.com/ortuk-onyargi-michael-brownstein-stanford-encyclopedia-of-philosophy-michael-brownstein/>
- Blascovich, J., Mendes, W. B., Hunter, S. B., Lickel, B., & Kowai-bell, N. (2001). Perceiver threat in social interactions with stigmatized others. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 80(2), 253-267.
- Briñol, P., & Petty, R. E. (2009). Persuasion: Insight from the self-validation hypothesis *In Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 41, 69–118.
- Carver, C. S., Glass, D. C., & Katz, I. (1978). Favorable evaluations of blacks and the handicapped: positive prejudice, unconscious denial, or social desirability? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 8(2), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1978.tb00768.x>
- Challis, B. H., & Brodbeck, D. R. (1992). Level of processing affects priming in word fragment completion. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 18(3), 595.
- Charlesworth, T. E. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2019). Patterns of Implicit and Explicit Attitudes: I. Long-Term Change and Stability From 2007 to 2016. *Psychological Science*, 30(2), 174-192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618813087>
- Chen, S., Ma, L., & Zhang, J. X. (2011). Chinese undergraduates' explicit and implicit attitudes toward persons with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 55(1), 38-45.
- Chubon, R. A. (1992). Defining rehabilitation from a systems perspective: critical implications.

- Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, 23(1), 27–32. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0047-2220.23.1.27>
- Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A., & O'brien, L. (2002). Social norms and the expression and suppression of prejudice: the struggle for internalization. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 82(3), 359.
- De Houwer, J. (2006). Using the implicit association test does not rule out an impact of conscious propositional knowledge on evaluative conditioning. *Learning and Motivation*, 37(2), 176–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lmot.2005.12.002>
- Doob, A. N., & Ecker, B. P. (1970). Stigma and compliance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 14(4), 302.
- Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., & Howard, A. (1997). On the nature of prejudice: Automatic and controlled processes. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 33(5), 510-540.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Fiske, S. T. (2012). Under the radar: how unexamined biases in decision-making processes in clinical interactions can contribute to health care disparities. *American journal of public health*, 102(5), 945-952.
- Dovidio, J. F., Pagotto, L., & Hebl, M. R. (2011). Implicit attitudes and discrimination against people with physical disabilities. In R. L. Wiener & S. L. Willborn (Eds.), *Disability and Aging Discrimination* (pp. 157–183). Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-6293-5_9
- Dunn, D. S. (2019). *Understanding the Experience of Disability: Perspectives from Social and Rehabilitation Psychology*. Oxford University Press.
- Dural, U., & Bayazit, M. (2015). Kadın liderliğine karşı örtük kalıp düşünceler ve örtük önyargılar: Türkiye’de kadın belediye başkanlığı bağlamında karşılaştırmalı çalışma [Sözlü bildiri]. 23. *Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı*, 656-666, Türkiye.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Harcourt brace Jovanovich college publishers.
- Fazio, R. H., & Olson, M. A. (2003). Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. *Annual review of psychology*, 54(1), 297-327.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878–902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878>
- Friedman, C. (2017). Siblings of people with disabilities’ explicit and implicit disability attitude divergence. *Journal of Social Work in Disability & Rehabilitation*, 16(1), 74-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1536710X.2017.1260519>
- Friedman, C. (2019). Mapping Ableism: A two-dimensional model of explicit and implicit disability attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies*, 8(3), 95–120. <https://doi.org/10.15353/cjds.v8i3.509>
- Friedman, C. (2023). Explicit and implicit: Ableism of disability professionals. *Disability and Health Journal*, 16(4), 202482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dhjo.2023.101482>
- Gawronski, B. (2007). Attitudes can be measured! But what is an attitude? [Editorial] *Social Cognition*, 25(5), 573–581. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2007.25.5.573>
- Gawronski, B., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2006). Associative and propositional processes in

- evaluation: an integrative review of implicit and explicit attitude change. *Psychological bulletin*, 132(5), 692.
- Gedik, Z., & Toker, H. (2018). Attitudes toward the disabled and social desirability among university students. *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, 8(1), 111. <https://doi.org/10.5961/jhes.2018.253>
- Gething, L. (1994). The interaction with disabled persons scale. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 9(5), 23.
- Glock, S., & Kovacs, C. (2013). Educational psychology: using insights from implicit attitude measures. *Educational Psychology Review*, 25(4), 503–522. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-013-9241-3>
- Goffman, E. (1983). "The Interaction Order." *American Sociological Review*, 48(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095141>
- Goodley, D. (2014). *Dis/ability studies: Theorising disablism and ableism*. Routledge.
- Goodley, D. (2020). Disability studies and human encounters. *Indian Journal of Critical Disability Studies*, 1(1), 12–21.
- Gouvier, W. D., Coon, R. C., Todd, M. E., & Fuller, K. H. (1994). Verbal interactions with individuals presenting with and without physical disability. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 39(4), 263.
- Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Pyszczynski, T. (1997). Terror management theory of self-esteem and cultural worldviews: Empirical assessments and conceptual refinements. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 29, 61–139.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102(1), 4–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.1.4>
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464–1480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464>
- Hirschberger, G., Florian, V., & Mikulincer, M. (2005). Fear and compassion: a terror management analysis of emotional reactions to physical disability. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 50(3), 246–257. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0090-5550.50.3.246>
- Hofmann, W., Gawronski, B., Gschwendner, T., Le, H., & Schmitt, M. (2005). A meta-analysis on the correlation between the Implicit Association Test and explicit self-report measures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(10), 1369-1385.
- Hürriyetoğlu, H. (2019). Gruplar arası tehdit ve empatinin Suriyeli göçmenlere yönelik açık ve örtük tutumlar üzerindeki etkisi [Doctoral thesis]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Ildiz, G. İ., & Tezel, D. (2018). Engelli bireylere yönelik tutumlara ilişkin Türkiye’de gerçekleştirilen çalışmaların incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Bilimsel Araştırmalar Dergisi (IBAD)*, 3(2), 599-609.
- Karaca, Z. E., & Nam, D. (2021). Kronik bir sosyal sorun: engellilere yönelik ayrımcılık. *Bilgi sosyal bilimler dergisi*, 23(1), 167–194.
- Karakuyu, A. (2017). Working and daily life disabled problems through the views of disableds’engellilerin bakışıyla çalışma ve günlük hayattaki engelli sorunları. *Kesit Akademi Dergisi*, (12), 674-685.
- Karademiir, T., Açak, M., Türkçapar, Ü., & Eroğlu, H. (2018). Beden eğitimi öğretmen adaylarının zihinsel engellilere yönelik tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi* 20(3), 103-112.

- Keller, R. M., & Galgay, C. E. (2010). Microaggressive experiences of people with disabilities. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 241–267). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Krischler, M., & Pit-ten Cate, I. M. (2020). Inclusive education in Luxembourg: implicit and explicit attitudes toward inclusion and students with special educational needs. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(6), 597-615.
- Korkmaz, L. (2017). Tutumlarımızın ne kadar farkındayız? örtük tutumlar ve örtük ölçüm yöntemleri. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 20(40), 109-127.
- Kuklinski, J. H., Sniderman, P. M., Knight, K., Piazza, T., Tetlock, P. E., Lawrence, G. R., & Mellers, B. (1997). Racial prejudice and attitudes toward affirmative action. *American Journal of Political Science*, 402-419.
- Labour Act No. 4857 (2003). Labour Act of Turkey. Retrieved from <https://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/docs/ELECTRONIC/64083/77276/F75317864/TUR64083%20English.pdf>.
- Lacruz-Pérez, I., Pastor-Cerezuela, G., Tárraga-Mínguez, R., & Lüke, T. (2023). Implicit and explicit measurement of pre-service teachers' attitudes toward autism spectrum disorder. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 1-18.
- Levine, A., Park, J., & Kuo, H. J. (2021). Understanding disability biases in undergraduate rehabilitation students: An exploratory study. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 64(3), 172–180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034355220910238>
- Liesener, J. J., & Mills, J. (1999). An experimental study of disability spread: talking to an adult in a wheelchair like a child 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(10), 2083-2092.
- Maio, G. R., Haddock, G., & Verplanken, B. (2018). The psychology of attitudes and attitude change. Sage.
- Mamatoğlu, N., & Tasa, H. (2018). Engelliye yönelik ayrımcılık ve iş yerinde engelli. *Türkiye Klinikleri J Pschol-Special Topics* 3(1), 1-10.
- Marder, C., & D'Amico, R. (1992). How well are youth with disabilities really doing? A comparison of youth with disabilities and youth in general. a report from the national longitudinal transition study of special education students. *The Office of Special Education Programs U.S. Department of Education*.
- Markova, M., Pit-ten Cate, I., Krolak-Schwerdt, S., & Glock, S. (2016). Preservice teachers' attitudes toward inclusion and toward students with special educational needs from different ethnic backgrounds. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 84(3), 554-578.
- Martens, A., Greenberg, J., Schimel, J., & Landau, M. J. (2004). Ageism and death: effects of mortality salience and perceived similarity to elders on reactions to elderly people. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(12), 1524–1536. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271185>
- McKenzie, R. M., & Carrie, E. (2018). Implicit–explicit attitudinal discrepancy and the investigation of language attitude change in progress. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(9), 830-844.
- Myers, D. G. (2022). When does social networking uplift—and dispirit—us? *Observer*, 31(1), 71.
- Neuberg, S. L., & Cottrell, C. A. (2008). Managing the threats and opportunities afforded by human sociality. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 12(1), 63–72. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.12.1.63>
- Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, 84(3), 231–

259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.3.231>
- Nario-Redmond, M. R. (2019). *Ableism: The causes and consequences of disability prejudice*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Nosek, B. A. (2007). *Implicit–Explicit Relations*. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(2), 65–69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00477.x>
- Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). The go/no-go association task. *Social cognition*, 19(6), 625–666.
- Nosek, B. A., Smyth, F. L., Hansen, J. J., Devos, T., Lindner, N. M., Ranganath, K. A., Smith, C. T., Olson, K. R., Chugh, D., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2007). Pervasiveness and correlates of implicit attitudes and stereotypes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 18(1), 36–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280701489053>
- Olson, M. A., & Fazio, R. H. (2003). Relations between implicit measures of prejudice: What are we measuring? *Psychological Science*, 14(6), 636–639..
- Park, J. H., Faulkner, J., & Schaller, M. (2003). Evolved disease-avoidance processes and contemporary anti-social behavior: Prejudicial attitudes and avoidance of people with physical disabilities. *Journal of Nonverbal behavior*, 27(2), 65–87.
- Payne, B. K., Cheng, C. M., Govorun, O., & Stewart, B. D. (2005). An inkblot for attitudes: Affect misattribution as implicit measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 277–293. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.3.277
- Planalı, G. Ö., & Uçar, G. K. (2021). Erkeklerin toplumsal cinsiyet ve şiddete ilişkin örtük çağrışımlarının demografik özellikler ve adil dünya inancı perspektifinden incelenmesi. *Nesne* 9(21), 572–586
- Polat, E. K. (2020). Engelli bireylerin çalışma yaşamında karşılaştıkları sorunlara yönelik nitel bir araştırma: Çanakkale örneği. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(39), 869–897.
- Pruett, S. R., & Chan, F. (2006). The development and psychometric validation of the Disability Attitude Implicit Association Test. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 51(3), 202–213. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0090-5550.51.3.202>
- Robey, K. L., Beckley, L., & Kirschner, M. (2006). Implicit Infantilizing Attitudes About Disability. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 18(4), 441–453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10882-006-9027-3>
- Rohmer, O. & Louvet, E. (2012). Implicit measures of the stereotype content associated with disability: Implicit stereotyping and disability. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51(4), 732–740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02087.x>
- Rohmer, O. & Louvet, E. (2018). Implicit stereotyping against people with disability. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 21(1), 127–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216638536>
- Sawyer, J. E., & Gampa, A. (2023). Social movements as parsimonious explanations for implicit and explicit attitude change. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 27(1), 28–51.
- Smart, J. (2018). *Disability Definitions, Diagnoses, and Practice Implications: An Introduction for Counselors*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315276694>
- Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2004). The cultural animal: Twenty years of terror management theory and research. In J. Greenberg, S. L. Koole, & T. Pyszczynski (Eds.), *Handbook of Experimental Existential*

- Psychology* (pp. 13–34). Guilford Press.
- Son Hing, L. S., Chung-Yan, G. A., Hamilton, L. K., & Zanna, M. P. (2008). A two-dimensional model that employs explicit and implicit attitudes to characterize prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(6), 971–987. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.6.971>
- Stangor, C., (2009). *A quick history of theory and research in Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination T., D., Nelson* pp. 1-22. Taylor & Francis
- Stier, A., & Hinshaw, S. P. (2007). *Explicit and implicit stigma against individuals with mental illness*. *Australian Psychologist*, 42(2), 106-117.
- Şahin, H., & Bekir, H. (2016). Üniversite öğrencilerinin engellilere yönelik tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 20(3), 767-779.
- Şenoğuz, U. D. (2016). *Understanding the malleability of implicit stereotyping and implicit prejudice toward female leadership: a longitudinal field study on municipality employees in Turkey* [Doctoral thesis]. Sabancı University.
- Şenyurt, A. Y., Coşkun, H., & Ünlü, E. S. (2020). Örtük çağrışım testinin Türkçe'ye uyarlama çalışması. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15(26), 4437-4453. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.632149>
- Tayınmak, İ. (2020). Önyargılı tutumlar ve saldırganlık. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Akademik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4(1), 71-87.
- Thalhammer, E., Zucha, V., Enzenhofer, E., Salfinger, B., & Ogris, G. (2001). *Attitudes towards minority groups in the European Union*. Viena: European Monitoring.
- Thomas, A., Doyle, A., & Vaughn, D. (2007). Implementation of a computer based implicit association test as a measure of attitudes toward individuals with disabilities. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 73(2), 13.
- Thomas, A., Vaughn, E. D., Doyle, A., & Bubb, R. (2014). implicit association tests of attitudes toward persons with disabilities. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 82(2), 184–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2013.813357>
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2015). *Dünya nüfus günü raporu [World population day report]*. Retrieved from <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Dunya-Nufus-Gunu-2015-18617>
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2021). *Engelli ve Yaşlı İstatistik Bülteni Temmuz-2021 [Bulletin of Disabled and Elderly Statistics July-2021.]*. Retrieves from https://www.aile.gov.tr/media/88684/eyhgm_istatistik_bulteni_temmuz2021.pdf
- Van Mieghem, A., Verschueren, K., Petry, K., & Struyf, E. (2020). An analysis of research on inclusive education: a systematic search and meta review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(6), 675-689.
- Vaughn, E. D., Thomas, A., & Doyle, A. L. (2011). The multiple disability implicit association test: Psychometric analysis of a multiple administration IAT measure. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 54(4), 223-235.
- Wagner, M. M., & Blackorby, J. (1996). Transition from high school to work or college: how special education students fare. *The Future of Children*, 6(1), 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1602496>
- White, M. J., Jackson, V., & Gordon, P. (2006). Implicit and explicit attitudes toward athletes with disabilities. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 72(3), 33–40.
- Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. *Psychological review*, 107(1), 101.
- Wilson, M. C., & Scior, K. (2014). Attitudes towards

individuals with disabilities as measured by the Implicit Association Test: A literature review. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 35(2), 294–321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2013.11.003>

World Health Organization, & United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2008). *Human rights, health, and poverty reduction strategies (No. 5)*. World Health Organization.

World Health Organization. (2020). Disability and Health. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/disability-and-health>

Wittenbrink, B., & Schwarz, N. (Eds). (2007). *Implicit Measures of Attitudes*. Guilford Press.

Wright, B. A. (1983). *Physical Disability: A Psychosocial Approach* (2nd ed.). Harper Collins, New York.

Yang, Y., & Montgomery, D. (2013). Gaps or bridges in multicultural teacher education: A Q study of attitudes toward student diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 30, 27–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.003>

Yuker, H. E. Block, J. R. & Young, J. H. (1966). The measurement of attitudes towards disabled persons: Human resources. Albertson, N.Y.

Yuker, H. E., & Hurley, M. K. (1987). Contact with and attitudes toward persons with disabilities: The measurement of intergroup contact. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 32(3), 145.

Author Contributions:

The contribution of the first author is 60%, the second author's contribution is 40%.