

**A Research Report
of a
Baseline Survey of Students' Attitudes
toward
People with a Disability**



**Department of Social Work & Social Administration
The University of Hong Kong**

The Disability Research Team

Principal Investigator Prof. Veronica PEARSON

Project Director Ms. Donna WONG Kam Pun

Project Team Members

Ms. Heidi HUI Sim Kiu
Ms. Frances IP Yin Sum
Ms. Eva LO NG Mei Kuen

Research Officer Ms. Rose YU Wai Man

Statistician Mr. Nelson YIP Siu Hong

Research Assistant Ms. Sally LAM Yuk Lan
Ms. Dalice FUNG

Student Researchers Ms. Doris CHOI Kit Sum
Ms. Daisy FAN Suet Yin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	13
1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	13
1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT	13
1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	14
1.4 LITERATURE REVIEW	14
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY.....	17
2.1 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN:	17
2.2 SCALE CONSTRUCTION	17
2.3 VIGNETTE STUDY	19
2.4 DESCRIPTIVE LABELS	19
2.5 COMPARISON GROUP	19
2.6 SAMPLING FRAME.....	20
2.7 ADMINISTRATION PROCEDURES	22
CHAPTER THREE : RESULTS.....	26
3.1 PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS.....	26
3.2 PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES AND STRUCTURE OF THE ATTITUDE SCALE	26
3.3 STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS PEOPLE WITH A DISABILITY: BASELINE AND VARIATIONS	27
3.4 VIGNETTE RESPONSES	32
3.5 DESCRIPTIONS OF PEOPLE WITH A DISABILITY	37
3.6 EFFECTS OF SOCIAL CONTACTS AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES	39
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	45
4.1 DISCUSSION	45
4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	51
4.3 THE WAY FORWARD	54
REFERENCES.....	55

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background of the Study

The Baseline Survey of Students' Attitudes towards People with a Disability, Gender Stereotypes and Family Roles was commissioned by the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) in April, 2000. A major objective of the study was to establish the present level of acceptance/recognition of people with a disability, gender stereotypes, family roles and non-traditional family types by students for the purposes of future comparison. It is also a broader and ultimate goal of the study to assess the effectiveness of the various efforts to promote equal opportunity concepts among students. It is hoped that the survey will provide information and useful data for professionals in the field of education, social welfare and other disciplines to help formulate effective strategies in pursuing integration and equal opportunities for people regardless of their disability, gender and social background.

Research Objectives

- a To survey students' attitudes (acceptance and recognition) towards people with disabilities.
- b To establish an objective index or a set of indices of students' attitudes towards people with a disability for future comparison.
- c To examine the relationships between students' attitudes towards people with a disability and the following factors:
 - I. Demographic and economic characteristics,
 - II. Experience of interaction with people with a disability, and
 - III. Exposure to specific programmes intended to promote equal opportunities concepts for people with a disability ("Kids on the Block", Pilot Projects on Integrated Education, other special programmes by schools/student groups or non-governmental organizations).

Sample

For the survey of students' attitudes towards people with a disability, 5069 questionnaires were collected from students in forms P4 (1,181) F1 (1,407) F4 (1,403) and F 6 (1,076). These questionnaires were divided into five categories: people with a physical impairment, those with a hearing impairment, those with a physical handicap, ex-mentally ill people and those with a learning disability. Students in each class were

divided into five sets and students in each set were asked to fill in a questionnaire that related to only one kind of disability. Overall, there were more female respondents (58.4%) in the sample than male respondents (41.6%). The percentage of females increased in the upper forms, 63.5% in F6 and 53.2% in P4. The number of respondents for each type of questionnaire was 1,019 for intellectual impairment, 1,077 for the ex-mentally ill, 1094 for physical impairment, 918 for hearing impairment and 961 for visual impairment.

Measuring instrument

An instrument was constructed to encompass four attitude sub-scales, viz, optimism-human rights, behavioural misconceptions, pessimism-hopelessness and social acceptance. At a preliminary stage of instrument construction focus groups with age-specific students with and without disabilities were held so that they could share their impression, subjective attitudes, knowledge and experience in relation to people with a disability. A pilot test involving 355 students was held. The measuring instrument was demonstrated to be able to discriminate adequately between high and low scorers on all sub-scales. This differentiating power supported the predictive power and general validity of the sub-scales. Cronbach's Alphas were computed for the four attitude sub-scales for each disability type. All sub-scales had good reliability scores ranging from 0.69 to 0.85. A set of indices of students attitudes towards people with different types of disabilities were computed by converting the four attitude sub-scale scores along a scale between 1-100. The social acceptance sub-scale was taken as the key index of the baseline measurement of students' attitudes towards people with disabilities.

Results and Discussion

Multi-dimensional facets in students' attitudes towards people with a disability

As noted in the previous chapters, students tended to respond positively towards the optimism-human rights and pessimism-hopelessness sub-scales and negatively towards the behavioural misconception sub-scale. Responses to the social acceptance sub-scale were dependent on the situational requirement or personal commitment to the episodes described in the given statements. Analysis of itemized responses to the four attitude components as described in section 3.3.1 supported the multi-dimensional nature of students' attitudes towards people with a disability. Their attitude responses were dependent on the types of questions asked and the perceived social implications

arising from the interaction episodes. It is also obvious that there is a ranking of disabilities, with those with a learning impairment and those who have experienced mental illness at the bottom – very much in line with the international literature.

Apparently, the majority of students were aware of the ethos of non-discrimination, equal opportunities and human rights for people with a disability. But they were still largely under the negative influences of many prevailing behavioural misconceptions about people with a disability. They had a segregationist view in assuming that people with a disability would be more comfortable and better educated in special instead of integrated schools. So the abstract notions of equality and human rights do not necessarily increase the likelihood of befriending people with a disability. Students were hesitant towards personal commitments and cautious about the social consequences, in particular the sense of threat and unpredictability, in relating to people with a disability. This also explained the negative attitude scores towards people with intellectual impairment and mental illnesses. Such caution and calculation is understandable, especially when over 60% of the respondents had no prior contact with people with a disability.

Findings of the present study echo previous research in that they demonstrate that attitude should be treated as a multi-dimensional construct, consisting of the interlocking facets of cognitive, affective and behavioural responses. Such results call for the need to alert educators and social workers in carefully thinking through the core messages to be delivered in public education for equal opportunities. In particular, for people with intellectual impairment and mental illness, the misconceptions about their bizarreness, unpredictability and deviant personality must be rectified to enhance social acceptance. The segregationist orientation of students was also a reflection of the existing way of life of people with a disability in the larger society. Rehabilitation and special education facilities are largely designed on segregationist assumptions. It was therefore not surprising that students thought that special settings were where people with a disability should belong. More provisions for integration of children in school settings and adults in employment and community settings must be made to knock down the barriers to equal participation.

Stereotypical assumptions towards people with a disability

Students' stereotypical views towards people with a disability were evident in the behavioural misconception index (see Table 1.6.3) and the itemized responses within the corresponding sub-scale (see Table 1.5.3). The misconceptions might be based on

both a deficit assumption and a halo effect. Students tended to pay attention only to the constraints and limitations of people with a disability. The disabling implications of a given impairment were magnified because of misunderstanding and erroneous inference. For example, people with a disability were perceived as deviant, accident prone and appropriate for repetitive work. Furthermore, the characteristics of a minority of people with a disability were taken to be the stereotypical representation of people with a disability in general. For example, people with mental illness were assumed to be deviant and violent.

Findings in relation to descriptive labels of people with a disability were apparently less negative and yet still depicted deficit assumptions. Students were asked to select 5 descriptive labels from a list for a person with a given type of disability. If we look at the lists of descriptive attributes the results by no means suggest an overall negative impression of people with a disability. However, the positive descriptions that were chosen tend to be paternalistic, benevolent and pitying. Half of all respondents viewed people with a disability as pitiful. There are generally more negative descriptive labels given for those with an intellectual impairment and those who have had a mental illness across all forms. Disability groups tend not to be seen as `the same as me'. Positive in this context does not mean equal.

All respondents said that their impression of people with a disability came largely from the mass media (television, newspapers and magazines). Only about one-quarter indicated that they had also formed their impressions from direct contact with people with a disability. The pervasive deficit and deviant assumptions in the mass media portraits of people with a disability were detrimental to building up a positive image of people with a disability. Forty four percent had never been exposed to educational programmes about equal opportunities (e.g. 'New Kids on the Block') while another forty percent had seen or heard them. Even if students did participate in educational programmes, the possibility that they might rectify prevailing misconceptions was constrained by limited time and lack of personal experience in coming into contact with people with a disability. Results of the present study suggests that there is a need to strengthen and re-structure educational programmes for students, in terms of quantity, content and format.

Significant socio-demographic variables associated with students' attitudes towards people with a disability

F1 and F4 students had significantly more negative attitudes towards people with a disability than students in P4 and F6 forms. Students in P4 tended to be more accepting of all disability groups. This suggests that the relationship between age and negative attitudes is not a linear one. As students progressed through the age groups, it was interesting to note that P4 and F6, the lowest and highest age cohorts, were more positive than the middle group of students in F1 and F4. Age indicates an increase in knowledge and also a more sophisticated and careful calculation of the potential commitment and personal risks in social encounters. F1 and F4 students are still seeking their own identity, are in a period of social experimentation where the opinion of their peer group is overwhelmingly important. It is possible that they fear associating themselves with those seen to be different and therefore of 'lower status' for fear of damaging their own social position/ranking. So F1 and F4 students would be more negative in their attitudes, particularly in those statements that require personal commitment. The F6 students may, on the other hand, have more accurate ideas about the characteristics of different disabilities and be prepared to take more risks in social interactions. In their stage of psychological development they have moved towards individuation and are better able to accept difference without being threatened by it.

Overall, female students were significantly more positive in their attitudes towards people with a disability than male students. The educational level of mother and father, number of computers at home and family composition were found to have no significant relationships with the attitude scores. A weak, but significant, relationship, was found between housing type and attitude scores. Students living in the lowest strata of housing type tended to have more negative attitudes. Socio-demographic variables were associated with responses of the family to social issues, which in turn might have an influence on attitudes towards people with a disability. However, the findings in the present study have not produced enough evidence to make any definite claims. Age, types of disability and some of the socio-demographic variables emerged from this research as clearly influential variables in relation to the formation of attitudes towards people with a disability. Presumably they work together to form a complex model, but how this occurs requires further investigation.

The effects of social contacts

One third of the total sample reported that they knew or had had contact with

people with a disability. These students were found to have a significantly more positive attitude towards people with a disability than those who had not. However, cross-sectional analysis did not match the results from a comparison group. Even with our deliberate attempt to recruit students who had participated in Treats programmes into our sample the numbers who had had direct contact with anyone with a disability still only amounted to about one-third of the sample. This shows how very separate the lives of youngsters with and without disabilities still tend to be. The small number in some comparison groups posed difficulties for furthering our understanding of the effect of social contact on students' attitudes towards people with a disability. The largest comparison group was junior students coming into contact with students with intellectual impairment ($n=312$). By further dividing the comparison group into three sub-groups, ANOVA indicated that the P.4 and P.5 students who had participated in Treats programmes were more positive in their attitudes towards people with intellectual impairment than the other two groups (F.1 or F.2 Treats program participants and P.4 and P.5 students with classmates with intellectual impairment or learning disabilities). So the impacts of social contacts might work differently for different age groups and would depend on the context.

The vignettes are designed to ascertain behavioural intentions while minimizing the social desirability response. It is very noticeable the vignettes with a school theme (e.g. asking a classmate with a disability to join an activity during recess) elicit generally more negative responses than the birthday party or neighbourhood settings. One possible explanation for this harks back to the theme of 'what will my other classmates think' and students may hesitate to publicly ally themselves with a disabled classmate because of this. We also found the level of avoidance of people with a disability on a bus somewhat surprising. On the other hand, willingness to invite someone with a disability to a birthday party was relatively high indicating that previous acquaintance and presumed friendship may also be involved. This suggests that behavioural intentions are at least partly dependent on a social context.

From this research it is clear that 'social contact' is not an homogeneous construct. 'Social contact' varies in terms of duration, intensity, nature and willingness of those involved. On a broad, general level it seems that social contact is associated with more positive impressions. But more detailed analysis indicates a much more complex relationship. As we mentioned in the report, there may be an element of self-selection so that people who are well-intentioned seek out information about and contact with people with a disability. We had no measure of how willing students without a disability were to participate in educational programmes. For at least some of them, it is a

programme organized by their school about which they have no choice and their sense of being forced (if they have such a sense) may affect their subsequent attitude.

Duration of contact may also be an issue; a one-shot programme could have a profound effect in either direction. Prolonged contact (for instance in the classroom or family) could lead to genuine understanding and respect, or a sense of frustration and irritation. Contact may also be passive (listening to a talk in morning assembly given by a visually impaired person; watching a television programme) or interactive (playing with a hearing impaired schoolmate in recess). We may need to control further the different dimensions in social contact before we can gain an accurate understanding into how and in what ways it affects attitude formation and social acceptance.

Effects of educational programmes

As noted in Chapter 3, 44% of the respondents indicated that they had never participated in educational programmes about equal opportunities (see Table 4.1). With T-test comparison, the present study indicated that exposure to educational programmes was associated with positive attitudes towards people with a disability. The relationship could be explained in terms of the impact of the educational programmes or a self-selection factor, as mentioned in 3.6.1 of Chapter 3. Moreover, a closer look at the type of educational programmes revealed that the majority of the students came across such programmes in a passive manner, e.g. watching television programmes or drama series, puppet shows or plays, road shows, school talks or EOC publications. These educational programmes may serve the purpose of conveying knowledge and equal opportunity concepts but do not offer chances for interaction and co-operation with people with a disability. Without the social experimentation of knowing the strengths and potentials of people with a disability in person, it would be unlikely for students to clear away the hesitations and misconceptions, and commit themselves to meaningful social encounters with people with a disability.

Participation in educational programmes in the present study was a crude indicator based on self-reported responses of students only. Findings in the present study indicated the positive effects of educational programmes on students' attitudes. But cautious interpretation is required to take note of the possible self-selection factor such that those with more positive attitudes are more inclined to participate in educational programmes. Evidence of the effectiveness of educational programmes on the basis of this gross cross-sectional comparison could only be taken as tentative. Educational programmes differ in scope, duration, format, content and core messages.

Their effects on the public and student population would be cumulative with the possibility of being counteracted by the dominant mass media influence. The present baseline research is useful in building up a localized norm among the student population as a basis for comparison. Further research could examine the effects of a given educational programme or set of programmes by making comparisons among the program participants and the norms for a particular cohort of students.

Limitations of the study

In general the reliability and validity of the various measures has been assured and the major findings could inform future directions and practices in the education of students. However, limitations of the study have to be noted for the more accurate interpretation and utilization of the research findings. First, the sample did not correspond to the original sampling frame because many schools refused to participate. Eventually, all secondary and half of the primary schools in Hong Kong were approached and invited to participate, so there was no deliberate selection. However, it is possible that schools that agreed to take part in the research had a more positive approach to disability than those that refused. Thus a self-selection factor may be involved. Second, it was up to each participating school to select the classes for administration of the questionnaires. School staff were responsible for the selection and may have screened out those they thought would be less co-operative. So there may be sample bias towards a more compliant group within the general student population. However, this may have added to the plausibility of the research results because very few questionnaires were discarded due to suspected flaws or playfulness in students' responses.

Third, a great deal of effort was put into making the questionnaire as succinct as possible but it was still long and may have tested the patience and the concentration span of the respondents, especially the younger ones. Fourth, the socio-economic indicators that we were able to use had to take account of the age of our respondents and their sensitivities. Thus we were not able to collect the detailed information that we would ideally have wished to have on income and occupation. Fifth, the inclusion of a comparison group of students who had had contact with people with a disability was undoubtedly useful. However, the present study covered a broad spectrum of disability types and forms. Given the short time frame for data collection, there were practical difficulties to have a large comparison group for each corresponding type of disability and form of students. Therefore, detailed comparisons within that group of their responses to different disability categories were somewhat limited because of the small

numbers involved. The exception was those who had had contact with people with a learning impairment.

Recommendations

1. Educational programmes should start early and be friendship based

Public education programmes directed towards the acceptance of people with disabilities should be targeted at children from the early primary forms through secondary school. As we can see, P4 students tend to be more accepting of all disability groups than F.1, F.4 and F.6. respondents. If they are given the opportunity to have social contact with people with a disability and learn how to accept children different from themselves, their attitudes would be less dominated by influences from the media. It would also be beneficial for children to learn how to appreciate the strength and perseverance of people with a disability in maximizing their potential despite the constraints of their disabilities. The younger the children, the less resistance they have to interacting with children with disabilities and as they get older they need continuous 'vaccination' against the prejudicial attitudes of the teenage world.

As for the adolescents and upper form students, the friendship theme in the vignette situation dominates the social acceptance of people with a disability. When they had prior acquaintance with a peer with disabilities, they would most likely accept their participation in the peer group. Educational programmes for students should be directed towards enhancement of mutual learning and friendship between students with and without disabilities. Extra-curricula activities, sports, games or youth groups that enable students with and without disabilities to meet each other and develop friendship should be promoted. The common ground of youth culture and developmental issues should foster mutual understanding and exchange among students with and without disabilities. More integrated youth programmes should be promoted by NGOs and schools to foster friendship and partnership between young people with and without disabilities.

2. Social contact and integration in daily life

The results from the comparison groups demonstrate that interaction occurring in a one-shot context may or may not have a positive impact on the non-disabled students. Attitudes are unlikely to be changed by one single event. Attitudes are formed and influenced by different variables and it takes time to change beliefs and attitudes,

especially when they are entrenched. Since there are so many stereotypes and negative labels about people with a disability, especially those with an intellectual impairment and those recovering from mental illness, more systematic group sessions or programmes over a significant period of time should be organized. This would provide more chances of ensuring that the interaction experience is positive and enjoyable.

Only about one-third of the students indicated that they were acquainted or had had personal contact with people with a disability. The existing service provisions and community facilities are not user friendly and barrier-free for people with a disability. Many people with a disability are still largely excluded socially from the mainstream. Students were inclined to assume the existing segregated pattern as normative. This leads to a vicious cycle of further misunderstanding and hesitance to treat them equally as members of society. There must be a re-orientation and extensive effort within special education and rehabilitation services to promote social integration of people with a disability in the different facets of community life. More people with a disability should be educated in the mainstream, engage in open employment, live in communal residential settings, and participate in as well as contribute to the community's way of life. Education of students should be seen as a long term socialization process embedded in the cultural and structural changes in terms of social policies and action to enhance the rights of and remove barriers for people with a disability in society.

3. Fostering a responsible and non-discriminatory media culture

All respondents said that their impression of people with a disability came largely from the mass media (television, newspapers and magazines). Clearly this is a highly influential channel and there should be deliberate attempts to utilize the media in a constructive manner in fostering positive public attitudes and acceptance towards people with a disability. The media people should also be the target for education so that many prevailing misconceptions and misunderstanding towards people with a disability can be clarified. Reports and editors should be ensured of an accurate understanding of disabilities and as well as an awareness of their own pervasive power and social responsibility in equal opportunities. Positive images of people with disabilities should be portrayed by highlighting their strengths and their contribution towards society.

Attitudes towards the ex-mentally ill and intellectually impaired people are, as we expected, generally more negative than towards other disability groups. This clearly implies that students do not have proper knowledge and skills to interact with these two

categories of people. Without proper knowledge and with very limited interaction, undoubtedly impressions may not be accurate. More campaigns in the mass media and specific strategies should be adopted in promoting acceptance towards these two groups. In particular, the media should restrain from less sensational news reporting and challenge the misconceptions that people have about those with an intellectual impairment and mental illness being deviant and violent.

4. Effecting social integration in schools

A very important change has taken place in Hong Kong's education system, as since 1997, children with disabilities have been accepted into ordinary primary schools. Research from overseas has clearly indicated that peer relationships between disabled and non-disabled students are profoundly affected by the environment of integration that the school creates. Proper preparation and training should be offered to those non-disabled students who are studying together with disabled students. This requires a great deal of effort from teachers and tailor-made integrative programmes in the school. Teachers do play an important role model for non-disabled students to learn how to interact and to relate with disabled students. However, local research (Wong, Pearson, Ip and Lo, 1999) reflects that many teachers in Hong Kong lack skills and knowledge in teaching children with special needs. This inadequacy adversely affects their attitudes towards integration and a negative message may be conveyed to their students. To instill positive attitudes in students, teachers must have positive attitudes towards children with disabilities and the idea of an integrated classroom. A more positive frame of mind in teachers should be inculcated through in service training and education, particularly so that their confidence and competence levels in the face of special needs students are raised. Systematic and tailored made interventions should be developed at the school level to assist students with and without special needs in the integrated classroom. Programmes such as "Student Ambassador Schemes" or "Peer Counselor Schemes" should be promoted so as to facilitate the acceptance and understanding of non-disabled students towards disabled students.

The Way Forward

This research has established a reliable and useful measuring instrument and also charted the baselines of students' attitudes towards people with a disability. Further research effort should be directed towards specific educational strategies and social interaction variables to foster a positive and accepting attitude. The importance of different social contexts, adult intervention and preparation for meaningful interactions

should be emphasized. More educational programmes should be designed to facilitate joint ventures and social grounds for mutual understanding for students with and without disabilities. More effort should be made to promote, in particular, the images of people with intellectual impairment or previous mental illness as well as to provide education and training to teachers and non-disabled students.

But who should be the service providers and planners for community education: social workers, teachers or the Equal Opportunities Commission? Existing educational programmes on equal opportunities are delivered by different parties and organizations without any concerted effort or strategic directions. The social goals of equal opportunities and full inclusion are not specified and evaluated in concrete terms with social indicators. Likewise, for community education programmes, there should be more specific long-term goals and systematic review to chart the changes in public attitude, organizational practices and experiences of people with a disability themselves. The machinery of community education must be built to set the direction, solicit resources and co-ordinate community effort to bring about attitude changes and social integration.

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

The Baseline Survey of Students' Attitudes towards People with a Disability, Gender Stereotypes and Family Roles was commissioned by the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) in April, 2000. A major objective of the study was to establish the present level of acceptance/recognition of people with a disability, gender stereotypes, family roles and non-traditional family types by students for the purposes of future comparison. It is also a broader and ultimate goal of the study to assess the effectiveness of the various efforts to promote equal opportunity concepts among students. It is hoped that the survey will provide information and useful data for professionals in the field of education, social welfare and other disciplines to help formulate effective strategies in pursuing integration and equal opportunities for people regardless of their disability, gender and social background.

1.2 Organization of the Report

The Baseline Survey was commissioned as a single project by the EOC. However, the subject under study fell into the two academic foci of disability and gender. The research team has, therefore, taken it as two separate research projects, viz. 'Baseline Survey of Students' Attitudes towards People with a Disability' and 'Baseline Survey of Students' Attitudes towards Gender Stereotypes and Family Roles'. Each study has its own unique conceptual framework, instrument and questionnaire design. Because the target population of the two studies was the same and both were utilizing the questionnaire approach in data collection, the two research projects were carried out simultaneously, sharing the convenience of field administration and school liaison. The same sampling frame and data collection procedures were used with participating students randomised in responding to different sets of questionnaires. In drawing up findings and analysis of the research data, separate research reports have been written up on the two research projects. This report focuses on findings in relation to the 'Baseline Survey of Students' Attitudes towards People with a Disability'. Tables are numbered according to the order of questions in the questionnaire.

1.3 Research Objectives

- a. To survey students' attitudes (acceptance and recognition) towards people with disabilities.
- b. To establish an objective index or a set of indices of students' attitudes towards people with a disability for future comparison.
- c. To examine the relationships between students' attitudes towards people with a disability and the following factors:
 - i. Demographic and economic characteristics,
 - ii. Experience of interaction with people with a disability, and
 - iii. Exposure to specific programmes intended to promote equal opportunities concepts for people with a disability (“Kids on the Block”, Pilot Projects on Integrated Education, other special programmes by schools/student groups or non-governmental organizations).

1.4 Literature Review

1.4.1 *Definition of attitude:*

Essentially, the present research has to address the conceptualisation of the nature and dimensions of attitudes of school children towards people with a disability, particularly in the local context; and the operational issues in the construction of measuring instruments and accurate administering procedures.

With its complexity and multi-faceted structure, the different conceptual definitions of attitude vary in abstractness and extensiveness (Antonak, 1988). Contemporary literature on attitude measurement (Konty & Dunham, 1998) embraces three components: affect, cognition and conation. The affective component has to do with feelings of like or dislike toward the attitude object. Cognition refers to the knowledge or beliefs a person has about the attitude object. Conation refers to the behavioural intentions or actions of a person toward the attitude object.

1.4.2 *Approach in studying attitudes*

The study of attitudes toward people with a disability has been a popular research area in the last decade. Most attitude scales are constructed along the lines of one of the following: Bogardus's social distance scale; Thurstone's Method of Equal Appearing Intervals; Likert's Method of Summated Ratings; Guttman's Cumulative Scaling

Method and Osgood's Semantic Differential. Each type of scale has its merits and limitations.

Antonak and Livneh (1995) concluded that despite sophistication in statistical manipulation and sampling designs, the scaling methods still have the drawbacks of limited validity, the possibility of multidimensional scaling and spurious effects in terms of magnitude, complexity and centrality in predicting behavioural outcomes. Research findings are therefore equivocal as regarding attitude towards people with a disability. As noted by Fichten et.al 1989, 'the prevalence of positive description of individuals with disabilities may be due to social desirability, sympathy or self-presentation bias'. Antonak and Livneh (1995) recommended adopting non-direct response methods such as behavioural observations, interviews and self-reported measures alongside the scaling methods to validate the instruments, as well as to increase the plausibility in the interpretation of quantitative findings.

1.4.3 Relevance of social contact as a variable on attitude

Allport (1958) posited in his equal-status contact theory that involvement in activities of mutual interest and value would have an impact on the acceptance of children with a disability by non-disabled peers. His theory is still the basis of current research, especially in studying social acceptance of children with a disability in the integrated classroom (Archie & Sherill 1989; Diamon, Le-Furgy & Blass, 1993). Despite the general assumption in integrated education that contact promotes the development of positive attitudes, special education studies (Horne1985; Archie & Sherrill, 1989; Hastings & Graham, 1995) found that attitude change in children depends on whether the interactions are meaningful or carefully structured.

1.4.4 Interplay between cognition, affect and behavioural components

Hastings and Graham (1995) noted that perceptions and beliefs (the affective component of attitudes) toward children with a disability would affect children's readiness for social interaction and acceptance. On the other hand, a more accurate understanding of the needs, limitations and competence of children (cognitive component) with disabilities would increase the likelihood of acceptance. If interaction with children with disabilities is seen as threatening the social status and self-image of their non-disabled peers (both cognitive and affective components), there may be an increased likelihood of non-acceptance. As noted by Verplanken and Meijnders (1994), the positive evaluation of people with a disability is based on a process of cognitive

reasoning, while the negative affective response is based on emotions, which occur mainly without reasoning. They have stressed the importance of differentiating the dominance of individual components in the attitude construct.

Chapter Two: Methodology

2.1 Questionnaire Design:

In addressing the research objectives a and b (see section 1.3), essentially, the present research had to operationalize the attitude construct of school children towards people with a disability, particularly in the local context; and the operational issues in the construction of measuring instruments and accurate administering procedures. Bearing all this in mind, the study adopted the scaling method, vignette responses and adjective checklists to examine students' attitudes towards people with a disability. This multi-method design enabled cross validation of the instruments and also created rich database for our understanding of students' subjective perceptions and behavioural intentions in specific social situations.

Five categories of disabilities have been included in this research, viz. physically impaired*, intellectually impaired*, ex-mentally ill, hearing impaired and visually impaired. In enabling comparison of students' attitudes towards different disability types when the respondents come from different forms, it is better to have the same version as far as possible so that either cross sectional or longitudinal comparison would be feasible. Therefore, the structure and number of statements for the different versions of the questionnaires are similar and designed in accordance with the same conceptual constructs.

2.2 Scale Construction

Consultation and review of the conceptual dimensions, cultural relevance and psychometric properties of existing attitude scales was carried out in order to construct a local instrument. For the present study, the instrument is based on the three most widely used attitude scales: Scale of Attitudes towards Disabled Persons (SADP) (Antonak, 1988) Acceptance Scale (AS) by Voeltz (1980) and Student Questionnaire (SQ) by Shapiro (1999). Four components are included: optimism-human rights, behavioural misconceptions, pessimism-hopelessness and social acceptance. SADP addresses the first three components while AS and SQ address the fourth dimension of social acceptance. The SADP has already been validated on a group of 338 secondary students in Hong Kong in 1988 by Chan.

A big item pool was compiled incorporating all the items in the SADP, AS and SQ.

* The more commonly used terms 'physically handicapped' and 'mentally handicapped' are used in the questionnaire for easier understanding. In this report, terms 'physically handicapped/physically impaired' and 'mentally handicapped/intellectually impaired' are used interchangeably.

Based on the differentiation of the original scales, the items were grouped into four components: optimism-human rights, behavioural misconceptions, pessimism-hopelessness and social acceptance. In the optimism-human rights component, the statements expressed positive, optimistic views of people with disabilities and also affirmed their human rights to live and work as citizens of society. The behavioural misconceptions component described common misconceptions about the behaviour of people with a disability, such as they enjoy repetitive, menial work, should stay in institutions etc. The pessimism-hopelessness component stated negative, pessimistic beliefs about the educability, maturity and morality of people with a disability. The social acceptance component examined the possible reactions or behavioural intentions of students toward people with a disability in different social contexts.

Altogether more than 100 items were gathered in the item pool. After streamlining by deleting overlapping or similar items and culturally irrelevant items, the list included 57 items. The wording of the items was reviewed to provide a balance between positively worded and negatively worded statements. After further refinement and modifications, a scale with 48 items was compiled. There are 17 items in the social acceptance component, 8 items in the optimism-human rights component, 13 items in the behavioural misconception component and 9 items in the pessimism-hopelessness component (Table 1).

Focus groups with age specific children and adolescents with and without disabilities were conducted, and the preliminary scale was tested. Students also shared their impression, subjective attitudes, knowledge and experiences in relation to people with a disability. With their feedback and questions raised, the scale was further refined, descriptive labels (see section 2.4) drawn up and vignettes (see section 2.3) were constructed with reference to the most significant social interaction episodes between students with and without disabilities. The questionnaire was also reviewed by an expert panel consisting of educational psychologists, a school principal, social workers from Treats* and representatives of disability self-help groups. The content validity of the instrument is thus ensured through the review process.

In general, international studies report gradations of attitude differences towards people with physical or sensory impairment, intellectual impairment and mental illness. A different set of indices was established for children's attitudes toward five particular

* TREATS is a non-profit organization that aims to promote the concept of community integration for people who are disabled. The scope of their services includes integrative programmes for young people between 8-15 years old, public education on community integration, family programmes etc.

disability groups, intellectual impaired, mentally ill, physically impaired, hearing impaired and visually impaired.

2.3 Vignette Study

Vignettes were developed to provide a tangible social character and situation for the children as referent in responding to the questionnaire. The use of the vignettes was included partly to reduce the social desirability effect. Different categories of disability would be differentiated and each student would only be given the relevant vignette that depicted one particular type of disability. This avoided ambiguity and by controlling the sampling frame, comparison of children's attitudes across different types of disability could be made.

Three vignette situations were designed based on three social situations, respectively in school, neighbourhood and general social activities suitable for the particular age group. The responses to the vignettes depict social distance measures of the students towards a character with a specific type of disability. The vignettes were developed from a literature review and focus group interviews with students with and without disabilities.

2.4 Descriptive Labels

A list of descriptive labels was drawn up from focus group interviews regarding students' perceptions of people with a disability. The words and phrases chosen corresponded as far as possible to the students' own and a balance between positive and negative descriptions was closely monitored. Students were asked to choose five words or phrases from the list to describe the characteristics of people with a particular type of disability. Frequency counts of the descriptions reflected the most common perceived characteristics of people with disabilities.

2.5 Comparison Group

In addressing research objectives c-ii and c-iii (see section 1.3), the present research adopted the approach of having a comparison group to identify the impact of social interactions on attitudes. Because most of the students we interviewed in the focus groups have no prior contacts with people with a disability, taking prior social contacts as an independent variable in the sample runs the risk of having a very few students for comparison. A targeted comparison group serve the purpose better.

Non-disabled students in classes with students with disabilities and students participating in educational programmes organized by Treats were chosen as the comparison group as regarding their attitudes towards people with a disability. The age and forms of respondents in the comparison group were controlled as far as possible to match with the general sample. By comparing the results between the two groups, the effect of social contacts and educational programmes could be examined.

2.6 Sampling Frame

Since the survey on students' attitudes towards people with a disability was conducted alongside the other survey on students' attitudes towards gender stereotypes and family roles, the two surveys shared the same procedures both in selection of sampling frame and administration of field studies.

2.6.1 Multi-stage stratified proportional sampling

The target population of this survey consisted of all P4, F1, F4 and F6 students in Hong Kong with the exception of those from international schools, pre-vocational schools, special schools and evening schools because of the difference in curriculum. Schools were taken to be the basic unit in the sampling frame. There were a total of 819 (12 Boys', 21 Girls' & 786 co-ed.) primary and 433 (37 Boys', 47 Girls' and 349 co-ed) secondary schools (Education Department 2001) in our population. Each individual school constitutes one independent unit. In view of the various lines of division amongst the various types of primary and secondary schools in Hong Kong, the study employed a multi-stage stratified proportional sampling method. Essentially, we separated the primary schools, secondary schools and secondary schools with Form 6 and Form 7 as different populations in the sampling frame.

The sample size was spread across four different forms and five types of disability to enable us to examine students' attitudes towards specific groups of disabilities. In addition, given that the type of the school (single-sex or co-educational) might have an influence on students' perception of gender roles, a stratified, proportional-sampling method was adopted. All the schools in the target population were grouped under boys', girls' and co-education schools and samples were drawn from each stratum with reference to their respective proportions in the sampling frame. In the first stage of sampling, individual primary schools were the unit of sampling. Schools distributed geographically in the three major regions of Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories were taken as the first level of stratification. In the second stage, the

individual class was the sampling unit.

In order to get the sample size required, it was estimated that at least 21 primary and 21 secondary schools were needed in the sample. The first batch of 60 schools was randomly selected by a stratified, proportional-sampling method. Letters and samples of the questionnaires were sent to selected schools to invite their participation in the survey. However, after processing two batches, it was found that the acceptance rate was very low (about 7% to 8%). It was decided that the sampling frame had to be enlarged. Based on the acceptance rate and the sample size needed, invitation letters were sent to all secondary schools and to every alternate school on the primary school list supplied by the education department. 33 secondary schools and 30 primary schools agreed to participate. At the individual school's discretion, 2 classes in each form were selected from every participating school to be the participants of the study. Therefore, 2 classes in each primary school ($2 \times P.4$) and 6 classes in each secondary school ($2 \times F.1$, $2 \times F.4$ and $2 \times F.6$) were targeted as the sample. Breakdown of the sampled schools is as follows:

	Population		Sample		%	
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Boys	12	37	1	3	8.3	8.1
Girls	21	47	4	8	19.0	17.0
Co-ed	786	349	25	22	2.9	6.3
Total	819	433	30	33	3.7	7.6

2.6.2 Random quota sampling within each class of students

The two surveys, 'Students' Attitudes towards Gender Stereotypes, Family Roles and Non-Traditional family Types', and 'Students' Attitudes towards People with a Disability ' were conducted simultaneously within the participating schools. Classes to respond to the questionnaire were chosen by the schools and for each class of students, 40% were randomly assigned to fill in the questionnaire on gender stereotypes and family roles and the other 60% were participants in the survey on attitudes towards people with a disability. The group of students responding to the disability questionnaire were further divided into five sub-groups, each of them randomly assigned to fill in a questionnaire for a particular disability: (1) intellectual impairment (2) ex-mentally ill, (3) physical impairment, (4) hearing impairment and (5) visual impairment. Again, each questionnaire comprised a junior version (for P.4 and F.1

students) and a senior version (for F.4 and F.6 students). Hence, there are altogether 12 versions of the questionnaires, i.e. 2 versions for gender stereotypes and family roles (junior & senior), 10 versions for disability groups (5 disabilities each for junior and senior). The percentage of questionnaires distributed in each class was:

'Students' Attitudes towards Gender Stereotypes and Family Roles' = 40%

'Students' Attitudes towards People with a Disability' = 60% (12% x 5 disabilities types)

2.7 Administration Procedures

2.7.1. Training of survey assistants

There were a total of 258 classes included in the survey, and 75 field study assistants were involved. Almost all (96%) of the field study assistants were undergraduate or post-graduate students from local and overseas universities. All of them went through a training session before they were sent to do the survey. A manual describing the survey objectives, role of the assistants and the procedure in administering the questionnaires was given to every assistant during the training session. Emphasis was put on neutrality of the assistant and strict adherence to the procedures. A sample set of questionnaires was also given to familiarize them with the questions. A more experienced assistant was usually assigned as the team leader when they were dispatched to each school.

2.7.2. Pilot Test

A pilot study was done in two primary schools and three secondary schools to test-run the questionnaires and the administering procedure. A total of 182 questionnaires were completed. No major problem was noted from the pilot test except that some of the vocabulary in the questionnaires had to be modified to make it more comprehensive for junior students e.g. for the questionnaire on gender stereotypes, the term 「異性」 (opposite sex) was revised to 「另一個性別」 (another sex). Common mistakes in filling in the questionnaire were identified e.g. some students filled in the chosen answer as well as crossed out the un-selected answers. Subsequently, a special reminder was added in the preamble during the field study.

In one of the classes, a student was found to have difficulties in understanding the questionnaire and it was thus noted that some schools took in students with special needs without being classified as having an 'integrated programme' or 'resource class'

etc. Hence, special attention was given to inquiring about whether there were special needs students in the class when making the arrangements. If there were, consent was sought to have an individual/small group sharing session with the student(s). Also, extra interviewers were sent to that class.

From the number and nature of the questions asked by students in the pilot study, it was decided that 1-2 assistants were sufficient for one class. The average time for completing the questionnaire was 35 minutes.

2.7.3. Data collection procedure for the target group

The questionnaires were completed on site by the students in their respective classrooms with 1 or 2 trained assistant(s) present to provide help and guidance. An introduction briefly explaining the survey, its purpose and how the questions should be answered was read out by one of the assistants from a written preamble. Anonymity of the respondents, confidentiality, the importance of their subjective impressions rather than a 'right' or 'wrong' answer were emphasized. These crucial points were also printed on the front-page of the questionnaire. The students were asked to fill in the questionnaires with pencils and they were reminded to use the correct format to enable accuracy in optic scanning.

The distribution of the five types of questionnaire was determined according to the number of students in each class. To minimize error, a table showing the different composition of types of questionnaires was prepared beforehand for easy on-site administration in distributing the exact number of questionnaires according to class size. The questionnaires were then distributed randomly. The assistant(s) answered any questions the students had and minimized external influence on the respondents. Students were reminded not to discuss the answers among themselves. The questionnaire was read out by an assistant if any of the students asked for clarification. This was more common in the junior forms. The explanation of the meaning of the different items was as neutral and as matter of fact as possible to avoid influencing the responses of the students. After the students had completed and returned the questionnaires, the assistant(s) checked and made sure that all the questionnaires were collected. The average time for completing the questionnaires was 30 - 40 minutes.

2.7.4. Analysis of participating students

A total of 5107 questionnaires were collected for the survey on students' attitudes towards people with a disability. Of these, 38 were discarded and not analysed. They were considered invalid when (i) over half of the questions were unanswered, or (ii) when there was obvious evidence that the respondent was not being serious in responding to the questions. Examples included giving the same answer to all or most of the questions, noting a visual 'pattern' in the answer column or where the questionnaire was seriously defaced.

Distribution of questionnaires collected according to disability types and forms of students

	<u>MH</u> <u>n</u>	<u>MI</u> <u>n</u>	<u>PH</u> <u>n</u>	<u>HI</u> <u>n</u>	<u>VI</u> <u>n</u>	Total
P4	233	259	263	205	221	1181
F1	286	288	293	266	274	1407
F4	285	296	297	257	270	1405
F6	215	234	241	190	196	1076
invalid	13	5	6	4	10	38
Total	1032	1082	1100	922	971	5107

2.7.5. Data collection procedures for the comparison group

In studying students' attitudes towards people with a disability, two types of students were included in the comparison group. (1) Students in the sampled schools who had classmates with a disability (such as in schools with integrated programmes, a resource class, or in an ordinary class). (2) Participants in TREATS programmes who had contact with students with a disability. For this survey, groups of primary and secondary school students who had participated in a day or an overnight camp together with people with a disability were selected as the comparison group.

The procedures in administering the questionnaires to the contact group and the non-contact group was exactly the same. However, students in the TREATS programmes were given only a single questionnaire relating to the type of disability of their fellow students in the programme. Only those students without disabilities were asked to fill in the questionnaire. Due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions in the questionnaire, special consideration was given for the students with a disability in the programmes and classrooms. Participants in the TREATS programme were separated into two groups by the staff at the time the questionnaire was administered. For students with a disability in primary and secondary schools, depending on the

number involved, one or two social-work-trained field study assistant(s) met them separately in small groups. A semi-structured interview guideline was given to the assistants to help them elicit the students' school experience and feelings.

2.7.6. Analysis of disability types with whom students in the comparison group had contact (including Treats programmes and students in ordinary schools)

Distribution of comparison group according to school settings and disability types

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	S	J	S	J	S	J	S	J	S	J
Treats	15	207	---	---	31	13	---	---	---	21
ordinary school	---	69	---	---	---	---	69	38	39	---
resource class	---	5	---	4	---	4	---	4	---	4
IE & remedial class	---	31	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
sub-total	15	312	---	4	31	17	69	42	39	25
TOTAL	327		4		48		111		64	

2.8 Time schedule

April – June 2000	literature review and construction of survey instruments
July – August 2000	focus groups
Sept. – Dec. 2000	drafting and revisions of questionnaires Recruitment and training of interviewers Invite schools for pilot testing Sample selection (target and comparison)
Jan. – April, 2001	confirmation of questionnaires Pilot test Invitation and confirmation of sampled schools Field study – data collection Data cleaning and scanning
May – Sept, 2001	Data analysis and drafting of report

Chapter Three : Results

3.1 Profile of Respondents

A total of 5069 useable questionnaires were collected for the disability survey. Five types of questionnaire that explored students' attitudes towards people with intellectual impairment, ex-mental illness, physical impairment, hearing impairment and visual impairment were distributed. The distribution of respondents in accordance with their respective forms and types of questionnaires is shown in Table 4.2. The total sample included P4 (1,181), F1 (1,407), F4 (1,405) and F6 (1,076). There were more female respondents (58.4%) than male respondents (41.6%) in the sample. The percentages of female respondents increased with age from 53.2% in P4 to 63.5% in F6 (Table 4.1). The number of respondents for each type of questionnaire was respectively 1019 for intellectual impairment, 1077 for ex-mental illness, 1094 for physical impairment, 918 for hearing impairment and 961 for visual impairment (Table 4.2).

As shown in Table 4.5, most of the respondents were living in public housing (40.3%), private housing (37.9%), and home-ownership housing/sandwich class housing (13.1%). Only a very small percentage of the respondents occupied rooms in private flats or other types of housing (8.7%). Roughly one third of the respondents (36.2%) indicated that they were acquainted or had had contact with people with a disability (Table 4.7). Among this group of respondents, 12.8% and 14.4% had family members or relatives with a disability. Another 23.2% and 25.2% had known people with a disability in the capacity of friends or service recipients (Table 4.8). Most of the respondents said that their main sources of information about people with a disability came from television programmes (63.4%) or newspapers/magazines (37.2%). 23.9% indicated that they formed their impressions from direct contacts with people with a disability (Table 4.9). 44% had never participated in educational programmes on equal opportunities while 40.9% had come across such programmes in the mass media, i.e. television announcements of public interest or television docu-dramas about equal opportunities.(Table 4.10).

3.2 Psychometric Properties and Structure of the Attitude Scale

The mean and standard deviation for each item, as well as the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient between each item and the total sub-scale score were calculated. All items were able to discriminate adequately between high and low scorers on the sub-scales. To test the reliability, Cronbach's Alphas were computed for

the four attitude component sub-scales for each disability type (Table 1.7). All the sub-scales had good reliability scores, ranging from 0.69 to 0.85. When factorial analysis was computed to examine the structure of the scale, a principal component was found to dominate the scale, with an Eigen value of 12.7 and upon rotation, the resolution of factors did not correspond well with the four sub-scales. The commonality among items as well as among sub-scales was strong. This meant that there was considerable overlapping between the four sub-scales that were not describing mutually exclusive conceptual dimensions in attitudes. They were interlocking facets of attitude components. The Pearson product moment correlation matrix of the four sub-scales was shown in Table 1.8. Correlation scores ranged from 0.57 ($p<0.001$) to 0.73 ($p<0.001$) showing inter-relatedness or overlapping among the four conceptual constructs. The internal reliability and inter-relatedness of the four attitude components indicates the consistency of items within and between each component. Although there was considerable overlapping, the four components were considered useful and reliable in measuring the students' attitudes.

The four sub-scales were able to differentiate between student attitudes both among the different forms and also towards people with different types of disabilities. The attitude component sub-scales showed that students had less favourable attitudes towards people with intellectual impairment and the ex-mentally ill. This differentiating power supported the predictive power and general validity of the sub-scales. The attitude component scores were also highly correlated with the vignette responses, an indication of the concurrent validity of the instrument. The results of the descriptions of people with disabilities also converged with the direction and pattern of attitude scores and vignette scores of the students. The primary students were more undifferentiating and positive in their attitudes towards people with disabilities. This evidence and the reliability analysis of the attitude component sub-scales supported the validity of the instrument.

3.3 Students' Attitudes Towards People with a Disability: Baseline and Variations

3.3.1 Students' attitudes towards people with a disability

The mean score for each statement in the Students' Attitudes Towards People with a Disability Scale was computed for each form of students and type of disability. The mean scores were computed by assigning values to students' responses as follows. For positively worded statements, the item score equals 1 for strongly agree, 2 for agree, 3

for disagree and 4 for strongly disagree. For negatively worded statements, the item score equals 4 for strongly disagree, 3 for disagree, 2 for agree and 1 for strongly agree. A detailed breakdown of the mean scores was shown in the sets of tables under Table 1. The mean scores of the whole sample for individual statements were computed and their variations between disability types computed by ANOVA (see Table 1.5.1 to Table 1.5.4).

Within the social acceptance sub-scale, except for the three statements in A38, A39 and A33, there were significant differences in students' responses across disability types. The association between attitude and disability types was most noticeable in students' reactions towards statement A27 (nauseated watching a person with a disability eat) ($F=70.8$, $p < 0.001$); A28, (using disability labels to tease others), ($F=89.0$, $p < 0.001$); A25 (sitting next to a person with a disability on a bus) ($F=111.6$, $p < 0.001$); and A45 (fearing interactions with people with disabilities because they are unpredictable) ($F=80.4$, $p < 0.001$). The pattern of variation between disability types will be reported and discussed for the summated scores of each attitude component in the following sections.

In order to compare students' attitudes across the different items, the average of the mean scores of all 47 statements, (overall mean = 2.0), was taken to be the cut off value in differentiating the statements with more negative responses. Those statements with a mean score greater than the overall mean, i.e. a value of 2.0 would be those with more negative responses. Taking a cut-off value of 2.0, 6 out of a total of 17 statements yielded more negative responses. These statements require a more personal involvement or interaction with people with a disability. Students had more reservation towards interacting with people with a disability because they are often unpredictable and violent (A45, mean score = 2.1). They were also less inclined to tell people if they had a brother or sister with a disability (A26, mean score = 2.2). A higher proportion of students considered people with a disability difficult to get along with (A34, mean score = 2.2) and were unwillingly to have a neighbour with disabilities (A1, mean score = 2.2). Many students demonstrated a segregationist orientation as they thought special schooling preferable to integrated schooling (A6, mean score = 2.5) and that those with a disability would be more comfortable with 'their own kind' (A33, mean score = 2.6).

On the other hand, students tended to respond rather positively in acknowledging the human rights of people with a disability (see Table 1.5.2). They had positive attitudes towards seven out of a total of eight statements under the optimism-human

right sub-scale. On the whole, the majority of students supported the right of people with a disability to receive education (A12), choose their place of residence (A4), have chances of employment (A15), working benefits (A14) and legal protection (A16), intimate relationships (A23) and community presence (A2). However, when it came to issues of residence, more students took the view that people with a disability should live with others who had similar disabilities (A3, mean score = 2.2), indicating an attitude of exclusion.

Students' responses to the statements in the behavioural misconception sub-scale were, in general, unfavorable. Out of a total of 13 statements, 9 statements yielded a mean score above 2, indicating more negative attitudes towards people with a disability. More students regarded them as burdensome (A47, mean score = 2.1), bizarre (A32, mean score = 2.2), adversely affecting others in the regular classroom (A7, mean score = 2.3), naturally inferior (A30, mean score = 2.3), deviant in personality (A40, mean score = 2.3), unpredictable and impulsive (A40, mean score = 2.4), handicapped in all situations (A31, mean score = 2.4), appropriate for repetitive work (A13, mean score = 2.4) and accident prone (A44, mean score = 2.8). In particular, the misconceptions of bizarreness, deviant personality and unpredictability were associated strongly with disability type as indicated by the F-values ($F=166.5$, $p < 0.001$ for A32; $F=90.4$, $p < 0.001$ for A46 and $F=124.2$, $p < 0.001$ for A40). As we have discussed elsewhere here in this report, students had a tendency to associate bizarreness etc. with the ex-mentally ill and people with an intellectual impairment, rather than those with physical and sensory deficits.

The pessimism hopelessness sub-scale is composed of negative and discriminatory value statements. Students refuted many of these oppressive notions associated with people with a disability and therefore students' scores on this sub-scale, in general, reflected a favorable attitude. They were against them being described as 'useless eaters' (A19), deprived of child bearing rights (A24), wasteful of resources (A22), unfit for survival (A42), uneducable (A10) and unable to fit into the competitive environment (A21). Students also affirmed the responsibility of the government towards people with a disability (A20). However, a higher proportion of students thought that they were more inclined to develop criminal tendencies (A43, mean score = 2.1) and were concerned about the heavy investment of resources in providing rehabilitation programmes and facilities. (A17, mean score = 2.4).

3.3.2 Baseline of students' attitudes

The means and standard deviations of students' scores on the four attitude component sub-scales were shown in Table 1.9 (a higher score means a less favourable attitude towards people with a disability). The descriptive statistics of attitude component measures constitute a baseline for the purpose of the present study and future comparison. For easy reference and conceptual simplicity, a set of indices of students' attitudes towards people with different types of disabilities was computed by converting the four attitude component scores along a scale between 1 and 100. Four indices were computed to constitute the baseline measurement of students along the four sub-scales of social acceptance, optimism-human rights, behavioural misconception and pessimism-hopelessness (see Table 1.6.1 to 1.6.4). It would be possible for all four-attitude component scores to be taken as attitude baseline measures thus showing the different conceptual dimensions of attitude constructs. On the other hand, for easier comparison and understanding of the research findings to the lay public, the social acceptance attitude component was taken as the key index of the baseline measurement of students' attitudes towards people with disabilities. The social acceptance component had the highest reliability scores and reflected mainly the students' behavioural intentions towards people with a disability apart from the evaluative and cognitive dimensions of the other attitude components. It was also found to have a high correlation with the vignette responses and therefore was more predictive of students' responses to people with a disability in social interactions. The baseline measurement of the social acceptance component across different forms and disability types was shown in Table 1.6.1.

3.3.3 Variations across different forms

ANOVA was computed to examine the variations in attitude component sub-scale scores for different forms of students. As shown in Table 1.9, the F-values are respectively 29.8 ($p<0.001$) for social acceptance, 13.3 ($p<0.001$) for optimism-human rights, 13.3 ($p<0.001$) for behavioural misconceptions and 39.7 ($p<0.001$) for pessimism-hopelessness. It is therefore evident from the statistics that students from different forms varied significantly in their attitudes towards people with a disability based on the four sub-scales. Multiple comparison (Table 1.10) indicates that the correlation between attitude scores and age is not a linear relationship. In multiple comparisons, F1 and F4 students apparently scored higher in their attitude component scores. The scores of P4 and F6 students indicated a more favourable attitude in comparison with the other two forms. The same pattern of attitude differences among the various forms was evident as more refined comparisons were computed among students responding to the questionnaire with the same disability type (Table 1.11).

3.3.4 Variations across disability types

ANOVA was also computed to examine the variations of attitude component scores for different disability types within each form. As shown in Table 1.9, the F scores indicate all classes, except P4, have significant differences in their attitude component scores toward different disability groups. The F-value increased for higher forms, indicating a more diverse and clearer differentiation in their attitudes towards the different disability categories. Further analysis with Tukey HSD showed that students in F1, F4 and F6 scored significantly higher in their attitude component scores, which means a less favourable attitude tendency, towards those with an intellectual impairment and those who have experienced mental illness. On the other hand, the three other disability groups (the physically, hearing and visually impaired) were in the same homogeneous subset along the four attitude component sub-scales (Table 1.11). Multi-comparison analysis confirmed that secondary school students (including F1, F4 and F6) have a less favourable attitude towards the learning impaired and those who have experienced mental illness in comparison with the physically, visually and hearing impaired.

3.3.4 Association with demographic and socio-economic variables

To examine the relationships between students' attitudes towards people with a disability and the demographic and socio-economic variables, either a T-test or ANOVA were computed to test for the significance of these independent variables on the attitude component scores of social acceptance, optimism-human rights, behavioural misconceptions and pessimism-hopelessness. Among the list of demographic variables, sex and forms were found to be statistically significant in predicting the dependent variable of attitude component scores. As shown in Table 4.11, the female students had a more favourable attitude towards people with a disability, albeit a small one, as indicated by the marginal mean-differences. The sex differences in students' attitudes towards people with a disability was shown in Table 4.11: the respective t-scores being $t=9.7$ ($p<0.001$) for social acceptance, $t=8.4$ ($p<0.001$) for optimism-human rights, $t=6.7$ ($p<0.001$) for behavioural misconceptions and $t=6.9$ ($p<0.001$) for pessimism hopelessness.

The relationship between the students' forms and their attitudes has been examined in an elaborate manner in sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 of this chapter so they will not be repeated here. The educational levels of father and mother, number of computers

at home and family composition were found to have no significant relationship to the attitude component scores. Housing type, a gross socio-economic indicator, were found to have a significant relationship with the attitude component scores through ANOVA. The small F-value and the marginal difference in the mean attitude component scores between the different housing types indicated that the association is a weak one. In Table 4.12, the association between housing types and attitude component scores was reported with their respective F-values: $F=3.6$ ($p<0.05$) for social acceptance, $F=8.3$ ($p<0.001$) for optimism-human rights, $F=5.3$ ($p<0.001$) for behavioural misconceptions and $F=5.8$ ($p<0.001$) for pessimism-hopelessness. The weak associations between demographic and socio-economic variables may be due to the presence of too many confounding variables and also the difficulty in gaining accurate socio-economic data on the students. Housing type and number of computers at home were only crude general measures to indicate the economic status of students. The findings suggest that the economic background of students may have some bearing on their attitudes but the relationship is by no means clear.

3.4 Vignette Responses

Frequency distributions of students' responses to the three vignette situations were described in Table 2.1, Table 2.2, Table 2.3, and Table 2.4. Chi-square statistics were computed for vignette 1 and 3 to examine whether significant differences exist in students' responses to the vignette situations across different age groups.

3.4.1 Vignette responses to people with intellectual impairment

The first vignette situation describes a school setting and the students were asked to indicate whether they would involve another student with an intellectual impairment in their peer activities. In Table 2.1, the Pearson Chi-square is 70.7 ($p<0.001$) showing significant differences among students of different forms in their responses to Vignette 1. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages (Table 2.1), P4 students (59.5%) were more positive than the F1 (39.2%), F4 (25.0%) and F6 students (37.9%) in indicating a definite willingness to invite the classmate with intellectual impairment to join in their peer activities during recess time.

The second vignette for the junior forms (P4 and F1) asked for the students' responses when they identified a person with intellectual impairment on a bus. As shown in Table 2.2, the percentages of F1 (42.8%) and P4 (39.0%) students expressing willingness to sit by a person with intellectual impairment were more or less the same.

For the senior forms (F4 and F6), the second vignette situation asked whether they would invite a young person with intellectual impairment to a birthday party. Around half of the respondents (51.4% for F4 and 60.3% for F6) said that they would most likely do so. Only very few (13.8% for F4 and 8.4% for F6) indicated that they were unlikely or most unlikely to involve the young person with intellectual impairment (Table 2.3).

The third vignette describes a neighbourhood situation in which the student was asked whether they would introduce another young person with intellectual impairment to their neighbours. In Table 2.4, the Pearson Chi-square is 26.7 ($p<0.01$) showing significant differences among students of different forms in their responses to Vignette 3. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages, the differences among students of different forms were not as obvious as those in Vignette 1. P4 (60.3%) and F6 students (61.2%) displayed slightly higher percentages in their likelihood to introduce a young person with intellectual impairment to their neighbours (Table 2.4).

3.4.2 Vignette responses to the ex-mentally ill

The first vignette situation describes a school setting and the students were asked to indicate whether they would involve another student who was an ex-mentally ill person in their peer activities. In Table 2.1, the Pearson Chi-square is 82.9 ($p<0.001$) showing significant differences among students of different forms in their responses to Vignette 1. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages, P4 students (68.0%) were more positive than the F1 (42.5%), F4 (33.6%) and F6 students (38.9%) in indicating a more definite willingness to invite the ex-mentally ill classmate to join in their peer activities during recess time (Table 2.1).

The second vignette for the junior forms (P4 and F1) asked for the students' responses when they identified an ex-mentally ill person in a bus where the only vacant seat was next to this person. As shown in Table 2.2, F1 students (48.1%) were more likely than the P4 (34.7%) to sit by the side of an ex-mentally-ill person. For the senior forms (F4 and F6), the second vignette situation asked whether they would invite an ex-mentally ill young person to a birthday party. Around 70% of the respondents (69.8% for F4 and 67.5% for F6) expressed that they would most likely do so. Only very few (9.2% for F4 and 7.7% for F6) indicated that they were unlikely or most unlikely to invite the young person with a mental illness (Table 2.3).

The third vignette describes a neighbourhood situation in which the student was

asked whether they would introduce an ex-mentally ill young person to their neighbours. In Table 2.4, the Pearson Chi-square is 21.5 ($p<0.05$) showing significant differences among students in different forms in their responses to Vignette 3. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages, the differences among students of different forms were not so obvious as those in Vignette 1. P4 (63.8%) and F6 students (57.3%) displayed higher percentages than the F1 (50.2%) and F4 students (54.9%) in their likelihood to introduce an ex-mentally ill young person to their neighbours (Table 2.4).

3.4.3 Vignette responses to people with physical impairment

The first vignette situation describes a school setting and the students were asked to indicate whether they would involve another student with physical impairment in their peer activities. In Table 2.1, the Pearson Chi-square is 60.7 ($p<0.001$) showing significant differences among students of different forms in their responses to Vignette 1. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages, P4 students (69.3%) were more positive than the F1 (50.3%), F4 (41.1%) and F6 students (49.4%) in indicating a more definite willingness to invite the classmate with a physical impairment to join in their peer activities during recess time (Table 2.1).

The second vignette for the junior forms (P4 and F1) asked for the students' responses when they identified a person with physical impairment in a bus. As shown in Table 2.2, less than one-third of the F1 students (27.7%) and P4 (30.5%) were willing to sit by the side of a person with physical impairment. For the senior forms (F4 and F6), the second vignette situation asked whether they would invite a young person with physical impairment to a birthday party. Around 70% of the respondents (73.7% for F4 and 69.7% for F6) expressed that they would most likely do so. Only very few (4.7% for F4 and 7.9% for F6) indicated that they were unlikely or most unlikely to invite the young person with a physical impairment (Table 2.3).

The third vignette describes a neighbourhood situation in which the student was asked whether they would introduce another young person with a physical impairment to their neighbours. In Table 2.4, the Pearson Chi-square is 39.4 ($p<0.001$) showing significant differences among students of different forms in their responses to Vignette 3. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages, the differences among students of different forms were not so obvious as those in Vignette 1. P4 (69.7%) and F6 students (73.9%) displayed slightly higher percentages than the F1 (60.3%) and F4 students (63.6%) in their likelihood of introducing a young person with physical

impairment to their neighbours (Table 2.4).

3.4.4 Vignette responses to people with a hearing impairment

The first vignette situation describes a school setting and the students were asked to indicate whether they would involve another student with hearing impairment in the peer activities. In Table 2.1, the Pearson Chi-square is 70.0 ($p<0.001$) showing significant differences among students of different forms in their responses to Vignette 1. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages, P4 students (70.2%) were more likely than the F1 (52.3%), F4 (47.1%) and F6 (41.6%) students to invite the classmate with hearing impairment to join in their peer activities during recess time (Table 2.1).

The second vignette for the junior forms (P4 and F1) asked for the students' responses when they identified a person with hearing impairment in a bus. As shown in Table 2.2, F1 students (58.0%) were more likely than the P4 (34.6%) to sit by the side of a person with hearing impairment. The senior forms (F4 and F6) were asked to indicate whether they would invite a young person with a hearing impairment to a birthday party. Around 80% of the students, 77.8% for F4 and 84.7% for F6 indicated they would most likely to do so (Table 2.3).

The third vignette describes a neighbourhood situation in which the student was asked whether they would introduce another young person with a hearing impairment to their neighbours. In Table 2.4, the Pearson Chi-square is 26.2 ($p<0.01$) showing significant differences among students of different forms in their responses to Vignette 3. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages, the differences among students of different forms were not so obvious than those of Vignette 1. Around 60% of the students, P4 (64.9%), F1 (58.0%), F4 (61.5%) and F6 students (65.3%), expressed they were most likely to introduce a young person with hearing impairment to their neighbours (Table 2.4).

3.4.5 Vignette responses to people with a visual impairment

The first vignette situation describes a school setting and the students were asked to indicate whether they would involve another student with visual impairment in the peer activities. In Table 2.1, the Pearson Chi-square is 34.9 ($p<0.001$) showing significant differences among students of different forms in their responses to Vignette 1. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages, P4 students (63.6%) were more likely than the F1 (48.4%), F4 (40.5%) and F6 (41.8%) students to invite the

classmate with visual impairment to join in their peer activities during recess time (Table 2.1).

The second vignette for the junior forms (P4 and F1) asked for the students' responses when they identified a person with visual impairment on a bus. As shown in Table 2.2 one-third of the junior form students, F1 students (37.6%) and P4 (31.7%) were willing to sit by the side of a person with visual impairment. The senior forms (F4 and F6) were asked to indicate whether they would invite a young person with a visual impairment to a birthday party and 64.3% of F4 and 80.1% of F6 students indicated they would most likely do so (Table 2.3).

The third vignette describes a neighbourhood situation in which the student was asked whether they would introduce another young person with visual impairment to their neighbours. In Table 2.4, the Pearson Chi-square is 30.2 ($p<0.001$) showing significant differences among students of different forms in their responses to Vignette 3. As noted from the frequency distribution percentages, the differences among students of different forms were not so obvious as those in Vignette 1. When asked whether they would introduce a young person with a visual impairment to their neighbours, 63.9% of P4, 52.9% of F1, 57.6% of F4 and 70.9% of F6 students said that they were most likely to do so (Table 2.4).

3.4.6 Association with demographic and socio-economic variables

To examine the relationship between vignette responses and the demographic and socio-economic variables, Chi-square statistics were computed to test for the significance of these independent variables. As shown in Table 2.5.1, Table 2.5.4, Table 2.5.5, Table 2.5.6 and Table 2.5.7, the Chi-square statistics of students' responses to the three vignette situations were summarized to indicate the significance of the independent variables of sex, education of father and mother, housing type and number of computers at home. Other than the sex variable, the other Chi-square tables (Tables 2.5.4 and 2.5.7) failed to have a consistent and strong association of the demographic variables across the vignette responses for different forms. Since the Chi-square statistic is a non-parametric measure and thus less sensitive than parametric measures, findings in relation to the variations in vignette responses only serve as confirmatory to the t-test and regression statistics in Section 3.3.4. The few isolated significant Chi-square scores in relation to education of father and mother, housing types and number of computers at home could not be taken as sufficient evidence for a significant relationship.

On the other hand, the variable of sex had a more consistent and significant relationship with students' responses across the three vignette situations and for all forms. There were significant differences between male and female students in their responses to all three vignettes, except those for students in F.4 for vignette 1 and students in F.6 for vignette 2. Female students in different forms responded more positively for all vignette situations than male students. Findings in relations to the association between vignette responses and demographic variables echoed the analysis of the variation of attitude component scores in section 3.3.4.

3.5 Descriptions of People with a Disability

Students were asked to select five descriptions applicable to a person with a given type of disability in the questionnaire. Tables 3.1 to 3.5 summarize the frequencies of the descriptive labels for different forms with the percentages in descending sequences. There were striking similarities for the first three descriptive labels across disability types. Half of the respondents regarded people with a disability as pitiful and more than one third thought that people with a disability should be helped, but that they are in no way different from ordinary people.

3.5.1 Descriptions of people with intellectual impairment

There are more negative labels than positive ones among the top ten descriptions. Those students (including P4, F1, F4 and F6) responding to the questionnaire on intellectual impairment generally described people with intellectual impairment as having poor self-expression skills (49.7%), pitiable (47.6%) should be offered help (33.2%) unvigilant (27.7%) having weird behaviours (24.1%) naïve (20.9%) not harmful to others (19.2%) poor in social skills (18.0%) lacking self-confidence (17.7%) and just like ordinary people (17.1%). There were relatively fewer positive descriptions among the secondary school students while more P4 students perceived the positive qualities of being considerate (27.2%) easy-going (27.2%) eager to make progress (16.4%) and self-confident (16.4%) (Table 3.1).

3.5.2 Descriptions of ex-mentally ill people

There are more negative labels than positive ones among the top ten descriptions. Those students (including P4, F1, F4 and F6) responding to the questionnaire about the ex-mentally ill generally described ex-mentally ill people as pitiable (39.1%) should be

offered help (35.2%) poor in self expression skills (33.8%) just like ordinary people (29.5%) lacking self-confidence (25.2%) self-abasing (25.2%) poor in social skills (23.2%) having weird behaviour (19.6%) unvigilant (19.5%) and unpredictably explosive (17.5%). There were similarities in the descriptions between the secondary school students in F1, F4 and F6 in comparison with the P4 students. More P4 students perceived the positive qualities of not being harmful to others (33.6%) considerate (29.7%) easy going (21.2%) self-confident (21.2%) and eager to make progress (18.9%) (Table 3.2).

3.5.3 Descriptions of people with a physical impairment

There are both positive and negative labels among the top ten descriptions for people with a physical impairment. Those students (including P4, F1, F4 and F6) responding to the questionnaire about physical impairment used descriptions such as pitiable (48.4%), should be offered help (43.4%), just like ordinary people (39.6%), eager to make progress (28.7%), not harmful to others (27.4%), admirable (25.6%), constantly striving to improve themselves (25.2%), lacking self-confidence (24.9%), self-abasing (23.7%) and self-protective (19.2%). There were similarities in the descriptions between the secondary school students of F1, F4 and F6 in comparison with the P4 students. More P4 students perceived the positive qualities of being considerate (37.2%), easy-going (26.1%), self-confident (18.4%) and the negative quality of being unvigilant (19.9%) as compared with the secondary school students (Table 3.3).

3.5.4 Descriptions of people with a hearing impairment

There are both positive and negative labels among the top ten descriptions for people with a hearing impairment. Those students (including P4, F1, F4 and F6) responding to the questionnaire about hearing impairment used descriptions such as just like ordinary people (46.7%), pitiable (45.6%), should be offered help (44.3%), lacking self-confidence (25.1%), poor in self-expressive skills (24.8%), not harmful to others (24.7%), self-abasing (22.4%), poor in social skills (22.3%), eager to make progress (21.1%) and amiable (19.1%). There were similarities in the descriptions among the secondary school students of F1, F4 and F6 in comparison with the P4 students. More P4 students perceived the positive qualities of being considerate (33.7%), easy-going (26.3%), self-confident (22.0%) and the negative quality of unvigilant (24.4%) as compared with the secondary school students (Table 3.4).

3.5.5 Descriptions of people with a visual impairment

There are both positive and negative labels among the top ten descriptions for people with a visual impairment. Those students (including P4, F1, F4 and F6) responding to the questionnaire about people with a visual impairment generally described them as pitiable (49.4%), should be offered help (45.1%), just like ordinary people (39.5%), lacking self-confidence (26.7%), not harmful to others (25.2%), self-abasing (24.2%), admirable (23.4%), constantly striving to improve themselves (23.2%), eager to make progress (22.5%), amiable (20.8%) and self-protective (20.8%). There were similarities in the descriptions among the secondary school students of F1, F4 and F6 in comparison with the P4 students. More P4 students perceived the positive qualities of being considerate (31.2%), easy-going (28.1%) and self-confident (18.1%) and the negative quality of unvigilant (19.5%) as compared with the secondary school students. (Table 3.5).

3.6 Effects of Social Contacts and Educational Programmes

3.6.1 Variations within the sample

Based on the self-reported data in the questionnaire, roughly one third of the respondents (36.2%) indicated that they were acquainted or had contact with people with a disability in the capacity of family members, friends, classmates or service recipients (see Table 4.7). Using 'knowing' or 'not knowing' people with a disability as the independent variable of social contact, the t-test comparison indicated that students who knew people with a disability had a slightly more favorable attitude: $t=9.2$ ($p<0.001$) for social acceptance, $t=6.4$ ($p<0.001$) for optimism-human rights, $t=4.1$ ($p<0.001$) for behavioural misconceptions and $t=4.4$ ($p<0.001$) for pessimism hopelessness (Table 4.13).

Adopting the same variable, Chi-square statistics were also computed to examine the effect of this variable on the vignette responses for different forms (see Table 2.6.1 to Table 2.6.3). The effect of 'knowing' people with a disability on the vignette responses could be taken as a small one in view of the marginal differences in the percentages and the small value of the Chi-square statistics. The association was more evident for Vignette 1. A higher percentage of students who were acquainted with people with a disability indicated more favorable social distance responses to Vignette 1. However, the effect of acquaintance with people with a disability was, however, not

so evident for P.4, F.4 and F.6 students in Vignette 2 and also for F.1 students in Vignette 3. Since non-parametric measures run the risk of crudeness and spurious factors, the Chi-square statistics could be taken as confirmatory evidence in addition to the t-test comparisons of attitude component scores reported earlier in this section. We can conclude that social contact appears to have some effect on students' attitudes towards people with a disability.

44% of the respondents in the sample indicated that they had never participated in educational programmes about equal opportunities (Table 4.10). Their attitude component scores were compared with those who had participated in educational programmes. T-test comparison indicated that there were significant attitude differences between the participants and non-participants. Those who had been exposed to educational programmes about equal opportunities had a more favourable attitude as indicated by the lower mean value and the significance of the t-scores: $t=8.7$ ($p<0.001$) for social acceptance, $t=8.1$ ($p<0.001$) for optimism-human rights, $t=7.7$ ($p<0.001$) for behavioural misconceptions and $t=7.1$ ($p<0.001$) for pessimism-hopelessness (Table 4.14).

Again, Chi-square statistics were also computed to examine the effect of this variable on the vignette responses for different forms (see Table 2.7.1 to Table 2.7.3). The effect of participation in equal opportunity programmes on the vignette responses could be taken as a small one in view of the marginal differences in the percentages and the small value of the Chi-square statistics. The association was more evident for Vignette 1 and Vignette 3. A higher percentage of students who had participated in equal opportunity programmes indicated more favorable social distance responses to Vignette 1 and Vignette 3 across all the forms. However, the effect of participation in programmes was not so evident for P.4, F.4 and F.6 students in Vignette 2. Since non-parametric measures are not a sensitive statistical tool, the Chi-square statistics should be taken as confirmatory evidence to further support the effects of educational programmes on attitude component scores reported earlier in this section.

However, the difference in attitude component scores between the contact and non-contact groups could be explained either in terms of the impact of the educational programmes or a self-selection factor. The participants might be influenced by the educational programmes to have a more positive attitude, or their general positive attitude towards people with a disability increased the chances of them participating in the educational programmes. The direction of causality can only be proven through further research.

3.6.2 Comparison between those who had contact with people with a disability and those who did not among junior students

Table 5 summarized t-test comparison in attitude component scores across disability types for the junior group of students (P4 and F1). For students responding to questionnaires about people with intellectual impairment, the comparison group (those who had had contact) showed significantly higher scores on all four of the attitude component sub-scales, indicating a less favourable attitude than the corresponding target group of the overall sample. The t-test statistics were respectively $t=4.48$ ($p<0.001$), $t=5.98$ ($p<0.001$), $t=4.06$ ($p<0.001$) and $t=5.45$ ($p<0.001$) for the four attitude component scores of social acceptance, optimism-human rights, behavioural misconceptions, pessimism-hopelessness.

In Table 6, the Chi-Square statistics between vignette responses of the contact versus non-contact groups provided further supporting evidence of the attitude difference between the two groups of students. The Chi-Square test indicated significant differences in responses to vignette 1 ($\chi^2=25.87$; $p<0.001$) and 3 ($\chi^2=28.31$; $p<0.001$) between the two groups in responding to questionnaires about people with intellectual impairment. Fewer students in the contact group had the 'most likely' response to interact with the person with intellectual impairment in the social situations of vignette 1 and vignette 3. Therefore, comparison of both the attitude component scores and vignette responses apparently showed that the contact group had a less favourable attitude towards people with intellectual impairment. A similar result was also found in vignette 1 for hearing impairment. However, no significant difference was found between the comparison and the target groups for physical impairment and visual impairment in all the three vignettes.

In view of the heterogeneous background and age-range of the contact group, it may be misleading to attribute the apparent differences to any single factor such as social contacts with people with a disability or participation in educational programmes. Further analysis to examine the composition of the contact group was made to explore the underlying factors of attitude differences between the comparison group and the sample. The 312 students in the contact group were mainly made up of three types of student. A further analysis of the three sub-groups and their respective attitude component scores was computed and analysed. Among the 312 students in the comparison group, 135 students were either F1 or F2 students who had participated in Treats programmes (JCMH1), 105 were P4 or P5 students with classmates who were

intellectually impaired or had learning difficulties (JCMH2) and another 72 students were P4 or P5 students who had participated in Treats programmes (JCMH3). So all three groups of students had prior contact with children with intellectual impairment.

Distribution of Comparison Group for MH (Junior)

	Treats	resource class	IE & remedial class	ordinary school	Total
JCMHI	135	---	---	---	135
JCMH2	---	5	31	69	105
JCMH3	72	---	---	---	72

With ANOVA, significant differences were found on all four component scores (Table 7). The F values were 35.3 ($p<0.001$), 27.9 ($p<0.001$), 20.4 ($p<0.001$) and 25.3 ($p<0.001$) for social acceptance, optimism-human rights, behavioural misconceptions and pessimism-hopelessness respectively. With multiple comparison, it was found that the JCMH3 group had significantly smaller attitude component scores than the other two groups, indicating a more favourable attitude towards people with intellectual impairment than the other two groups (Table 7). Apparently, the difference in attitude scores within the contact group implied a complex model in explaining the relationship between social contact and attitude. It would be necessary to control the demographic and other confounding variables among the contact group to achieve a more meaningful comparison. Further research to control more rigorously the various independent variables and demographic profile of contact and non-contact groups would be required to examine the impact of social contact and educational programmes on the attitudes of students.

3.6.3 Comparison between contact and non-contact groups among senior students

Table 8 summarized t-test comparisons of attitude component scores across disability types for the senior group of students (F4 and F6). For students responding to questionnaires about people with visual impairment, the comparison group showed significantly higher scores on all four of the attitude component sub-scales, indicating a less favourable attitude than the non-contact group (Table 8). The t-test statistics were respectively $t=5.15$ ($p<0.001$), $t=3.50$ ($p<0.001$), $t=3.13$ ($p<0.01$) and $t=4.49$ ($p<0.001$) for the social acceptance, optimism-human rights behavioural misconceptions and pessimism-hopelessness attitude components for students responding to questionnaires of visual impairment.

Students responding to questionnaires about people with physical disabilities also showed less favourable attitudes for the contact group. They yielded higher scores (that is a less favourable attitude) on the attitude components of social acceptance ($t=2.84$, $p<0.01$), optimism-human rights ($t=2.88$, $p<0.01$) and behavioural misconceptions ($t=2.10$, $p<0.05$). In Table 9, the Chi-Square statistics comparing vignette responses of the contact and non-contact groups provided further supporting evidence of the attitude difference between the two groups of students. The Chi-Square test indicated significant differences in responses to vignette 2 ($\chi^2=8.93$; $p<0.05$) and vignette 3 ($\chi^2=7.44$; $p=0.059$) between the comparison and target groups in responding to questionnaires about people with a physical impairment. Fewer students in the contact group had the 'most likely' responses to interact with those with physical impairment in the social situations of vignette 2 and vignette 3.

For students responding to questionnaires about visual impairment, the Chi-Square test also indicated significant differences in responses to vignette 2 ($\chi^2=12.02$; $p<0.01$) and vignette 3 ($\chi^2=22.51$; $p<0.001$) between contact and non-contact groups (Table 9). Therefore, comparison of both the attitude component scores and vignette responses apparently showed that the contact group had a less favourable attitude towards people with physical and visual impairments than the students who had no contact with these disability types. There was no difference in attitude between contact and non-contact groups in relation to hearing impaired people.

In the present study, the findings were equivocal with regard to the impact of social contact on students' attitudes towards people with a disability. While the cross-sectional comparison indicated a positive direction, the use of a comparison group yielded contradictory findings. In view of the small number of students in the senior students comparison group (31 for the physically impaired and 39 for the visually impaired contact groups), the apparent difference in attitude component scores must be interpreted cautiously. Since the comparison groups consisted mainly of participants in Treats programmes and students in classes with people with a disability, the background and socio-economic profile of the students may not match the corresponding profile in the main sample. The differences in attitudes may be due to a number of factors such as the social background, age-range or components of social contacts with people with disabilities (like duration or interactivity). Further research is

required to ascertain the effects of any single factor, such as type of social contact with people with a disability or participation in educational programmes, on the dependent variable of students' attitudes toward people with a disability.

Chapter Four: Discussion and Recommendations

4.1 Discussion

4.1.1 Multi-dimensional facets in students' attitudes towards people with a disability

As noted in the previous chapter, students tended to respond positively towards the optimism-human rights and pessimism-hopelessness sub-scales and negatively towards the behavioral misconception sub-scale. Responses to the social acceptance sub-scale were dependent on the situational requirement or personal commitment to the episodes described in the given statements. Analysis of itemized responses to the four attitude components as described in section 3.3.1 in the previous chapter supported the multi-dimensional nature of students' attitudes towards people with a disability. Their attitude responses were dependent on the types of questions asked and the perceived social implications arising from the interaction episodes. It is also obvious that there is a ranking of disabilities, with those with a learning impairment and those who have experienced mental illness at the bottom – very much in line with the international literature.

Apparently, the majority of students were aware of the ethos of non-discrimination, equal opportunities and human rights for people with a disability. But they were still largely under the negative influences of many prevailing behavioral misconceptions about people with a disability. They had a segregationist view in assuming that people with a disability would be more comfortable and better educated in special instead of integrated schools. So the abstract notions of equality and human rights do not necessarily increase the likelihood of befriending people with a disability. Students were hesitant towards personal commitments and cautious about the social consequences, in particular the sense of threat and unpredictability, in relating to people with a disability. This also explained the negative attitude scores towards people with intellectual impairment and mental illnesses. Such caution and calculation is understandable, especially when over 60% of the respondents had no prior contact with people with a disability.

Findings of the present study echo previous research in that they demonstrate that attitude should be treated as a multi-dimensional construct, consisting of the interlocking facets of cognitive, affective and behavioural responses. Such results call for the need to alert educators and social workers in carefully thinking through the core messages to be delivered in public education for equal opportunities. In particular, for

people with intellectual impairment and mental illness, the misconceptions about their bizarre ness, unpredictability and deviant personality must be rectified to enhance social acceptance. The segregationist orientation of students was also a reflection of the existing way of life of people with a disability in the larger society. Rehabilitation and special education facilities are largely designed on segregationist assumptions. It was therefore not surprising that students thought that special settings were where people with a disability should belong. More provisions for integration of children in school settings and adults in employment and community settings must be made to knock down the barriers to equal participation.

4.1.2 Stereotypical assumptions towards people with a disability

Students' stereotypical views towards people with a disability were evident in the behavioral misconception index (see Table 1.6.3) and the itemized responses within the corresponding sub-scale (see Table 1.5.3). The misconceptions might be based on both a deficit assumption and a halo effect. Students tended to pay attention only to the constraints and limitations of people with a disability. The disabling implications of a given impairment were magnified because of misunderstanding and erroneous inference. For example, people with a disability were perceived as deviant, accident prone and appropriate for repetitive work. Furthermore, the characteristics of a minority of people with a disability were taken to be the stereotypical representation of people with a disability in general. For example, people with mental illness were assumed to be deviant and violent.

Findings in relation to descriptive labels of people with a disability were apparently less negative and yet still depicted deficit assumptions. Students were asked to select 5 descriptive labels from a list for a person with a given type of disability. If we look at the lists of descriptive attributes the results by no means suggest an overall negative impression of people with a disability. However, the positive descriptions that were chosen tend to be paternalistic, benevolent and pitying. Half of all respondents viewed people with a disability as pitiful. There are generally more negative descriptive labels given for those with an intellectual impairment and those who have had a mental illness across all forms. Disability groups tend not to be seen as 'the same as me'. Positive in this context does not mean equal.

All respondents said that their impression of people with a disability came largely from the mass media (television, newspapers and magazines). Only about one-quarter indicated that they had also formed their impressions from direct contact with people

with a disability. The pervasive deficit and deviant assumptions in the mass media portraits of people with a disability were detrimental to building up a positive image of people with a disability. Forty four percent had never been exposed to educational programmes about equal opportunities (e.g. 'New Kids on the Block') while another forty percent had seen or heard them. Even if students did participate in educational programmes, the possibility that they might rectify prevailing misconceptions was constrained by limited time and lack of personal experience in coming into contact with people with a disability. Results of the present study suggests that there is a need to strengthen and re-structure educational programmes for students, in terms of quantity, content and format.

4.1.3 Significant socio-demographic variables associated with students' attitudes towards people with a disability

F1 and F4 students had significantly more negative attitudes towards people with a disability than students in P4 and F6 forms. Students in P4 tended to be more accepting of all disability groups.. This suggests that the relationship between age and negative attitudes is not a linear one. As students progressed through the age groups, it was interesting to note that P4 and F6, the lowest and highest age cohorts, were more positive than the middle group of students in F1 and F4. Age indicates an increase in knowledge and also a more sophisticated and careful calculation of the potential commitment and personal risks in social encounters. F1 and F4 students are still seeking their own identity, are in a period of social experimentation where the opinion of their peer group is overwhelmingly important. It is possible that they fear associating themselves with those seen to be different and therefore of 'lower status' for fear of damaging their own social position/ranking. So F1 and F4 students would be more negative in their attitudes, particularly in those statements that require personal commitment. The F6 students may, on the other hand, have more accurate ideas about the characteristics of different disabilities and be prepared to take more risks in social interactions. In their stage of psychological development they have moved towards individuation and are better able to accept difference without being threatened by it.

Overall, female students were significantly more positive in their attitudes towards people with a disability than male students. The educational level of mother and father, number of computers at home and family composition were found to have no significant relationships with the attitude scores. A weak, but significant, relationship, was found between housing type and attitude scores. Students living in the lowest strata of housing type tended to have more negative attitudes. Socio-demographic variables

were associated with responses of the family to social issues, which in turn might have an influence on attitudes towards people with a disability. However, the findings in the present study have not produced enough evidence to make any definite claims. Age, types of disability and some of the socio-demographic variables emerged from this research as clearly influential variables in relation to the formation of attitudes towards people with a disability. Presumably they work together to form a complex model, but how this occurs requires further investigation.

4.1.4 The effects of social contacts

One third of the total sample reported that they knew or had had contact with people with a disability. These students were found to have a significantly more positive attitude towards people with a disability than those who had not. However, cross-sectional analysis did not match the results from a comparison group. Even with our deliberate attempt to recruit students who had participated in Treats programmes into our sample the numbers who had had direct contact with anyone with a disability still only amounted to about one-third of the sample. This shows how very separate the lives of youngsters with and without disabilities still tend to be. The small number in some comparison groups posed difficulties for furthering our understanding of the effect of social contact on students' attitudes towards people with a disability. The largest comparison group was junior students coming into contact with students with intellectual impairment ($n=312$). By further dividing the comparison group into three sub-groups, ANOVA indicated that the P.4 and P.5 students who had participated in Treats programmes were more positive in their attitudes towards people with intellectual impairment than the other two groups (F.1 or F.2 Treats program participants and P.4 and P.5 students with classmates with intellectual impairment or learning disabilities). So the impacts of social contacts might work differently for different age groups and would depend on the context.

The vignettes are designed to ascertain behavioural intentions while minimizing the social desirability response. It is very noticeable the vignettes with a school theme (e.g. asking a classmate with a disability to join an activity during recess) elicit generally more negative responses than the birthday party or neighbourhood settings. One possible explanation for this harks back to the theme of 'what will my other classmates think' and students may hesitate to publicly ally themselves with a disabled classmate because of this. We also found the level of avoidance of people with a disability on a bus somewhat surprising. On the other hand, willingness to invite someone with a disability to a birthday party was relatively high indicating that

previous acquaintance and presumed friendship may also be involved. This suggests that behavioural intentions are at least partly dependent on a social context.

From this research it is clear that 'social contact' is not an homogeneous construct. 'Social contact' varies in terms of duration, intensity, nature and willingness of those involved. On a broad, general level it seems that social contact is associated with more positive impressions. But more detailed analysis indicates a much more complex relationship. As we mentioned in the report, there may be an element of self-selection so that people who are well-intentioned seek out information about and contact with people with a disability. We had no measure of how willing students without a disability were to participate in Treats programmes. For at least some of them, it is a programme organized by their school about which they have no choice and their sense of being forced (if they have such a sense) may affect their subsequent attitude.

Duration of contact may also be an issue; a one-shot programme (as essentially the Treats programmes are) could have a profound effect in either direction. Prolonged contact (for instance in the classroom or family) could lead to genuine understanding and respect, or a sense of frustration and irritation. Contact may also be passive (listening to a talk in morning assembly given by a visually impaired person; watching a television programme) or interactive (playing with a hearing impaired schoolmate in recess). We may need to control further the different dimensions in social contact before we can gain an accurate understanding into how and in what ways it affects attitude formation and social acceptance.

4.1.5 Effects of educational programmes

As noted in the previous Chapter, 44% of the respondents indicated that they had never participated in educational programmes about equal opportunities (see Table 4.1). With T-test comparison, the present study indicated that exposure to educational programmes was associated with positive attitudes towards people with a disability. The relationship could be explained in terms of the impact of the educational programmes or a self-selection factor, as mentioned in 3.6.1 of Chapter 3. Moreover, a closer look at the type of educational programmes revealed that the majority of the students came across such programmes in a passive manner, e.g. watching television programmes or drama series, puppet shows or plays, road shows, school talks or EOC publications. These educational programmes may serve the purpose of conveying knowledge and equal opportunity concepts but do not offer chances for interaction and co-operation with people with a disability. Without the social experimentation of

knowing the strengths and potentials of people with a disability in person, it would be unlikely for students to clear away the hesitations and misconceptions, and commit themselves to meaningful social encounters with people with a disability.

Participation in educational programmes in the present study was a crude indicator based on self-reported responses of students only. Findings in the present study indicated the positive effects of educational programmes on students' attitudes. But cautious interpretation is required to take note of the possible self selection factor such that those with more positive attitudes are more inclined to participate in educational programmes. Evidence of the effectiveness of educational programmes on the basis of this gross cross-sectional comparison could only be taken as tentative. Educational programmes differ in scope, duration, format, content and core messages. Their effects on the public and student population would be cumulative with the possibility of being counteracted by the dominant mass media influence. The present baseline research is useful in building up a localized norm among the student population as a basis for comparison. Further research could examine the effects of a given educational programme or set of programmes by making comparisons among the program participants and the norms for a particular cohort of students.

4.1.6 Limitations of the study

In general the reliability and validity of the various measures has been assured and the major findings could inform future directions and practices in the education of students. However, limitations of the study have to be noted for the more accurate interpretation and utilization of the research findings. First, the sample did not correspond to the original sampling frame because many schools refused to participate. Eventually, all secondary and half of the primary schools in Hong Kong were approached and invited to participate, so there was no deliberate selection. However, it is possible that schools that agreed to take part in the research had a more positive approach to disability than those that refused. Thus a self-selection factor may be involved. Second, it was up to each participating school to select the classes for administration of the questionnaires. School staff were responsible for the selection and may have screened out those they thought would be less co-operative. So there may be sample bias towards a more compliant group within the general student population. However, this may have added to the plausibility of the research results because very few questionnaires were discarded due to suspected flaws or playfulness in students' responses.

Third, a great deal of effort was put into making the questionnaire as succinct as possible but it was still long and may have tested the patience and the concentration span of the respondents, especially the younger ones. Fourth, the socio-economic indicators that we were able to use had to take account of the age of our respondents and their sensitivities. Thus we were not able to collect the detailed information that we would ideally have wished to have on income and occupation. Fifth, the inclusion of a comparison group of students who had had contact with people with a disability was undoubtedly useful. However, the present study covered a broad spectrum of disability types and forms. Given the short time frame for data collection, there were practical difficulties to have a large comparison group for each corresponding type of disability and form of students. Therefore, detailed comparisons within that group of their responses to different disability categories was somewhat limited because of the small numbers involved. The exception was those who had had contact with people with a learning impairment.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Educational programmes should start early and be friendship based

Public education programmes directed towards the acceptance of people with disabilities should be targeted at children from the early primary forms through secondary school. As we can see, P4 students tend to be more accepting of all disability groups than F.1, F.4 and F.6. respondents. If they are given the opportunity to have social contact with people with a disability and learn how to accept children different from themselves, their attitudes would be less dominated by influences from the media. It would also be beneficial for children to learn how to appreciate the strength and perseverance of people with a disability in maximizing their potential despite the constraints of their disabilities. The younger the children, the less resistance they have to interacting with children with disabilities and as they get older they need continuous 'vaccination' against the prejudicial attitudes of the teenage world.

As for the adolescents and upper form students, the friendship theme in the vignette situation dominates the social acceptance of people with a disability. When they had prior acquaintance with a peer with disabilities, they would most likely accept their participation in the peer group. Educational programmes for students should be directed towards enhancement of mutual learning and friendship between students with and without disabilities. Extra-curricula activities, sports, games or youth groups that enable students with and without disabilities to meet each other and develop friendship

should be promoted. The common ground of youth culture and developmental issues should foster mutual understanding and exchange among students with and without disabilities. More integrated youth programmes should be promoted by NGOs and schools to foster friendship and partnership between young people with and without disabilities.

4.2.2 Social contact and integration in daily life

The results from the comparison groups demonstrate that interaction occurring in a one-shot context may or may not have a positive impact on the non-disabled students. Attitudes are unlikely to be changed by one single event. Attitudes are formed and influenced by different variables and it takes time to change beliefs and attitudes, especially when they are entrenched. Since there are so many stereotypes and negative labels about people with a disability, especially those with an intellectual impairment and those recovering from mental illness, more systematic group sessions or programmes over a significant period of time should be organized. This would provide more chances of ensuring that the interaction experience is positive and enjoyable.

Only about one-third of the students indicated that they were acquainted or had had personal contact with people with a disability. The existing service provisions and community facilities are not user friendly and barrier-free for people with a disability. Many people with a disability are still largely excluded socially from the mainstream. Students were inclined to assume the existing segregated pattern as normative. This leads to a vicious cycle of further misunderstanding and hesitance to treat them equally as members of society. There must be a re-orientation and extensive effort within special education and rehabilitation services to promote social integration of people with a disability in the different facets of community life. More people with a disability should be educated in the mainstream, engage in open employment, live in communal residential settings, and participate in as well as contribute to the community's way of life. Education of students should be seen as a long term socialization process embedded in the cultural and structural changes in terms of social policies and action to enhance the rights of and remove barriers for people with a disability in society.

4.2.3 Fostering a responsible and non-discriminatory media culture

All respondents said that their impression of people with a disability came largely from the mass media (television, newspapers and magazines). Clearly this is a highly influential channel and there should be deliberate attempts to utilize the media in a

constructive manner in fostering positive public attitudes and acceptance towards people with a disability. The media people should also be the target for education so that many prevailing misconceptions and misunderstanding towards people with a disability can be clarified. Reporters and editors should be ensured of an accurate understanding of disabilities and as well as an awareness of their own pervasive power and social responsibility in equal opportunities. Positive images of people with disabilities should be portrayed by highlighting their strengths and their contribution towards society.

Attitudes towards the ex-mentally ill and intellectually impaired people are, as we expected, generally more negative than towards other disability groups. This clearly implies that students do not have proper knowledge and skills to interact with these two categories of people. Without proper knowledge and with very limited interaction, undoubtedly impressions may not be accurate. More campaigns in the mass media and specific strategies should be adopted in promoting acceptance towards these two groups. In particular, the media should restrain from less sensational news reporting and challenge the misconceptions that people have about those with an intellectual impairment and mental illness being deviant and violent.

4.2.4 Effecting social integration in schools

A very important change has taken place in Hong Kong's education system, as since 1997, children with disabilities have been accepted into ordinary primary schools. Research from overseas has clearly indicated that peer relationships between disabled and non-disabled students are profoundly affected by the environment of integration that the school creates. Proper preparation and training should be offered to those non-disabled students who are studying together with disabled students. This requires a great deal of effort from teachers and tailor-made integrative programmes in the school. Teachers do play an important role model for non-disabled students to learn how to interact and to relate with disabled students. However, local research (Wong, Pearson, Ip and Lo, 1999) reflects that many teachers in Hong Kong lack skills and knowledge in teaching children with special needs. This inadequacy adversely affects their attitudes towards integration and a negative message may be conveyed to their students. To instill positive attitudes in students, teachers must have positive attitudes towards children with disabilities and the idea of an integrated classroom. A more positive frame of mind in teachers should be inculcated through in service training and education, particularly so that their confidence and competence levels in the face of special needs students are raised. Systematic and tailored made interventions should be

developed at the school level to assist students with and without special needs in the integrated classroom. Programmes such as "Student Ambassador Schemes" or "Peer Counselor Schemes" should be promoted so as to facilitate the acceptance and understanding of non-disabled students towards disabled students.

4.3 The Way Forward

This research has established a reliable and useful measuring instrument and also charted the baselines of students' attitudes towards people with a disability. Further research effort should be directed towards specific educational strategies and social interaction variables to foster a positive and accepting attitude. The importance of different social contexts, adult intervention and preparation for meaningful interactions should be emphasized. More educational programmes should be designed to facilitate joint ventures and social grounds for mutual understanding for students with and without disabilities. More effort should be made to promote, in particular, the images of people with intellectual impairment or previous mental illness as well as to provide education and training to teachers and non-disabled students.

But who should be the service providers and planners for community education: social workers, teachers or the Equal Opportunities Commission? Existing educational programmes on equal opportunities are delivered by different parties and organizations without any concerted effort or strategic directions. The social goals of equal opportunities and full inclusion are not specified and evaluated in concrete terms with social indicators. Likewise, for community education programmes, there should be more specific long-term goals and systematic review to chart the changes in public attitude, organizational practices and experiences of people with a disability themselves. The machinery of community education must be built to set the direction, solicit resources and co-ordinate community effort to bring about attitude changes and social integration.

References

- Allport, G.W. (1954). The Nature of Prejudice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Archie, V.W. and Sherrill, C. (1989) Attitudes toward handicapped peers of mainstreamed and non-mainstreamed children in physical education. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 69, 319-322.
- Antonak, R. F. and Livneh, H., (1995) Randomized response technique: A review and proposed extension to disability attitude research. *Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs*, Feb95, Vol. 121 Issue1, p97-143.
- Antonak, R.F. and Livneh, H. (1988) The Measurement of Attitudes toward People with Disabilities: Methods, Psychometrics, and Scales, Springfield, Ill.: C.C. Thomas.
- Archie, V.W. and Sherrill, C. (1989) Attitudes toward handicapped peers of mainstreamed and non-mainstreamed children in physical education. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, Vol. 69, p.319-322.
- Chan, F., Hedl, J. Parker, H. Lam C. Chan, T. N. and Yu, B. (1988). Differential attitude of students toward people with disabilities: a cross-cultural perspective. The International Journal of Social Psychiatry, Vol. 34: 267-273.
- Diamond, K., Le-Furgy, W. and Blass, S. (1993) Attitudes of preschool children toward their peers with disabilities: a year-long investigation in integrated classrooms. The Journal of Genetic Psychology. Vol.154 June, 1993 p.215-21.
- Fichten, C. S., Robillard, K., Judd, D., & Amsel, R. (1989). College students with disabilities: Myths and realities. Rehabilitation Psychology, 34, 243-257.
- Hastings, R.P. and Graham, S. (1995) Adolescents' perceptions of young people with severe learning difficulties: the effects of integration schemes and frequency of contact. Educational Psychology, May 95, Vol.15 (2) p.149-160.
- Horne, M.D. (1985) Attitudes toward Handicapped Students: Professional, Peer and Parent Reactions New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Konty, M. A. and Dunham, C. C., Differences in value and attitude change over the life course Sociological Spectrum, Apr-Jun97, Vol. 17 Issue 2, p177-198
- Miller, D.C. (1991) Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement. (5th ed) . Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Rapier, J., Adelson, R., Carey, R., & Croke, K. (1972) Changes in children's attitudes toward the physically handicapped. Exceptional Children, 39, 219-233.
- Verplanken, B. and Meijnders, A. (1994) Emotion and cognition: Attitudes toward persons who are visually impaired. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, Nov/Dec 94 part 1 of 2, Vol. 88 Issue 6, p504-511.
- Voeltz, L.M. (1980) Children's attitudes toward handicapped peers, American Journal

- of Mental Deficiency, 84, p.455-464.
- Wong, D., Pearson, V., Ip, F., and Lo, E. (1999) A slippery road to equality: Hong Kong's experience of unplanned integrated education, *Disability & Society*. Vol.14, No. 6.
- Yuker, H.E. and Block, J.R. (1986) Research with the Attitude Toward Disabled Persons Scales (ATDP): 1960-1985. Hempstead, NY: Center for the Study of Attitudes Toward Persons with Disabilities, Hofstra University.

LIST OF TABLES

SECTION I: RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS PWDS.....I

TABLE 1.1 SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SUB-SCALE	I
TABLE 1.2 OPTIMISM – HUMAN RIGHT SUB-SCALE	VI
TABLE 1.3 BEHAVIOURAL MISCONCEPTION SUB-SCALE	IX
TABLE 1.4 PESSIMISM – HOPELESSNESS SUB-SCALE.....	XIII
TABLE 1.5 ATTITUDE SUB-SCALES: COMPARISON ACROSS ITEMS AND DISABILITY TYPES	XVII
TABLE 1.6 DISABILITY INDEX	XXI
TABLE 1.7 RELIABILITY ANALYSIS OF ATTITUDE COMPONENT SUBSCALES (CRONBACH'S ALPHA)	
.....	XXII
TABLE 1.8 CORRELATION MATRIX OF ATTITUDE COMPONENT SUB-SCALE.....	XXII
TABLE 1.9 COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE COMPONENT ACROSS DISABILITY TYPES	XXIII
TABLE 1.10 HOMOGENEOUS SUBSET ACROSS CLASSES (TUKEY HSD)*	XXIV
TABLE 1.11 HOMOGENEOUS SUBSET ACROSS DISABILITY (TUKEY HSD)*	XXV

SECTION II: VIGNETTES.....XXVI

TABLE 2.1 RESPONSES TO VIGNETTES 1	XXVI
TABLE 2.2 RESPONSE TO VIGNETTE 2 (JUNIOR).....	XXVII
TABLE 2.3 RESPONSE TO VIGNETTE 2 (SENIOR).....	XXVIII
TABLE 2.4 RESPONSE TO VIGNETTE 3	XXIX
TABLE 2.5 CHI SQUARE ASSOCIATION OF VIGNETTE RESPONSES WITH DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND, PRIOR EDUCATION CONTACTS AND PROGRAMME	XXX
TABLE 2.6 CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO VIGNETTES BY FORM AND SEX	XXXII
TABLE 2.7 CROSS TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO VIGNETTES BY FORMS AND PRIOR CONTACTS	XXXV
TABLE 2.8 CROSS TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO VIGNETTES BY FORMS AND PARTICIPATION IN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMMES.....	XXXVIII

SECTION III: DESCRIPTIVE LABELSXLI

TABLE 3.1 FREQUENCY RANKING OF DESCRIPTIVE LABELS (MH).....	XLI
TABLE 3.2 FREQUENCY RANKING OF DESCRIPTIVE LABELS (MI)	XLII
TABLE 3.3 FREQUENCY RANKING OF DESCRIPTIVE LABEL (PH).....	XLIII
TABLE 3.4 FREQUENCY RANKING OF DESCRIPTIVE LABELS (HI).....	XLIV
TABLE 3.5 FREQUENCY RANKING OF DESCRIPTIVE LABEL (VI).....	XLV

SECTION IV: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUNDXLVI

TABLE 4.1 GENDER DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS	XLVI
TABLE 4.2 DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRES ACCORDING TO TYPE AND CLASS	XLVI

TABLE 4.3	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION OF RESPONDENTS	XLVI
TABLE 4.4	EDUCATION LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS' PARENT(S).....	XLVII
TABLE 4.5	HOUSING TYPE OF RESPONDENTS.....	XLVII
TABLE 4.6	NUMBER OF COMPUTER(S) POSSESS BY RESPONDENTS' FAMILY	XLVII
TABLE 4.7	EVER KNOWN OR IN CONTACT WITH SOMEBODY WITH A DISABILITY	XLVIII
TABLE 4.8	RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONDENTS WITH PWDs.....	XLVIII
TABLE 4.9	SOURCE OF IMPRESSION OF PWDs.....	XLVIII
TABLE 4.10	EVER WATCHED THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMME OR PARTICIPATED IN THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES.....	XLIX
TABLE 4.11	T-TEST BY SEX OF RESPONDENTS	XLIX
TABLE 4.12	ANOVA OF ATTITUDE COMPONENT SCORES BY HOUSING TYPES	L
TABLE 4.13	T-TEST BY ACQUAINTANCE WITH PWDs.....	L
TABLE 4.14	T-TEST BY PARTICIPATION IN EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAMMES	LI
SECTION V: COMPARISON GROUP.....	LII	
TABLE 5	T-TEST SCORES BETWEEN COMPARISON AND TARGET GROUP ACROSS DISABILITY TYPES (JUNIOR)	LII
TABLE 6	CHI-SQUARE TEST BETWEEN TARGET (T) AND COMPARISON (C) GROUP ON VIGNETTE RESPONSES (JUNIOR) (%)	LIII
TABLE 7	COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE COMPONENT ACROSS COMPARISON SUB-GROUP	LIV
TABLE 8	T-TEST SCORES BETWEEN COMPARISON AND TARGET GROUP ACROSS DISABILITY TYPES (SENIOR)	LV
TABLE 9	CHI-SQUARE TEST BETWEEN TARGET (T) AND COMPARISON (C) GROUP ON VIGNETTE RESPONSES (SENIOR)(%).....	LVI
QUESTIONNAIRES (ENGLISH AND CHINESE).....	LVII	

SECTION I: RESPONDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS PWDs

Table 1 Respondents' Attitude towards PWDs*

Table 1.1 Social Acceptance Sub-scale

Table 1.1.1 I really would not want an (i) living in my neighbourhood.# (question 1)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	2.2	0.9	2.2	0.8	2.2	1.1	2.2	1.0	2.3	1.0
F1	2.3	0.8	2.4	0.8	2.2	0.8	2.3	0.8	2.2	0.8
F4	2.4	0.7	2.3	0.7	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.8	2.0	0.8
F6	2.2	0.7	2.4	0.6	1.9	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.8	0.7

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired person

Table 1.1.2 If I have an (i) as my classmate, I would talk to them. (question 5)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	1.8	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.7	0.8	1.7	0.7
F1	2.1	0.6	2.0	0.6	1.8	0.6	2.0	0.7	1.9	0.7
F4	2.2	0.6	2.0	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.9	0.5	1.8	0.5
F6	2.0	0.5	1.9	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.7	0.5	1.5	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired person

Table 1.1.3 For (i), integrative schooling is more preferable than special schooling. (question 6)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	2.4	0.9	2.2	0.9	2.4	1.0	2.5	1.0	2.4	1.0
F1	2.6	0.8	2.4	0.8	2.4	0.8	2.6	0.7	2.7	0.8
F4	2.8	0.6	2.3	0.7	2.3	0.6	2.6	0.7	2.6	0.7
F6	2.9	0.5	2.3	0.7	2.4	0.7	2.6	0.7	2.6	0.7

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired person

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.1.4 All students, whether they are an (i) or not, can learn from each other in school. (question 8)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M*	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
P4	1.7	0.8	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.8	1.7	0.8	1.6	0.7
F1	1.9	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.7	0.6	1.8	0.7	1.8	0.7
F4	2.0	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.8	0.6
F6	1.8	0.5	1.8	0.6	1.5	0.5	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired person

Table 1.1.5 I don't think it's nice to call an (i) classmate (ii). (question 9)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	1.7	0.9	1.8	1.1	1.7	1.1	1.8	1.1	1.8	1.1
F1	1.8	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.5	0.7	1.6	0.8	1.7	0.8
F4	1.8	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.5	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.6
F6	1.6	0.5	1.6	0.6	1.3	0.6	1.4	0.6	1.3	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

N.B.(ii): 'retard'/ 'mental'/'useless'/ 'deaf idiot'/ 'blind idiot'

Table 1.1.6 We have a responsibility to help (i). (question 18)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P1	1.4	0.7	1.4	0.7	1.4	0.7	1.5	0.7	1.3	0.6
F1	1.7	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.8	0.7
F4	1.9	0.6	1.9	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.6
F6	1.8	0.5	2.0	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.7	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.1.7 I don't want an (i) person sitting next to me on the bus.#(question 25)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M*</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
P4	1.9	0.9	1.9	0.9	1.7	0.9	1.7	0.9	1.7	0.9
F1	2.3	0.8	2.3	0.8	2.0	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.9	0.8
F4	2.4	0.7	2.2	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.6	0.6	1.7	0.6
F6	2.2	0.7	2.2	0.7	1.8	0.6	1.5	0.6	1.6	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 1.1.8 If I had a(an) (i) brother or sister, I wouldn't tell anyone.#(question 26)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	2.4	1.0	2.5	1.0	2.3	1.0	2.5	1.0	2.4	1.0
F1	2.3	0.9	2.4	0.8	2.0	0.8	2.2	0.8	2.2	0.8
F4	2.3	0.8	2.3	0.8	2.0	0.7	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.7
F6	2.0	0.6	2.3	0.7	1.9	0.6	1.9	0.6	1.8	0.7

N.B.(i): mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 1.1.9 Watching a(an) (i)eats makes me nauseous.#(question 27)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	1.7	0.8	1.7	0.9	1.7	0.9	1.6	0.9	1.6	0.8
F1	2.1	0.8	1.9	0.8	1.7	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.8	0.7
F4	2.1	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.6	0.6	1.5	0.6	1.6	0.6
F6	1.9	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.6	1.4	0.5	1.5	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired person

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.1.10 It is really not a big deal to tease somebody by calling him/her a (i).#(question 28)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M*</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
P4	1.6	0.8	1.7	1.0	1.5	0.9	1.5	0.8	1.5	0.8
F1	2.0	0.9	2.1	0.9	1.7	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.8	0.8
F4	2.3	0.8	2.3	0.8	1.7	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.8	0.6
F6	2.3	0.8	2.3	0.8	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7

N.B.(i) : ‘retard’/ ‘mental’/ ‘useless’ /‘deaf idiot’/ ‘blind idiot’

Table 1.1.11 If a (i) child / (ii)wants to play with me and my friends at the park, that would be OK. (question 29)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	1.8	0.8	1.7	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.7	0.8
F1	2.1	0.7	2.1	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.9	0.8
F4	2.1	0.6	2.2	0.6	1.9	0.6	1.8	0.5	1.9	0.5
F6	2.0	0.5	2.1	0.5	1.8	0.5	1.7	0.5	1.8	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

N.B.(ii) : ex-mentally-ill person

Table 1.1.12 A(an) (i) are more comfortable with ‘their own kind’. #(question 33)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	2.7	0.9	2.7	0.9	2.6	0.9	2.5	1.0	2.6	0.9
F1	2.7	0.7	2.7	0.7	2.6	0.7	2.7	0.7	2.8	0.7
F4	2.7	0.6	2.6	0.7	2.6	0.6	2.6	0.7	2.6	0.6
F6	2.5	0.6	2.6	0.6	2.6	0.5	2.6	0.7	2.6	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired person

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.1.13 Most (i) have an ‘attitude problem’ and are difficult to get along with. #(question 34)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M*</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
P4	2.2	0.9	2.2	0.9	2.0	0.9	2.1	0.9	2.0	0.9
F1	2.5	0.8	2.4	0.7	2.1	0.7	2.1	0.7	2.2	0.8
F4	2.5	0.7	2.2	0.7	2.1	0.6	2.1	0.6	2.1	0.6
F6	2.3	0.6	2.3	0.6	2.0	0.5	1.9	0.5	1.9	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.1.14 (i) are basically no different from everybody else except for their limitations in certain area(s). (question 35)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	1.8	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.9	0.9	1.8	0.9	1.9	0.9
F1	2.0	0.7	2.0	0.7	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.7	1.9	0.8
F4	2.0	0.6	1.9	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.5	1.8	0.6
F6	1.9	0.5	1.9	0.5	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.5	1.7	0.5

N.B.(i): mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.1.15 Our attitudes can have a strong effect on how a (i) sees himself or herself. (question 38)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	2.2	0.9	2.3	1.0	2.2	1.0	2.2	1.0	2.3	1.0
F1	1.8	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.7
F4	1.9	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.7	1.8	0.6
F6	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired person

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.1.16 Most (i) feel resentment and envy toward able-bodied persons.# (question 39)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M*</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
P4	1.9	0.8	1.8	0.9	1.8	0.9	1.9	1.0	1.8	0.9
F1	2.1	0.8	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.7	2.1	0.8	2.1	0.8
F4	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.7	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.6
F6	1.8	0.5	2.1	0.6	1.9	0.6	1.9	0.5	1.9	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.1.17 I fear interacting with (i) ,because they are often (ii) unpredictable and dangerous./ (iii)unpredictable and violent.# (question 45)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	2.0	0.9	2.0	0.9	1.8	0.9	1.9	0.9	1.9	1.0
F1	2.4	0.8	2.4	0.8	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.7	2.1	0.8
F4	2.5	0.8	2.3	0.8	2.0	0.6	1.9	0.6	2.0	0.6
F6	2.2	0.6	2.3	0.6	1.9	0.6	1.7	0.5	1.9	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

N.B.(ii) : for questionnaire on mentally handicapped / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

N.B.(iii) : for questionnaire on ex-mentally-ill

Table 1.2 Optimism – Human Right Sub-scale

Table 1.2.1 I do not mind having a service center for (i) in my residential neighbourhood. (question 2)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	1.9	0.9	1.9	0.9	1.8	1.0	1.8	0.9	1.9	0.9
F1	2.0	0.8	2.2	0.7	2.0	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.8
F4	2.2	0.8	2.1	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.7
F6	2.1	0.6	2.3	0.7	1.9	0.6	1.8	0.8	1.7	0.7

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.2.2 (i) should live with others of similar disabilities. # (question 3)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M*</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
P4	2.3	0.9	2.4	0.9	2.4	1.0	2.8	1.0	2.2	0.9
F1	2.2	0.8	2.2	0.8	2.3	0.8	2.1	0.8	2.2	0.8
F4	2.2	0.7	2.1	0.7	2.2	0.7	2.1	0.7	2.1	0.7
F6	2.2	0.7	2.1	0.6	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.2.3 (i) should be allowed to live where and how they choose. (question 4)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.8
F1	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.6	1.6	0.6	1.5	0.7	1.6	0.7
F4	1.8	0.7	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.7	1.5	0.6	1.6	0.6
F6	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.4	0.5	1.4	0.6	1.4	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.2.4 (i) children should not be provided with a high school education. #(question 12)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.9	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.8
F1	1.6	0.6	1.6	0.7	1.5	0.6	1.6	0.7	1.5	0.7
F4	1.7	0.7	1.5	0.6	1.5	0.7	1.5	0.7	1.5	0.6
F6	1.6	0.6	1.4	0.5	1.2	0.5	1.3	0.5	1.3	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree.

Table 1.2.5 (i) worker should receive the same wage as compared with other workers for the same workload. (question 14)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M*</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
P4	1.7	0.7	1.5	0.7	1.6	0.8	1.7	0.8	1.6	0.7
F1	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.7	0.7
F4	1.8	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.8	0.6
F6	1.7	0.5	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.5	1.7	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 1.2.6 Equal employment opportunities should be available to individuals who are (i). (question 15)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	1.5	0.6	1.5	0.7	1.5	0.7	1.4	0.7	1.5	0.7
F1	1.7	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.5	0.6	1.6	0.7
F4	1.8	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.7	0.7	1.6	0.5	1.7	0.6
F6	1.7	0.5	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.5	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 1.2.7 Laws to prevent employers from discriminating against (i) should be passed. (question 16)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	1.9	1.1	1.9	1.1	1.8	1.1	1.8	1.1	1.9	1.1
F1	1.6	0.7	1.7	0.8	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.8	1.6	0.8
F4	1.8	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.6	1.7	0.6
F6	1.5	0.6	1.7	0.7	1.6	0.6	1.7	0.7	1.6	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.2.8 (i) should date and marry each other, not able-bodied person.# (question 23)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M*	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
P4	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.8	1.0	1.8	1.0	1.9	1.0
F1	2.1	0.9	1.9	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.7	0.8	1.7	0.8
F4	2.0	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.6	1.7	0.7
F6	1.9	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.6	1.5	0.6	1.5	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.3 Behavioural Misconception Sub-scale

Table 1.3.1 (i) children in regular classrooms cause inconvenience to other children.# (question 7)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	2.1	0.9	2.0	0.8	2.0	0.9	2.2	0.9	2.1	0.9
F1	2.5	0.7	2.3	0.7	2.2	0.7	2.3	0.8	2.4	0.8
F4	2.6	0.7	2.2	0.6	2.2	0.6	2.3	0.7	2.3	0.7
F6	2.5	0.6	2.3	0.6	2.2	0.6	2.2	0.7	2.3	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 1.3.2 Students who are (i) often lack motivation to make progress.# (question 11)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	2.1	0.9	2.1	0.9	2.3	1.0	2.2	1.0	2.2	1.0
F1	1.9	0.7	2.2	0.8	2.0	0.8	2.1	0.8	2.1	0.8
F4	1.9	0.6	2.1	0.7	1.9	0.7	2.0	0.7	2.0	0.7
F6	1.7	0.5	1.9	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.8	0.6	1.7	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.3.3 Simple repetitive work is appropriate for (i). # (question 13)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M*</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
P4	2.7	0.9	2.8	0.9	2.8	1.0	2.6	0.9	2.6	0.9
F1	2.6	0.7	2.5	0.8	2.8	0.7	2.3	0.8	2.5	0.8
F4	2.6	0.7	2.3	0.7	2.2	0.7	2.1	0.7	2.3	0.7
F6	2.7	0.6	2.3	0.7	2.1	0.7	1.9	0.6	2.2	0.7

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.3.4 Most (i) are naturally inferior.# (question 30)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	2.3	0.9	2.1	0.8	2.2	1.0	2.1	0.9	2.2	0.9
F1	2.3	0.8	2.3	0.8	2.2	0.7	2.2	0.7	2.3	0.8
F4	2.5	0.7	2.3	0.7	2.3	0.7	2.4	0.7	2.4	0.7
F6	2.3	0.6	2.4	0.7	2.4	0.7	2.3	0.6	2.5	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.3.5 Persons who are (i) are handicapped in all situations.# (question 31)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	2.1	0.9	2.0	0.8	2.1	0.9	1.9	0.9	2.0	0.9
F1	2.6	0.8	2.4	0.8	2.5	0.7	2.4	0.7	2.4	0.8
F4	2.7	0.7	2.5	0.7	2.5	0.7	2.5	0.7	2.5	0.7
F6	2.5	0.6	2.4	0.6	2.6	0.6	2.4	0.6	2.5	0.7

N.B.(ii) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.3.6 (i) engage in bizarre activities.# (question 32)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M*</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
P4	2.4	0.9	2.2	0.8	2.1	0.9	2.0	0.9	1.9	0.9
F1	2.5	0.8	2.5	0.8	2.1	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.1	0.7
F4	2.6	0.7	2.4	0.7	2.0	0.6	1.9	0.6	2.0	0.6
F6	2.4	0.6	2.4	0.6	1.9	0.5	1.8	0.5	1.8	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.3.7 (i) can never really be happy. #(question 36)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	2.1	1.0	1.8	0.9	2.1	1.0	2.1	1.1	2.0	1.0
F1	2.1	0.8	2.2	0.8	2.1	0.8	2.2	0.8	2.1	0.8
F4	2.0	0.8	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.7	2.0	0.7	2.0	0.7
F6	1.8	0.6	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.6	1.8	0.5	1.8	0.7

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.3.8 (i)are no different from others in many ways. (question 37)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	2.0	0.9	1.9	0.9	1.9	0.9	1.9	0.9	1.8	0.9
F1	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.8	0.6	1.9	0.7
F4	2.1	0.6	1.9	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.5
F6	2.0	0.5	1.9	0.5	1.8	0.5	1.8	0.5	1.7	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.3.9 Most (i) are unpredictable and express impulsive behaviour. #(question 40)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M*	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
P4	2.5	0.8	2.5	0.9	2.3	0.9	2.3	0.9	2.4	0.9
F1	2.7	0.8	2.7	0.7	2.3	0.8	2.2	0.8	2.3	0.8
F4	2.7	0.7	2.7	0.7	2.2	0.6	2.1	0.6	2.2	0.6
F6	2.6	0.6	2.7	0.6	2.0	0.5	1.9	0.5	2.0	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.3.10 A(An) (i) is not capable of making moral decisions.# (question 41)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	2.0	0.9	2.0	0.9	1.9	0.9	1.9	0.9	1.9	0.8
F1	2.2	0.7	2.1	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.7
F4	2.2	0.7	2.0	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.8	0.6
F6	2.2	0.6	2.0	0.6	1.6	0.5	1.5	0.5	1.6	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired person

Table 1.3.11 (i) people are more accident prone than other people.# (question 44)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	2.7	0.9	2.5	1.0	2.7	0.9	2.6	1.0	2.8	0.9
F1	2.9	0.7	2.7	0.8	2.8	0.7	2.7	0.8	3.0	0.7
F4	2.8	0.7	2.6	0.7	2.9	0.6	2.7	0.7	2.9	0.6
F6	2.9	0.6	2.6	0.6	2.9	0.6	2.8	0.6	3.0	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.3.12 (i) people show a deviant personality profile. # (question 46)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M*</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
P4	2.7	0.9	2.6	1.0	2.6	1.0	2.5	1.0	2.5	1.0
F1	2.6	0.8	2.5	0.8	2.2	0.7	2.1	0.7	2.3	0.8
F4	2.5	0.7	2.4	0.7	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.6	2.1	0.6
F6	2.3	0.6	2.5	0.6	2.0	0.5	1.9	0.5	2.0	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 1.3.13 (i) are not a burden of their family and the society. (question 47)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	2.1	1.0	2.1	1.0	1.9	1.1	2.1	1.0	2.1	1.0
F1	2.2	0.8	2.1	0.8	2.0	0.8	2.0	0.8	2.0	0.8
F4	2.4	0.7	2.2	0.7	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.7	2.2	0.7
F6	2.3	0.6	2.3	0.6	2.2	0.6	2.1	0.6	2.1	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.4 Pessimism – Hopelessness Sub-scale

Table 1.4.1 Severe (i) / (ii) cannot really benefit from an education.# (question.10)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>								
P4	1.9	0.9	1.7	0.8	1.8	0.9	1.9	0.8	1.8	0.8
F1	2.1	0.8	1.9	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.8	0.7
F4	2.1	0.7	1.9	0.6	1.7	0.6	1.8	0.7	1.8	0.6
F6	1.9	0.7	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.7	1.7	0.6	1.5	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

N.B.(ii) : People who have had severe mental illness

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.4.2 Rehabilitation programmes for (i) are too expensive to operate.# (question 17)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M*	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
P4	2.2	0.9	2.2	1.0	2.1	1.0	2.1	1.0	2.1	1.0
F1	2.5	0.8	2.4	0.8	2.5	0.8	2.6	0.7	2.4	0.8
F4	2.4	0.7	2.4	0.7	2.5	0.7	2.4	0.6	2.4	0.7
F6	2.3	0.6	2.4	0.6	2.4	0.6	2.3	0.6	2.3	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

Table 1.4.3 Severe (i) / (ii) are really ‘useless eater’.# (question 19)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	1.5	0.7	1.5	0.7	1.5	0.8	1.4	0.6	1.4	0.7
F1	1.8	0.8	1.7	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.7	0.7
F4	1.8	0.7	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.6	1.6	0.6	1.6	0.6
F6	1.8	0.6	1.6	0.6	1.5	0.6	1.5	0.5	1.5	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped/ physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

N.B.(ii) : People who have had severe mental illness

Table 1.4.4 The government should take care of persons who are (i). (question 20)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	1.5	0.7	1.5	0.7	1.4	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.5	0.7
F1	1.8	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.7
F4	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.7	1.9	0.6	1.9	0.6	1.9	0.6
F6	1.9	0.6	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.6	1.9	0.6	1.8	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.4.5 (i) individuals can be expected to fit into competitive society. (question 21)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M*	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
P4	2.0	0.8	1.9	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.8	0.9	1.8	0.9
F1	2.1	0.8	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.6	1.9	0.6	2.0	0.7
F4	2.2	0.6	2.0	0.6	1.9	0.5	1.9	0.5	2.0	0.6
F6	2.3	0.6	2.1	0.5	2.0	0.5	1.9	0.5	2.0	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 1.4.6 It is a waste of money to have special facilities/services, e.g.(i)etc. for the (ii).# (question 22)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	1.7	0.8	1.7	1.0	1.8	1.1	1.6	0.9	1.7	0.9
F1	1.8	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.7	0.8	1.7	0.8	1.7	0.8
F4	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.6	1.8	0.8	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7
F6	1.7	0.5	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.6	1.6	0.6	1.6	0.7

N.B.(i) : MH version: equipment in special training and special education

MI version: halfway houses, sheltered workshops

PH version: wheelchair accessible ramps, wheelchair accessible toilets

VI version: Braille, traffic lights with sound alert

HI version: sign language, subtitle

N.B.(ii) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 1.4.7 (i) people should be prevented from having children. # (question 24)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	1.6	0.8	1.7	0.9	1.5	0.8	1.6	0.9	1.6	0.9
F1	1.9	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.6	0.7	1.5	0.7	1.6	0.8
F4	2.0	0.8	1.7	0.7	1.5	0.6	1.5	0.6	1.6	0.7
F6	1.9	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.4	0.6	1.4	0.6	1.4	0.5

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.4.8 Keeping severely (i) / (ii) alive is scientifically unnatural and flies in the face of ‘survival of the fittest.’# (question 42)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M*	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
P4	1.8	0.9	1.7	0.9	1.6	0.9	1.7	0.9	1.8	0.9
F1	1.9	0.8	1.9	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.8	0.8	1.9	0.9
F4	2.0	0.8	1.8	0.7	1.7	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.7	0.7
F6	1.8	0.7	1.8	0.7	1.6	0.7	1.5	0.6	1.6	0.7

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

N.B.(ii) : persons who have had severe mental illness

Table 1.4.9 (i) people when influenced by the environment are easy to develop and express criminal tendencies.# (question 43)

	MH		MI		PH		HI		VI	
	M	SD								
P4	2.4	0.9	2.4	1.0	2.1	0.9	2.1	1.0	2.1	0.9
F1	2.4	0.8	2.5	0.8	2.1	0.8	2.1	0.8	2.1	0.8
F4	2.3	0.7	2.4	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.9	0.6
F6	2.1	0.6	2.4	0.7	1.8	0.5	1.7	0.6	1.6	0.6

N.B.(i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 1.5 (i)All mentally handicapped people are mentally ill as well. (question 48)

	MH		MI	
	M	SD	M	SD
P4	3.3	0.8		
F1	3.2	0.7		
F4	3.1	0.6		
F6	3.3	0.5		

N.B.(i) : This question only appears in questionnaires for ‘mentally handicapped persons’ and ‘ex-mentally-ill persons’

* Scoring Key: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, 4=strongly disagree. However, for questions with symbol # , the statements are negatively worded and was coded in reverse order, i.e. 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. For all statements, a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDs.

Table 1.5 Attitude Sub-Scales: Comparison across Items and Disability Types

Table 1.5.1 Social Acceptance Sub-Scale: Comparison of Item Means across Disability Types

	Items ^a	M ^b	SD	F ^c
A9	I don't think it's nice to call an (i) student (ii).	1.6	0.8	19.6***
A18	We have a responsibility to help (i).	1.7	0.7	4.9**
A8	All students, whether they are an (i) or not, can learn from each other in school.	1.7	0.7	30.0***
A27	Watching a(an) (i) eats makes me nauseous.	1.7	0.7	70.8***
A5	If I have an (i) as my classmate, I would talk to them.	1.8	0.7	54.9***
A35	(i) are basically no different from everybody else except for their limitations in certain areas.	1.9	0.7	16.6***
A28	It is really not a big deal to tease somebody by call him/her a (i).	1.9	0.8	89.0***
A29	If a (i) child/(ii) wants to play with me and my friends at the park, that would be OK.	1.9	0.7	42.4***
A38	Our attitudes can have a strong effect on how a (i) sees himself or herself.	1.9	0.8	2.0
A25	I don't want an (i) person sitting next to me on the bus.	1.9	0.8	111.6***
A39	Most (i) feel resentment and envy toward able-bodied persons.	2.0	0.7	1.5
A45	I fear interacting with (i) because they are often unpredictable and violent.	2.1	0.8	80.4***
A26	If I had a(an) (i) brother or sister, I wouldn't tell anyone.	2.2	0.8	33.7***
A34	Most (i) have an 'attitude problem' and are difficult to get along with.	2.2	0.7	51.3***
A1	I really would not want an (i) living in my neighborhood.	2.2	0.8	29.8***
A6	For (i), integrative schooling is more preferable than special schooling.	2.5	0.8	41.0***
A33	A/An (i) are more comfortable with 'their own kind'.	2.6	0.7	2.1

Note: (i) denotes mentally handicapped / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons
(ii) denotes 'retard' / 'mental' / 'useless' / 'deaf idiot' / 'blind idiot'

^a Items are arranged in an ascending order of their mean scores. A lower score indicates a more favorable attitude towards PWDs.

^b For items 5, 6, 8, 9, 18, 29, 35 and 38, item score =1 for strongly agree; 2 for agree, 3 for disagree and 4 for strongly disagree. For items 1, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 39 and 45 (the negatively worded statements), item score = 4 for strongly agree, 3 for agree, 2 for disagree and 1 for strongly disagree.

^c F scores of comparison across disability types.

** p < 0.1 *** p < 0.001

Table 1.5.2 Optimism-Human Right Sub-Scale: Comparison of Item Means across Disability Types

Items ^a	M ^b	SD	F ^c
A12 (i) children should not be provided with a high school education.	1.6	0.7	22.3***
A4 (i) should be allowed to live where and how they choose.	1.6	0.7	21.7***
A15 Equal employment opportunities should be available to individuals who are (i).	1.6	0.6	9.3***
A14 (i) worker should receive the same wage as compared with other workers for the same workload.	1.7	0.7	8.4***
A16 Laws to prevent employers from discriminating against (i) should be passed.	1.7	0.8	3.4**
A23 (i) should date and marry each other, not able-bodied persons.	1.8	0.8	50.7***
A2 I do not mind having a service center for (i) in my residential neighbourhood.	2.0	0.8	28.9***
A3 (i) should live with others of similar disabilities.	2.2	0.8	7.8***

Note: (i) denotes mentally handicapped / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

^a Items are arranged in an ascending order of their mean scores. A lower score indicates a more favorable attitude towards PWDs.

^b For items 2, 4, 14, 15 and 16, item score =1 for strongly agree; 2 for agree, 3 for disagree and 4 for strongly disagree. For items 3, 12, and 23 (the negatively worded statements), item score = 4 for strongly agree, 3 for agree, 2 for disagree and 1 for strongly disagree.

^c F scores of comparison across disability types.

** p < 0.1 *** p < 0.001

Table 1.5.3 Behavioral Misconception Sub-Scale: Comparison of Item Means across Disability Types

Items ^a	M ^b	SD	F ^c
A37 (i) are no different from others in many ways.	1.9	0.7	31.3***
A41 A/An (i) is not capable of making moral decisions.	2.0	0.7	68.5***
A11 Students who are (i) are often just unmotivated.	2.0	0.8	1.2
A36 (i) can never really be happy.	2.0	0.8	0.6
A47 (i) are not a burden of their family and the society.	2.1	0.8	15.4***
A32 (i) engage in bizarre activities.	2.2	0.8	166.5***
A7 (i) children in regular classrooms have an adverse effect on other children.	2.3	0.8	30.7***
A30 Most (i) are naturally inferior.	2.3	0.8	3.7**
A46 (i) people show a deviant personality profile.	2.3	0.8	90.4***
A40 Most (i) are unpredictable and express impulsive behavior.	2.4	0.8	124.2***
A31 Persons who are (i) are handicapped in all situations.	2.4	0.8	9.6***
A13 Simple repetitive work is appropriate for (i).	2.4	0.8	46.8***
A44 (i) people are more accident prone than other people.	2.8	0.8	30.7***

Note: (i) denotes mentally handicapped / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

^a Items are arranged in an ascending order of their mean scores. A lower score indicates a more favorable attitude towards PWDs.

^b For items 37 and 47, item score =1 for strongly agree; 2 for agree, 3 for disagree and 4 for strongly disagree.

For items 7, 11, 13, 30, 31, 32, 36, 40, 41, 44 and 46 (the negatively worded statements), item score = 4 for strongly agree, 3 for agree, 2 for disagree and 1 for strongly disagree.

^c F scores of comparison across disability types.

** p < 0.1 *** p < 0.001

Table 1.5.4 Pessimism-Hopelessness Sub-Scale: Comparison of Item Means across Disability Types

Items ^a	M ^b	SD	F ^c
A19 Severe (i) are really ‘useless eater’.	1.6	0.7	28.9***
A24 (i) people should be prevented from having children.	1.7	0.8	61.8***
A22 It is a waste of money to have especial facilities/services, e.g (i) etc. for the (ii).	1.7	0.8	6.6***
A42 Keeping severely (i)/(ii) alive is scientifically unnaturally and lies in the face of ‘survival of the fittest’.	1.8	0.8	24.0***
A20 The government should take care of persons who are (i).	1.8	0.7	3.5**
A10 Severe (i)/(ii) cannot really benefit from an education.	1.9	0.7	35.3***
A21 (i) individuals can be expected to fit into competitive society.	2.0	0.7	28.0***
A43 (i) people when influenced by the environment are easy to develop and express criminal tendencies.	2.1	0.8	94.9***
A17 Rehabilitation programmes for (i) are too expensive to operate.	2.4	0.8	1.9

Note: (i) denotes mentally handicapped / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired persons

^a Items are arranged in an ascending order of their mean scores. A lower score indicates a more favourable attitude towards PWDS.

^b For items 20, and 21, item score =1 for strongly agree; 2 for agree, 3 for disagree and 4 for strongly disagree. For items 10, 17, 19, 22, 24, 42 and 43 (the negatively worded statements), item score = 4 for strongly agree, 3 for agree, 2 for disagree and 1 for strongly disagree.

^c F scores of comparison across disability types.

** p < 0.1 *** p < 0.001

Table 1.6 Disability Index*

Table 1.6.1 Social Acceptance Index by Disability and Class

	P4	F1	F4	F6	Total
MH	67.9	62.3	59.5	64.4	63.2
MI	68.2	62.5	63.5	64.2	64.5
PH	70.6	68.3	70.3	72.9	70.4
HI	68.8	67.9	69.9	73.4	69.9
VI	70.1	65.7	68.8	73.1	69.1
Total	69.1	65.3	66.3	69.4	67.3

Table 1.6.2 Optimism-Human Right Index by Disability and Class

	P4	F1	F4	F6	Total
MH	72.7	72.5	69.6	73.7	72.0
MI	73.7	72.4	73.5	74.8	73.5
PH	74.2	75.0	75.7	79.1	75.9
HI	75.7	76.9	77.2	79.1	77.2
VI	74.7	75.3	74.8	80.0	76.0
Total	74.1	74.4	74.1	77.3	74.9

Table 1.6.3 Behavioral Misconception Index by Disability and Class

	P4	F1	F4	F6	Total
MH	56.8	53.4	51.9	55.8	54.2
MI	59.6	55.4	57.3	57.8	57.4
PH	60.3	60.0	61.2	63.1	61.1
HI	60.7	62.0	62.9	66.2	62.9
VI	60.6	58.0	60.3	63.7	60.4
Total	59.6	57.7	58.6	61.1	59.1

* Index scores were based on the summated mean scores of the respective sub-scales.
Range of index:: 1 to 100 (with 100 indicating the most favourable attitude)

Table 1.6.4 Pessimism-Hopelessness Index by Disability and Class*

	P4	F1	F4	F6	Total
MH	72.1	65.4	64.4	67.9	67.2
MI	73.5	67.1	67.9	68.8	69.2
PH	75.3	70.6	72.0	74.1	72.9
HI	74.9	71.0	72.8	75.8	73.3
VI	74.8	70.2	71.3	77.0	72.9
Total	74.1	68.8	69.6	72.5	71.0

* Index scores were based on the summated mean scores of the respective sub-scales.

Range of index:: 1 to 100 (with 100 indicating the most favourable attitude)

Table 1.7 Reliability Analysis of Attitude Component Subscales (Cronbach's alpha)

Attitude Components	MH	MI	PH	HI	VI
Social Acceptance	0.85	0.83	0.84	0.82	0.84
Optimism - Human Right	0.70	0.71	0.73	0.73	0.74
Behavioral Misconceptions	0.79	0.80	0.79	0.80	0.79
Pessimism –Hopelessness	0.74	0.74	0.73	0.69	0.71

Table 1.8 Correlation Matrix of Attitude Component Sub-scale

	Social Acceptance	Optimism – Human Right	Behavioral Misconceptions	Pessimism – Hopelessness
Social Acceptance	--	0.70***	0.73***	0.73***
Optimism - Human Right	0.70***	--	0.57***	0.67***
Behavioral Misconceptions	0.73***	0.57***	--	0.67***
Pessimism –Hopelessness	0.73***	0.67***	0.67***	--

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 1.9 Comparison of Attitude Component across Disability Types

Attitude Component		MH		MI		PH		HI		VI		F ^a	total	
		M [#]	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		M	SD
Social	P4	33.4	7.6	33.2	7.5	32.0	8.0	32.9	7.1	32.2	7.0	1.5	32.7	7.5
Acceptance	F1	36.2	7.4	36.1	6.7	33.2	7.2	33.4	6.7	34.5	7.8	11.4***	34.7	7.3
	F4	37.7	6.0	35.6	6.0	32.2	5.7	32.4	5.5	32.9	5.0	48.8***	34.2	6.1
	F6	35.2	4.7	35.3	4.9	30.8	4.5	30.6	5.1	30.7	4.8	57.1***	32.6	5.3
Whole Sample				<u>M</u> = 33.7		<u>SD</u> = 6.7						<u>F</u> ^b = 29.8***		
Optimism -	P4	14.6	3.4	14.3	3.7	14.2	4.2	13.8	3.9	14.1	3.8	1.1	14.2	3.8
Human Right	F1	14.6	3.7	14.6	3.6	14.0	3.4	13.5	3.5	13.9	3.8	4.4**	14.1	3.6
	F4	15.3	3.0	14.4	3.0	13.8	3.3	13.5	2.9	14.1	2.9	13.8***	14.2	3.1
	F6	14.3	2.5	14.0	2.8	13.0	2.4	13.0	2.8	12.8	2.7	14.7***	13.5	2.7
Whole Sample				<u>M</u> = 14.0		<u>SD</u> = 3.4						<u>F</u> ^b = 13.3***		
Behavioral	P4	29.9	5.9	28.8	6.2	28.5	6.6	28.3	6.7	28.4	5.8	2.1	28.8	6.3
Misconceptions	F1	31.2	5.8	30.4	5.3	28.6	5.4	27.8	5.6	29.4	6.0	15.4***	29.5	5.8
	F4	31.8	4.7	29.7	4.9	28.1	4.6	27.5	4.6	28.5	4.6	35.0***	29.1	4.9
	F6	30.3	3.9	29.5	4.2	27.4	3.9	26.2	3.9	27.1	3.8	37.5***	28.2	4.2
Whole Sample				<u>M</u> = 28.9		<u>SD</u> = 5.4						<u>F</u> ^b = 13.3***		
Pessimism -	P4	16.5	4.0	16.2	4.3	15.7	4.9	15.8	3.8	15.8	3.8	1.6	16.0	4.2
Hopelessness	F1	18.4	4.3	17.9	4.0	17.0	3.5	16.8	3.7	17.0	4.2	7.8***	17.4	4.0
	F4	18.6	3.5	17.7	3.3	16.6	3.1	16.3	3.1	16.8	3.0	23.0***	17.2	3.3
	F6	17.7	3.0	17.4	2.9	16.0	2.8	15.5	2.8	15.2	2.7	31.7***	16.4	3.0
Whole Sample				<u>M</u> = 16.8		<u>SD</u> = 3.7						<u>F</u> ^b = 39.7***		

Note. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

F^a = ANOVA of Attitude Component Scores Across Disability Types with each Form.

F^b = ANOVA of Attitude Component Scores Across Different Forms of students.

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Table 1.10 Homogeneous Subset Across Classes (Tukey HSD)*

		N	1	2	3
Social Acceptance	P4	1049	32.7#		
	F1	1333		34.7	
	F4	1356		34.2	
	F6	1056	32.6		
	<i>Sig.</i>		0.95	0.26	
Optimism-Human Right	P4	1130		14.2	
	F1	1375		14.1	
	F4	1380		14.2	
	F6	1061	13.5		
	<i>Sig.</i>		1.00	0.95	
Behavioural Misconception	P4	1074		28.8	
	F1	1351			29.5
	F4	1368		29.1	29.1
	F6	1053	28.2		
	<i>Sig.</i>		1.00	0.31	0.37
Pessimism-Hopelessness	P4	1098	16.0		
	F1	1360		17.4	
	F4	1361		17.2	
	F6	1057		16.4	
	<i>Sig.</i>		1.00	1.00	0.49

Note. subset for alpha = 0.05

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Table 1.11 Homogeneous Subset Across Disability (Tukey HSD)*

		N	1	2	3	4
social acceptance	MH	973		35.8 [#]		
	MI	1019		35.1		
	PH	1039	32.1			
	HI	858	32.4			
	VI	906	32.7			
	<i>Sig.</i>		<i>0.19</i>	<i>0.19</i>		
Optimism-Human Right	MH	994		14.7		
	MI	1047		14.3		
	PH	1075	13.8			
	HI	892	13.5			
	VI	939	13.8			
	<i>Sig.</i>		<i>0.25</i>	<i>0.09</i>		
Behavioural Misconception	MH	968			30.9	
	MI	1027			29.6	
	PH	1050		28.2		
	HI	873	27.5			
	VI	929		28.4		
	<i>Sig.</i>		<i>1.00</i>	<i>0.80</i>	<i>1.00</i>	<i>1.00</i>
Pessimism-Hopelessness	MH	981			17.9	
	MI	1034		17.3		
	PH	1054	16.3			
	HI	883	16.2			
	VI	925	16.3			
	<i>Sig.</i>		<i>0.94</i>	<i>1.00</i>	<i>1.00</i>	

Note. subset for alpha = 0.05

* a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

SECTION II: VIGNETTES

Table 2.1 Responses to Vignettes 1

(Your classmate, Ah Man, is a (i) person. Ah Man seems to be accepted by other classmates. However, Ah Man often stays alone during recess or at lunchtime. You are playing with your classmates at lunchtime today when you see that Ah Man is sitting in a corner again. Would you make suggestion to invite Ah Man to join?)

		most likely		likely		unlikely		very unlikely		total
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
MH	P4	138	59.5	72	31.0	14	6.0	8	3.4	232 100
MI		176	68.0	63	24.3	9	3.5	11	4.2	259 100
PH		181	69.3	61	23.4	4	1.5	15	5.7	261 100
HI		144	70.2	45	22.0	3	1.5	13	6.3	205 100
VI		140	63.6	69	31.4	5	2.3	6	2.7	220 100
sub-total		779	66.2	310	26.3	35	3.0	53	4.5	1177 100
MH	F1	112	39.2	143	50.0	13	4.5	18	6.3	286 100
MI		122	42.5	141	49.1	14	4.9	10	3.5	287 100
PH		147	50.3	119	40.8	13	4.5	13	4.5	292 100
HI		138	52.3	108	40.9	5	1.9	13	4.9	264 100
VI		132	48.4	120	44.0	7	2.6	14	5.1	273 100
sub-total		651	46.4	631	45.0	52	3.7	68	4.9	1402 100
MH	F4	71	25.0	170	59.9	27	9.5	16	5.6	284 100
MI		99	33.6	167	56.6	13	4.4	16	5.4	295 100
PH		122	41.1	149	50.2	15	5.1	11	3.7	297 100
HI		121	47.1	115	44.7	17	6.6	4	1.6	257 100
VI		109	40.5	142	52.8	10	3.7	8	3.0	269 100
sub-total		522	37.2	743	53.0	82	5.8	55	3.9	1402 100
MH	F6	81	37.9	113	52.8	10	4.7	10	4.7	214 100
MI		91	38.9	110	47.0	16	6.8	17	7.3	234 100
PH		119	49.4	111	46.1	5	2.1	6	2.5	241 100
HI		79	41.6	101	53.2	9	4.7	1	0.5	190 100
VI		82	41.8	103	52.6	4	2.0	7	3.6	196 100
sub-total		452	42.0	538	50.2	44	4.1	41	3.8	1075 100

Note. (i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

χ^2 across different forms with a given type of disability:

MH: $\chi^2 = 70.7***$; MI: $\chi^2 = 82.9***$; PH: $\chi^2 = 60.7***$; HI: $\chi^2 = 70.0***$; VI: $\chi^2 = 34.9***$

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 2.2 Response to Vignette 2 (Junior)

(You are on a bus that is almost full, the only vacant seat is next to somebody who appears to be a/an (i) person. What would you do?)

		sit in the vacant seat		rather stand than sit down		go to the upper deck		get off the bus as soon as possible		total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
MH	P4	90	39.0	107	46.3	31	13.4	3	1.3	231	100
MI		90	34.7	122	47.1	42	16.2	5	1.9	259	100
PH		72	27.7	156	60.0	26	10.0	6	2.3	260	100
HI		71	34.6	100	48.8	29	14.1	5	2.4	205	100
VI		69	31.7	121	55.5	27	12.4	1	0.5	218	100
sub-total		392	33.4	606	51.7	155	13.2	20	1.7	1173	100
MH	F1	122	42.8	108	37.9	47	16.5	8	2.8	285	100
MI		138	48.1	89	31.0	55	19.2	5	1.7	287	100
PH		89	30.5	155	53.1	45	15.4	3	1.0	292	100
HI		153	58.0	79	29.9	30	11.4	2	0.8	264	100
VI		103	37.6	124	45.3	46	16.8	1	0.4	274	100
sub-total		605	43.2	555	39.6	223	15.9	19	1.4	1402	100

Note. (i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 2.3 Response to Vignette 2 (Senior)

(You have been chatting with Snowball in ICQ for about six months. You can chat with Snowball on almost any topic for the whole night. Snowball is of similar age and hobbies with you. Sometimes, you think it would be a good idea if you can meet Snowball in person. This weekend is your birthday. You have planned to have a party and intended to invite Snowball to come along. However, Snowball has just mentioned to you that he/she is a/an (i) person. Would you still invite Snowball to your birthday party as planned?)

		most likely		likely		unlikely		most unlikely		total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
MH	F4	146	51.4	99	34.9	26	9.2	13	4.6	284	100
MI		206	69.8	62	21.0	20	6.8	7	2.4	295	100
PH		219	73.7	64	21.5	10	3.4	4	1.3	297	100
HI		200	77.8	43	16.7	9	3.5	5	1.9	257	100
VI		173	64.3	76	28.3	17	6.3	3	1.1	269	100
sub-total		944	67.3	344	24.5	82	5.8	32	2.3	1402	100
MH	F6	129	60.3	67	31.3	12	5.6	6	2.8	214	100
MI		158	67.5	58	24.8	12	5.1	6	2.6	234	100
PH		168	69.7	54	22.4	17	7.1	2	0.8	241	100
HI		160	84.7	23	12.2	5	2.6	1	0.5	189	100
VI		157	80.1	32	16.3	5	2.6	2	1.0	196	100
sub-total		772	71.9	234	21.8	51	4.7	17	1.6	1074	100

Note. (i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

Table 2.4 Response to Vignette 3

(Ah Nam is a/an person who moves next door to you. As the families get to know each other, Ah Nam's mother confides in you that Ah Nam has a difficult time making friends with youngsters his/her own age. She asks if you would introduce Ah Nam to the youngsters in the neighbourhood and ease the transition for Ah Nam. You and Ah Nam see a group of youngsters from the neighbourhood playing the next day, would you introduce Ah Nam to the neighbourhood?)

		most likely		likely		unlikely		most unlikely		total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
MH	P4	140	60.3	70	30.2	14	6.0	8	3.4	232	100
MI		164	63.8	72	28.0	12	4.7	9	3.5	257	100
PH		182	69.7	57	21.8	5	1.9	17	6.5	261	100
HI		133	64.9	54	26.3	6	2.9	12	5.9	205	100
VI		140	63.9	62	28.3	11	5.0	6	2.7	219	100
sub-total		759	64.7	315	26.8	48	4.1	52	4.4	1174	100
MH	F1	134	46.9	115	40.2	16	5.6	21	7.3	286	100
MI		144	50.2	109	38.0	18	6.3	16	5.6	287	100
PH		176	60.3	92	31.5	15	5.1	9	3.1	292	100
HI		153	58.0	100	37.9	7	2.7	4	1.5	264	100
VI		145	52.9	106	38.7	11	4.0	12	4.4	274	100
sub-total		752	53.6	522	37.2	67	4.8	62	4.4	1403	100
MH	F4	143	50.5	108	38.2	22	7.8	10	3.5	283	100
MI		162	54.9	106	35.9	17	5.8	10	3.4	295	100
PH		189	63.6	89	30.0	14	4.7	5	1.7	297	100
HI		158	61.5	86	33.5	11	4.3	2	0.8	257	100
VI		155	57.6	101	37.5	11	4.1	2	0.7	269	100
sub-total		807	57.6	490	35.0	75	5.4	29	2.1	1401	100
MH	F6	131	61.2	70	32.7	11	5.1	2	0.9	214	100
MI		134	57.3	91	38.9	7	3.0	2	0.9	234	100
PH		178	73.9	60	24.9	2	0.8	1	0.4	241	100
HI		124	65.3	59	31.1	6	3.2	1	0.5	190	100
VI		139	70.9	51	26.0	6	3.1	--	--	196	100
sub-total		706	65.7	331	30.8	32	3.0	6	0.6	1075	100

Note. (i) : mentally handicapped / ex-mentally-ill / physically handicapped / hearing impaired / visually impaired

χ^2 across different forms with a given type of disability:

MH: $\chi^2 = 26.7^{**}$; MI: $\chi^2 = 21.5^*$; PH: $\chi^2 = 39.4^{***}$; HI: $\chi^2 = 26.2^{**}$; VI: $\chi^2 = 30.2^{***}$

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 2.5 Chi Square Association of Vignette Responses with Demographic Background, Prior Education Contacts and Programme

Table 2.5.1 Chi-square Association of Vignette Responses with Sex

Form	χ^2 ^a		
	Vignette 1	Vignette 2	Vignette 3
P4	41.9***	12.8**	44.4***
F1	16.2***	26.9***	16.5***
F4	7.4	16.5***	16.8***
F6	28.0***	1.2	8.5*

Table 2.5.2 Chi-square Association of Vignette Responses with Prior Contacts

Form	χ^2 ^a		
	Vignette 1	Vignette 2	Vignette 3
P4	18.3***	6.2	15.7**
F1	10.5*	14.3**	7.0
F4	9.0*	5.8	11.1*
F6	24.9***	3.8	10.5*

Table 2.5.3 Chi-square Association of Vignette Responses with Participation in Educational Programmes

Form	χ^2 ^a		
	Vignette 1	Vignette 2	Vignette 3
P4	11.6***	1.9	12.3**
F1	34.9***	15.0**	22.9***
F4	9.4*	7.4	10.4***
F6	18.3***	6.1	12.8**

Table 2.54 Chi-square Association of Vignette Responses with Housing Types

Form	χ^2 ^a		
	Vignette 1	Vignette 2	Vignette 3
P4	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
F1	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
F4	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
F6	26.8*	n.s.	n.s.

N.B. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

n.s. = not significant

Table 2.5.5 Chi-square Association of Vignette Responses with No. of Computers at Home

Form	χ^2 ^a		
	Vignette 1	Vignette 2	Vignette 3
P4	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
F1	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
F4	16.9*	13.3*	n.s.
F6	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 2.5.6 Chi-square Association of Vignette Responses with Father's Education

Form	χ^2 ^a		
	Vignette 1	Vignette 2	Vignette 3
P4	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
F1	n.s.	14.7*	n.s.
F4	n.s.	15.6*	n.s.
F6	n.s.	15.4*	n.s.

Table 2.5.7 Chi-square Association of Vignette Responses with Mother's Education

Form	χ^2 ^a		
	Vignette 1	Vignette 2	Vignette 3
P4	13.6*	n.s.	n.s.
F1	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
F4	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
F6	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

N.B. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

n.s. = not significant

Table 2.6 Cross-Tabulation of Responses to Vignettes by Form and Sex

Table 2.6.1 Cross-Tabulation of Responses to Vignette 1 by Form and Sex

Form		% ^a			χ^2 ^a
		M	F	Total	
P4	Most likely	60.1	70.8	65.8	41.9***
	likely	27.1	25.7	26.4	
	unlikely	4.4	2.0	3.1	
	very unlikely	8.3	1.5	4.7	
F1	Most likely	40.4	45.1	43.1	16.2***
	likely	45.4	46.8	46.2	
	unlikely	5.4	3.6	4.4	
	very unlikely	8.7	4.5	6.3	
F4	Most likely	35.9	37.8	37.0	7.4
	likely	51.9	53.9	53.1	
	unlikely	6.7	5.3	5.8	
	very unlikely	5.5	3.0	4.1	
F6	Most likely	36.0	45.5	42.0	28.0***
	likely	51.0	49.4	50.0	
	unlikely	5.6	3.2	4.1	
	very unlikely	7.4	1.9	3.9	

^a Chi-square statistics in comparing responses between male and female students within each form

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Table 2.6.2 Cross-Tabulation of Responses to Vignette 2 by Form and Sex

Form		% ^a			χ^2 ^a
		M	F	Total	
P4	Most likely	32.0	35.0	33.5	12.8**
	likely	50.4	52.7	51.6	
	unlikely	14.4	11.6	12.9	
	very unlikely	3.2	0.80	1.9	
F1	Most likely	41.2	43.0	42.2	26.9***
	likely	37.2	40.8	39.2	
	unlikely	18.3	16.0	17.0	
	very unlikely	3.3	0.2	1.6	
F4	Most likely	62.3	70.8	67.3	16.5***
	likely	27.8	22.5	24.7	
	unlikely	6.2	5.3	5.6	
	very unlikely	3.7	1.5	2.4	
F6	Most likely	70.5	72.7	71.9	1.2
	likely	23.2	21.1	21.8	
	unlikely	5.1	4.5	4.7	
	very unlikely	1.3	1.8	1.6	

^a Chi-square statistics in comparing responses between male and female students within each form

*p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Table 2.6.3 Cross-Tabulation of Responses to Vignette 3 by Form and Sex

Form		% ^a			χ^2 ^a
		M	F	Total	
P4	Most likely	57.8	70.4	64.5	44.4***
	likely	27.5	25.2	26.2	
	unlikely	6.3	2.4	4.3	
	very unlikely	8.4	2.0	5.0	
F1	Most likely	48.6	52.2	50.6	16.5***
	likely	36.7	38.8	37.9	
	unlikely	6.7	5.4	6.0	
	very unlikely	8.0	3.6	5.5	
F4	Most likely	51.8	61.5	57.5	16.8***
	likely	38.8	32.6	35.1	
	unlikely	6.4	4.5	5.3	
	very unlikely	3.1	1.5	2.1	
F6	Most likely	60.7	68.4	65.6	8.5*
	likely	34.3	28.8	30.8	
	unlikely	4.1	2.3	3.0	
	very unlikely	1.0	0.4	0.6	

^a Chi-square statistics in comparing responses between male and female students within each form

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Table 2.7 Cross Tabulation of Responses to Vignettes by Forms and Prior Contacts

Table 2.7.1 Cross Tabulation of Responses to Vignette 1 by Forms and Prior Contacts

Form		Knowing/Having contacts %			χ^2 ^a
		No	Yes	Total	
P4	Most likely	62.0	72.7	65.9	18.3***
	likely	28.5	22.3	26.2	
	unlikely	3.4	2.6	3.1	
	very unlikely	6.1	2.4	4.7	
F1	Most likely	40.9	46.3	43.2	10.5*
	likely	49.5	41.5	46.0	
	unlikely	3.9	5.0	4.4	
	very unlikely	5.7	7.2	6.3	
F4	Most likely	34.3	41.5	36.9	9.0*
	likely	54.7	50.4	53.1	
	unlikely	6.4	5.1	5.9	
	very unlikely	4.6	3.1	4.1	
F6	Most likely	37.9	48.4	41.9	24.9***
	likely	51.6	47.7	50.1	
	unlikely	6.0	1.0	4.1	
	very unlikely	4.5	2.9	3.9	

^a Chi-square statistics in comparing responses between students with and without prior contacts with PWDs within each form

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Table 2.7.2 Cross Tabulation of Responses to Vignette 2 by Form and Prior Contacts

Form		Knowing/Having contacts %			χ^2 ^a
		No	Yes	Total	
P4	Most likely	33.8	32.6	33.4	6.2
	likely	49.5	55.4	51.6	
	unlikely	14.5	10.3	13.0	
	very unlikely	2.2	1.8	2.0	
F1	Most likely	39.4	46.2	42.3	14.3**
	likely	39.9	38.7	39.4	
	unlikely	19.4	13.2	16.7	
	very unlikely	1.3	1.9	1.6	
F4	Most likely	65.0	70.7	67.1	5.8
	likely	26.2	22.5	24.8	
	unlikely	6.4	4.5	5.7	
	very unlikely	2.5	2.2	2.4	
F6	Most likely	70.8	73.4	71.8	3.8
	likely	22.6	20.7	21.9	
	unlikely	4.5	5.1	4.7	
	very unlikely	2.1	0.7	1.6	

^a Chi-square statistics in comparing responses between students with and without prior contacts with PWDs within each form

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Table 2.7.3 Cross Tabulation of Responses to Vignette 3 by Form and Prior Contacts

Form		Knowing/Having Contacts %			χ^2 ^a
		No	Yes	Total	
P4	Most likely	60.4	71.3	64.4	15.7**
	likely	29.8	20.4	26.4	
	unlikely	4.6	3.7	4.3	
	very unlikely	5.2	4.6	5.0	
F1	Most likely	48.0	54.5	50.8	7.0
	likely	39.8	35.1	37.8	
	unlikely	6.1	5.7	6.0	
	very unlikely	6.1	4.7	5.5	
F4	Most likely	54.2	62.7	57.3	11.1*
	likely	38.2	30.1	35.2	
	unlikely	5.3	5.3	5.3	
	very unlikely	2.3	2.0	2.2	
F6	Most likely	63.6	68.9	65.6	10.5*
	likely	31.6	29.4	30.8	
	unlikely	4.2	1.0	3.0	
	very unlikely	0.6	0.7	0.7	

^a Chi-square statistics in comparing responses between students with and without prior contacts with PWDs within each form

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Table 2.8 Cross Tabulation of Responses to vignettes by Forms and Participation in Equal Opportunity Programmes

Table 2.8.1 Cross Tabulation of Responses to Vignette 1 by Form and Participation in Equal Opportunity Programs

Form		Participation in Equal Opportunity Programmes %			χ^2 ^a
		No	Yes	Total	
P4	Most likely	61.6	69.6	65.8	11.6**
	likely	28.5	24.4	26.4	
	unlikely	3.6	2.6	3.1	
	very unlikely	6.3	3.4	4.8	
F1	Most likely	37.3	48.0	43.2	34.9***
	likely	47.6	44.9	46.1	
	unlikely	6.3	3.0	4.4	
	very unlikely	8.9	4.2	6.3	
F4	Most likely	35.4	38.3	36.9	9.4*
	likely	52.3	54.0	53.2	
	unlikely	7.5	4.3	5.9	
	very unlikely	4.8	3.4	4.1	
F6	Most likely	39.8	43.2	42.0	18.3***
	likely	47.6	51.3	50.0	
	unlikely	5.8	3.2	4.1	
	very unlikely	6.8	2.3	3.9	

^a Chi-square statistics in comparing responses between students have and have not participated in Equal Opportunity programmes within each form

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Table 2.8.2 Cross Tabulation of Responses to Vignette 2 by Form and Participation in Equal Opportunity Programmes

Form		Participation in Equal Opportunity Programmes %			χ^2 ^a
		No	Yes	Total	
P4	Most likely	33.2	33.6	33.4	1.9
	likely	50.8	52.5	51.7	
	unlikely	14.2	11.7	12.9	
	very unlikely	1.8	2.2	2.0	
F1	Most likely	37.6	46.1	42.3	15.0**
	likely	41.4	37.4	39.2	
	unlikely	18.8	15.5	17.0	
	very unlikely	2.2	1.0	1.5	
F4	Most likely	64.0	70.2	67.2	7.4
	likely	27.0	22.6	24.8	
	unlikely	6.0	5.4	5.7	
	very unlikely	2.9	1.8	2.4	
F6	Most likely	67.5	74.3	71.9	6.1
	likely	25.7	19.7	21.8	
	unlikely	5.0	4.6	4.7	
	very unlikely	1.8	1.4	1.6	

^a Chi-square statistics in comparing responses between students have and have not participated in Equal Opportunity programmes within each form

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Table 2.8.3 Cross Tabulation of Responses to Vignette 3 by Form and Participation in Equal Opportunity Programmes

Form		Participation in Equal Opportunity Programmes %			χ^2 ^a
		No	Yes	Total	
P4	Most likely	60.1	68.4	64.4	12.3**
	likely	28.3	24.7	26.4	
	unlikely	5.4	3.1	4.2	
	very unlikely	6.1	3.9	4.9	
F1	Most likely	46.0	54.4	50.6	22.9***
	likely	39.2	36.7	37.8	
	unlikely	6.8	5.5	6.1	
	very unlikely	8.1	3.4	5.5	
F4	Most likely	53.9	60.7	57.3	10.4*
	likely	37.0	33.5	35.2	
	unlikely	6.1	4.4	5.3	
	very unlikely	2.9	1.4	2.2	
F6	Most likely	61.3	68.0	65.6	12.8**
	likely	32.7	29.7	30.8	
	unlikely	5.2	1.7	3.0	
	very unlikely	0.8	0.6	0.6	

^a Chi-square statistics in comparing responses between students have and have not participated in Equal Opportunity programmes within each form

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

SECTION III: DESCRIPTIVE LABELS

Table 3.1 Frequency ranking of descriptive labels (MH)

	P4 n = 232	F1 n=286	F4 n=285	F6 n=214	total N=1017
	%	%	%	%	%
poor self-expressing skill	22.0	46.2	63.2	66.4	49.7
pitiable	54.3	52.4	44.2	38.3	47.6
should offer help	24.6	29.0	30.5	51.9	33.2
unvigilant	21.1	28.7	24.2	38.3	27.7
weird behaviour	15.5	26.2	31.6	20.6	24.1
naïve	12.1	20.3	21.8	30.4	20.9
not harmful to the others	33.2	18.2	10.5	16.8	19.2
poor social skills	3.0	16.1	22.5	30.8	18.0
lacking self-confidence	15.9	16.4	18.2	20.6	17.7
just like ordinary people	35.8	17.1	8.8	7.9	17.1
considerate	27.2	11.9	5.6	5.6	12.3
easy-going	27.2	11.5	7.0	5.6	12.6
eager to make progress	16.4	14.0	13.7	3.3	12.2
self-confident	16.4	3.1	2.5	--	5.3
self-abasement	9.9	19.2	20.0	17.8	17.0
self-pity	12.1	7.7	5.6	2.8	7.1
trust-worthy	13.4	7.0	7.4	6.5	8.5
amiable	11.6	11.9	11.2	12.1	11.7
sociable	10.8	5.2	3.5	1.9	5.3
boring	10.3	8.0	7.4	1.9	7.1
admirable	8.2	4.9	4.9	2.3	5.1
self-protective	6.9	4.2	8.4	13.6	8.0
unpredictably explosive	8.6	14.3	16.1	9.3	12.5
not easy to get along with	9.1	17.5	15.8	17.8	15.1
immature thinking	14.7	18.5	18.6	13.1	16.5
interesting	7.8	6.3	3.2	2.3	4.9
sophisticated	5.2	0.3	0.7	--	1.5
constantly strive to improve oneself	6.0	10.5	7.7	6.1	7.8
dangerous	5.6	5.9	7.4	0.5	5.1
hot-tempered	5.2	8.7	9.8	5.6	7.6
optimistic	8.2	10.8	15.4	21.5	13.8
scary	5.2	11.5	6.7	2.3	6.8
aggressive	5.6	8.0	4.9	0.9	5.1
self-centered	3.0	4.2	5.3	4.7	4.3
cute	4.7	5.2	2.8	1.4	3.6
ill-tempered	4.3	4.5	3.2	0.5	3.2
intolerance	3.0	4.5	8.1	8.4	6.0
like to yell and shout aloud	5.6	13.6	17.9	13.6	13.0

Note. █ top ten of the column

Table 3.2 Frequency ranking of descriptive labels (MI)

	P4 n = 259	F1 n = 288	F4 n = 296	F6 n = 234	total N = 1077
	%	%	%	%	%
pitiable	47.9	43.8	30.4	34.6	39.1
should offer help	23.6	29.2	38.9	50.9	35.2
poor self-expressing skill	18.5	37.2	39.2	39.7	33.8
just like ordinary people	35.9	26.0	28.0	28.6	29.5
lacking self-confidence	18.5	20.1	31.4	30.8	25.2
self-abasement	17.0	24.3	26.0	34.2	25.2
poor social skill	4.2	22.2	28.7	38.5	23.2
weird behaviour	13.5	27.4	18.2	18.4	19.6
unvigilant	22.4	18.1	19.3	18.4	19.5
unpredictably explosive	15.4	22.2	15.2	16.7	17.5
not harmful to the others	33.6	11.5	12.5	12.8	17.4
considerate	29.7	10.1	9.5	3.8	13.3
easy-going	21.2	7.3	7.8	3.8	10.0
eager to make progress	18.9	17.0	18.2	11.1	16.5
self-confident	21.2	5.9	3.4	0.4	7.7
self-pity	13.9	14.6	3.0	6.0	9.4
trust-worthy	12.0	9.7	10.8	3.0	9.1
amiable	8.9	15.3	15.5	15.4	13.8
sociable	14.3	5.2	2.7	1.3	5.9
boring	11.2	12.2	8.1	5.1	9.3
admirable	8.9	8.0	10.1	11.5	9.6
self-protective	12.0	6.6	19.6	29.9	16.5
not easy to get along with	10.4	14.9	15.2	12.8	13.5
immature thinking	12.0	10.1	7.4	4.3	8.5
naïve	5.8	9.0	11.1	9.0	8.8
interesting	8.9	4.2	3.0	1.7	4.5
sophisticated	5.8	2.1	1.0	1.7	2.6
constantly strive to improve oneself	6.9	13.9	13.5	9.4	11.1
dangerous	6.9	7.3	6.8	3.8	6.3
hot-tempered	8.1	14.2	10.8	8.5	10.6
optimistic	4.6	9.7	11.1	7.7	8.5
scary	5.4	9.7	5.4	2.6	5.9
aggressive	7.7	10.4	7.4	7.7	8.4
self-centered	3.5	3.1	5.7	7.3	4.8
cute	3.5	1.4	3.0	0.9	2.2
ill-tempered	4.2	3.8	1.7	0.9	2.7
intolerance	4.2	4.5	4.7	4.3	4.5
like to yell and shout aloud	3.9	6.6	9.1	5.6	6.4

Note. █ top ten of the column

Table 3.3 Frequency ranking of descriptive label (PH)

	P4 <u>n</u> =261	F1 <u>n</u> =292	F4 <u>n</u> =297	F6 <u>n</u> =241	total <u>N</u> =1091
	%	%	%	%	%
pitiable	53.6	51.0	43.8	45.2	48.4
should offer help	24.9	41.1	47.5	61.0	43.4
just like ordinary people	39.8	39.0	41.8	37.3	39.6
eager to make progress	23.0	26.7	37.7	26.1	28.7
not harmful to the others	39.1	24.7	22.9	23.7	27.4
admirable	10.3	19.2	35.7	37.3	25.6
constantly strive to improve oneself	6.5	23.3	36.0	34.4	25.2
lacking self-confident	14.2	26.0	30.0	29.0	24.9
self-abasement	13.4	26.4	25.6	29.0	23.7
self-protective	10.3	11.0	20.9	36.5	19.2
considerate	37.2	13.4	13.1	10.0	18.2
easy-going	26.1	18.2	11.8	5.8	15.6
unvigilant	19.9	11.0	10.4	9.1	12.6
self-confident	18.4	7.9	4.7	3.3	8.5
poor self-expressing skill	12.3	12.3	12.5	6.2	11.0
self-pity	11.5	13.4	8.1	7.9	10.3
trust-worthy	10.0	15.4	10.8	6.2	10.8
amiable	12.3	22.6	19.5	16.2	17.9
sociable	10.3	7.9	5.1	--	6.0
boring	10.0	8.6	7.7	5.0	7.9
weird behaviour	7.7	6.5	4.0	0.4	4.8
unpredictably explosive	6.5	7.2	3.4	0.8	4.6
not easy to get along with	8.4	13.4	5.7	5.8	8.4
immature thinking	8.0	3.4	2.4	0.4	3.6
naïve	8.4	4.8	3.4	1.2	4.5
interesting	6.9	2.4	2.0	0.8	3.0
sophisticated	10.0	7.5	3.7	8.3	7.2
dangerous	5.0	3.8	1.7	1.2	2.9
hot-tempered	5.0	5.1	5.4	2.1	4.5
optimistic	6.1	6.8	12.5	24.1	12.0
scary	6.1	4.8	2.4	0.4	3.5
aggressive	3.4	4.8	1.7	--	2.6
self-centered	4.6	3.4	4.7	4.1	4.2
poor social skills	4.2	11.3	16.2	22.4	13.4
cute	3.4	0.7	0.3	--	1.1
ill-tempered	3.4	3.1	0.3	--	1.7
intolerance	3.1	2.1	1.0	--	1.6
like to yell and shout aloud	4.2	2.7	0.3	0.4	1.9

Note. █ top ten of the column

Table 3.4 Frequency ranking of descriptive labels (HI)

	P4 n = 205	F1 n = 264	F4 n = 257	F6 n = 190	total n = 916
	%	%	%	%	%
just like ordinary people	40.5	45.5	47.1	54.7	46.7
pitiable	60.0	48.1	39.7	34.7	45.6
should offer help	22.0	40.2	51.8	64.2	44.3
lacking self-confidence	19.0	28.0	25.3	27.4	25.1
poor self-expressing skill	17.6	32.2	24.1	23.2	24.8
not harmful to the others	30.2	19.7	21.8	29.5	24.7
self-abasement	11.7	29.9	25.3	19.5	22.4
poor social skill	4.4	18.9	26.8	40.0	22.3
eager to make progress	21.5	22.7	21.8	17.4	21.1
amiable	14.6	19.3	19.8	22.6	19.1
considerate	33.7	15.2	11.3	6.8	16.5
easy-going	26.3	13.3	10.9	11.1	15.1
unvigilant	24.4	11.7	10.1	8.4	13.4
self-confident	22.0	8.0	4.7	1.1	8.7
self-pity	15.1	18.2	7.0	4.7	11.6
trust-worthy	11.7	11.0	11.7	11.6	11.5
sociable	14.6	4.5	4.7	3.7	6.7
boring	13.2	11.0	14.0	5.8	11.2
weird behaviour	8.3	6.1	3.1	1.6	4.8
admirable	14.1	11.4	22.2	29.5	18.8
self-protective	9.3	15.5	23.7	27.9	19.0
unpredictably explosive	8.8	3.4	1.6	--	3.4
not easy to get along with	13.2	13.6	10.9	5.3	11.0
immature thinking	2.9	2.7	0.4	--	1.5
naïve	4.9	5.3	3.9	1.6	4.0
interesting	6.8	1.1	3.5	1.1	3.1
sophisticate	6.3	4.9	1.9	2.1	3.8
constantly strive to improve oneself	3.9	18.9	26.8	23.2	18.7
dangerous	5.9	4.2	2.7	1.1	3.5
hot-tempered	3.4	5.3	3.1	1.1	3.4
optimistic	4.4	8.7	12.5	11.1	9.3
scary	3.4	2.3	1.2	1.1	2.0
aggressive	2.9	3.0	--	0.5	1.6
self-centered	5.9	6.4	10.9	4.7	7.2
cute	3.4	1.9	2.7	0.5	2.2
ill-tempered	4.4	2.7	1.6	1.1	2.4
intolerance	4.4	2.3	1.9	1.1	2.4
like to yell and shout aloud	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.6	2.4

Note. █ top ten of the column

Table 3.5 Frequency ranking of descriptive label (VI)

	P4 <u>n</u> = 221	F1 <u>n</u> = 274	F4 <u>n</u> = 269	F6 <u>n</u> = 196	total <u>N</u> = 960
	%	%	%	%	%
pitiable	57.5	50.4	46.8	42.3	49.4
should offer help	25.3	38.3	52.4	66.8	45.1
just like ordinary people	38.0	38.7	39.8	41.8	39.5
lacking self-confidence	19.5	25.9	33.1	27.0	26.7
not harmful to the others	37.6	18.6	21.6	25.5	25.2
self-abasement	16.7	27.0	27.1	24.5	24.2
admirable	9.5	17.9	28.3	40.3	23.4
constantly strive to improve oneself	7.2	22.6	24.5	40.3	23.2
eager to make progress	19.0	22.6	25.7	21.9	22.5
amiable	15.4	22.3	23.4	21.4	20.8
self-protective	9.5	15.0	26.8	33.7	20.8
considerate	31.2	14.2	8.9	8.2	15.4
easy-going	28.1	17.2	15.2	8.2	17.3
unvigilant	19.5	10.9	11.9	12.8	13.5
self-confident	18.1	6.6	2.2	3.1	7.3
poor self-expressing skill	15.4	20.1	15.6	5.6	14.8
self-pity	13.6	16.8	6.7	8.7	11.6
trust-worthy	15.8	10.2	10.0	10.2	11.5
sociable	9.0	6.9	3.7	1.5	5.4
boring	9.5	12.4	13.0	4.1	10.2
weird behaviour	7.2	9.9	4.5	2.0	6.2
unpredictably explosive	7.7	7.7	--	--	4.0
not easy to get along with	6.3	10.9	8.2	4.1	7.7
immature thinking	7.2	4.7	0.4	--	3.1
naïve	6.8	3.6	2.6	1.0	3.5
interesting	5.9	1.8	2.6	0.5	2.7
sophisticated	7.7	7.3	4.1	5.6	6.2
dangerous	7.2	4.7	3.3	2.0	4.4
hot-tempered	4.1	5.5	1.5	1.0	3.1
optimistic	2.7	7.3	11.9	16.3	9.4
scary	5.9	6.6	2.2	0.5	4.0
aggressive	5.4	2.6	0.7	0.5	2.3
self-centered	6.3	4.4	3.7	4.1	4.6
poor social skills	3.6	15.3	22.7	20.4	15.7
cute	4.5	1.1	1.9	0.5	2.0
ill-tempered	2.7	2.9	--	--	1.5
intolerance	4.1	3.3	0.7	--	2.1
like to yell and shout aloud	1.8	4.0	0.4	--	1.7

Note. █ top ten of the column

SECTION IV: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

Table 4 Demographic

Table 4.1 Gender Distribution of respondents

	P4 <u>n = 1165</u> %	F1 <u>n = 1402</u> %	F4 <u>n = 1399</u> %	F6 <u>n = 1076</u> %	total <u>N = 5042</u> %
M	46.8	42.1	40.7	36.5	41.6
F	53.2	58.0	59.3	63.5	58.4

Table 4.2 Distribution of questionnaires according to type and class

	MH <u>n</u>	MI <u>n</u>	PH <u>n</u>	HI <u>n</u>	VI <u>n</u>	total <u>N</u>
P4	233	259	263	205	221	1181
F1	286	288	293	266	274	1407
F4	285	296	297	257	270	1405
F6	215	234	241	190	196	1076
total	1019	1077	1094	918	961	5069

Table 4.3 Household composition of respondents

	P4 <u>n = 1173</u> f %		F1 <u>n = 1407</u> f %		F4 <u>n = 1403</u> f %		F6 <u>n = 1076</u> f %		total <u>N = 5059</u> f %	
living with grandparent(s)	218	18.6	211	15.0	165	11.8	121	11.2	715	14.1
living with father	1031	87.9	1303	92.6	1273	90.7	966	89.8	4573	90.4
living with mother	1065	90.8	1350	95.9	1344	95.8	1028	95.5	4787	94.6
living with sibling(s)	901	76.8	1111	79.0	1154	82.3	916	85.1	4082	80.7
others	139	11.8	123	8.7	102	7.3	56	5.2	420	8.3

Table 4.4 Education level of respondents' parent(s)

	P4				F1				F4				F6			
	ft		mt		ft		mt		ft		mt		ft		mt	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
primary or below	256	23.2	269	24.2	318	23.1	356	25.7	406	29.8	467	33.8	375	35.7	438	41.0
secondary	586	53.0	640	57.6	889	64.7	913	66.0	788	57.9	815	59.1	555	52.9	582	54.5
tertiary or higher	263	23.8	203	18.3	167	12.2	114	8.2	168	12.3	98	7.1	120	11.4	48	4.5

Table 4.5 Housing type of respondents

	P4		F1		F4		F6		total	
	<u>n=1122</u>		<u>n=1374</u>		<u>n=1388</u>		<u>n=1072</u>		<u>N = 4956</u>	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Public housing	459	40.9	553	40.2	536	38.6	450	42.0	1998	40.3
HOS(i)/SCHS(ii)	105	9.4	167	12.2	189	13.6	190	17.7	651	13.1
Private residential flat (whole)	416	37.1	535	38.9	555	40.0	371	34.6	1877	37.9
Private residential flat (room)	51	4.5	22	1.6	28	2.0	13	1.2	114	2.3
Villas/bungalows/modern village houses	40	3.6	40	2.9	45	3.2	29	2.7	154	3.1
others	51	4.5	57	4.1	35	2.5	19	1.8	162	3.3

N.B. (i) Home Ownership Scheme

(ii) Sandwich Class Housing Scheme

Table 4.6 Number of computer(s) possess by respondents' family

	P4		F1		F4		F6		total	
	<u>n=1169</u>		<u>n=1404</u>		<u>n=1400</u>		<u>n=1074</u>		<u>N = 5047</u>	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
none	40	3.4	122	8.7	1	0.1	--	--	163	3.2
one or more	1129	96.6	1282	91.3	1399	99.9	1074	100	4884	96.8

Table 4.7 Ever known or in contact with somebody with a disability

	P4		F1		F4		F6		total	
	<u>n=1168</u>		<u>n=1401</u>		<u>n=1402</u>		<u>n=1074</u>		<u>N = 5045</u>	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
no	755	64.6	859	61.3	941	67.1	665	61.9	3220	63.8
yes	413	35.4	542	38.7	461	32.9	409	38.1	1825	36.2

Table 4.8 Relationship of respondents with PWDs

	P4		F1		F4		F6		total	
	<u>n=413</u>		<u>n=542</u>		<u>n=461</u>		<u>n=409</u>		<u>N = 1825</u>	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
family members	55	13.3	136	25.1	24	5.2	19	4.6	234	12.8
relatives	48	11.6	78	14.4	73	15.8	63	15.4	262	14.4
friends	126	30.5	129	23.8	92	20.0	76	18.6	423	23.2
neighbours	97	23.5	85	15.7	64	13.9	67	16.4	313	17.2
classmates	43	10.4	73	13.5	63	13.7	67	16.4	246	13.5
service target	84	20.3	94	17.3	143	31.0	138	33.7	459	25.2
others	32	7.7	66	12.2	62	13.4	61	14.9	221	12.1

Table 4.9 Source of impression of PWDs

	P4		F1		F4		F6		total	
	<u>n=1181</u>		<u>n=1407</u>		<u>n=1405</u>		<u>n=1076</u>		<u>N = 5069</u>	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Family members/relatives	118	10.0	136	9.7	172	12.2	138	12.8	564	11.1
Friends	228	19.3	189	13.4	158	11.2	116	10.8	691	13.6
TV programmes	565	47.8	857	60.9	1011	72.0	782	72.7	3215	63.4
Newspaper and magazines	304	25.7	536	38.1	576	41.0	468	43.5	1884	37.2
Personal experiences with PWD	262	22.2	342	24.3	302	21.5	306	28.4	1212	23.9
Others	70	5.9	166	11.8	152	10.8	147	13.7	535	10.6

Table 4.10 Ever watched the following programme or participated in the following activities

	P4		F1		F4		F6		total		
	<u>n=1181</u>	f	<u>n=1407</u>	f	<u>n=1405</u>	f	<u>n=1076</u>	f	<u>N =5069</u>	f	%
puppet show/play on equal opportunities	140	11.9	89	6.3	64	4.6	52	4.8	345	6.8	
community roadshows on equal opportunities	133	11.3	132	9.4	88	6.3	67	6.2	420	8.3	
School talks or workshop on equal opportunities	132	11.2	179	12.7	143	10.2	101	9.4	555	10.9	
TV announcements of public interest or docu-drama on TV on equal opportunities	321	27.2	558	39.7	587	41.8	606	56.3	2072	40.9	
EOC publications, newsletters or EOC home page	165	14.0	231	16.4	187	13.3	149	13.8	732	14.4	
Other programmes or activities on equal opportunities	24	2.0	46	3.3	24	1.7	26	2.4	120	2.4	
none	570	48.3	608	43.2	674	48.0	380	35.3	2232	44.0	

Table 4.11 T-test by Sex of Respondents

Attitude Components	Sex		
	Male <u>n=</u>	Female <u>n=</u>	
Social Acceptance	<u>M</u> [#] <u>SD</u>	34.8 7.2	32.9 6.1
	<u>t</u>	9.7***	
Optimism - Human Right	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	14.5 3.6	13.7 3.1
	<u>t</u>	8.4***	
Behavioral Misconceptions	<u>M</u> <u>SD</u>	29.6 5.8	28.5 5.0
	<u>t</u>	6.7***	
Pessimism	<u>M</u>	17.3	16.5
Hopelessness	<u>SD</u>	4.2	3.3
	<u>t</u>	6.9***	

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Table 4.12 ANOVA of Attitude Component Scores by Housing Types

Attitude Components	Public Housing		Home-ownership/ Sandwich class Housing		Private Housing Flats		Others (rooms, squatters, village etc.)		F	
	<u>n</u> =1952		<u>n</u> =636		<u>n</u> =1830		<u>n</u> =420			
	<u>M</u> [#]	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Social Acceptance	33.9	6.5	33.2	6.4	33.4	6.6	34.3	7.6	3.6*	
Optimism-Human Rights	14.2	3.3	13.7	3.3	13.8	3.3	14.5	3.9	8.3***	
Behavioral Misconceptions	29.1	5.4	28.4	5.2	28.8	5.3	29.6	5.8	5.3**	
Pessimism-Hopelessness	17.0	3.6	16.5	3.7	16.7	3.7	17.3	4.3	5.8**	

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Table 4.13 T-test by Acquaintance with PWDs

Attitude Components	Knowing/Having contacts with PWDs		
	No	Yes	
	<u>n</u> =	<u>n</u> =	
Social Acceptance	<u>M</u> [#]	34.3	32.5
	<u>SD</u>	6.6	6.6
	<u>t</u>	9.2***	
Optimism - Human Right	<u>M</u>	14.3	13.6
	<u>SD</u>	29.2	28.5
	<u>t</u>	6.4***	
Behavioral Misconceptions	<u>M</u>	29.2	28.5
	<u>SD</u>	5.3	5.5
	<u>t</u>	4.1***	
Pessimism Hopelessness	<u>M</u>	17.0	16.5
	<u>SD</u>	3.7	3.8
	<u>t</u>	4.4***	

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Table 4.14 T-test by Participation in Equal Opportunities Programmes

Attitude Components	Participation in Equal Opportunities Programs		
	No <u>n</u> =2704	Yes <u>n</u> =2091	
Social Acceptance	M [#] <u>SD</u>	34.6 6.9	32.9 6.3
	t	8.7***	
Optimism - Human Right	M <u>SD</u>	14.4 3.5	13.7 3.2
	t	8.1***	
Behavioral Misconceptions	M <u>SD</u>	29.6 5.5	28.4 5.2
	t	7.7***	
Pessimism	M	17.3	16.5
Hopelessness	<u>SD</u>	3.9	3.5
	t	7.1***	

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

SECTION V: COMPARISON GROUP

Table 5 T-test scores between comparison and target group across disability types (junior)

Attitude Components		MH n _c =312 n _t =520		MI n _c =0 n _t =545		PH n _c =17 n _t =551		HI n _c =42 n _t =473		VI n _c =25 n _t =497	
		M [#]	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Social Acceptance	Comparison	37.62	8.37	--	--	29.93	4.89	31.55	7.11	34.11	6.73
	Target	34.96	7.59	34.80	7.23	32.66	7.58	33.16	6.84	33.51	7.57
	t	4.48***		--	--	-1.38		-1.42		0.33	
Optimism - Human Right	Comparison	16.21	3.98	--	--	13.00	3.38	13.43	3.76	14.52	2.69
	Target	14.57	3.59	14.49	3.66	14.08	3.76	13.66	3.66	14.00	3.79
	t	5.98***		--	--	-1.10		-0.39		0.66	
Behavioral Misconceptions	Comparison	32.37	5.86	--	--	27.60	6.15	29.75	6.39	29.13	5.14
	Target	30.60	5.90	29.67	5.77	28.59	6.03	28.03	6.08	28.91	5.97
	t	4.06***		--	--	-0.62		1.63		0.18	
Pessimism - Hopelessness	Comparison	19.33	4.76	--	--	16.59	3.16	16.83	3.89	16.52	3.82
	Target	17.54	4.27	17.09	4.24	16.37	4.31	16.38	3.78	16.50	4.07
	t	5.45***		--	--	0.21		0.73		0.03	

Note. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Table 6 Chi-Square Test between Target (T) and Comparison (C) Group on Vignette Responses (Junior) (%)

		MH n _c =312 n _t =520				MI n _c =0 n _t =545				PH n _c =17 n _t =551				HI n _c =42 n _t =473				VI n _c =25 n _t =497			
		most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely	most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely	most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely	most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely	most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely
Vignette 1	C	34.8 [#]	45.2	6.8	13.2					68.8	18.8	6.3	6.3	31.0	50.0	11.9	7.1	60.0	40.0	--	--
	T	48.4	41.4	5.2	5.0	54.6	37.5	4.0	3.9	59.5	32.3	3.1	5.1	60.3	32.7	1.7	5.3	55.4	38.2	2.4	4.0
χ^2		25.87***								1.64				25.21***				1.73			
Vignette 2	C	40.0	36.8	19.0	4.2					18.8	75.0	6.3	--	50.0	38.1	11.9	--	40.0	56.0	4.0	--
	T	41.0	41.8	15.1	2.1	41.5	38.8	17.8	1.8	28.9	56.7	13.0	1.5	48.0	38.2	12.3	1.5	35.0	49.8	14.8	0.4
χ^2		5.94								2.26				0.66				2.39			
Vignette 3	C	41.0	33.9	12.6	12.6					56.3	25.0	12.5	6.3	47.6	42.9	4.8	4.8	48.0	48.0	4.0	--
	T	53.0	35.6	5.8	5.6	56.5	33.4	5.5	4.6	64.6	27.2	3.6	4.6	61.1	32.7	2.8	3.4	58.0	33.9	4.4	3.6
χ^2		28.31***								3.41				3.10				2.69			

Note. [#]p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Table 7 Comparison of Attitude Component Across Comparison Sub-Group

Attitude Components	Comparison Sub-Group			
	JCMH1	JCMH2	JCMH3	
Social Acceptance	M [#]	40.7	38.1	31.0
	<u>SD</u>	7.2	8.8	5.9
	F		35.3***	
Optimism - Human Right	M	17.6	16.2	13.5
	<u>SD</u>	3.6	4.1	2.8
	F		27.9***	
Behavioural Misconceptions	M	33.7	33.2	28.6
	<u>SD</u>	4.9	6.3	5.3
	F		20.4***	
Pessimism	M	21.0	19.2	16.3
Hopelessness	<u>SD</u>	4.4	4.6	4.1
	F		25.3***	

Note. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

JCMH1 – F1/F2 students participated in Treats programme

JCMH2 – P4/P5 students with classmates with a disability

JCMH3 – P4/P5 students participated in Treats programme

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Table 8 T-test scores between comparison and target group across disability types (senior)

Attitude Components		MH n _c =15 n _t =500		MI n _c =0 n _t =532		PH n _c =31 n _t =543		HI n _c =69 n _t =445		VI n _c =39 n _t =464	
		M [#]	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
		Comparison	37.9	7.2		34.6	5.3	30.0	6.2	36.4	4.2
Social Acceptance	Target	36.6	5.6	35.5	5.6	31.6	5.3	31.6	5.4	32.0	5.0
	t	0.91	--			2.84**		-2.03*		5.15***	
Optimism - Human Right	Comparison	16.1	3.2			15.1	3.6	13.8	3.5	15.2	2.8
	Target	14.9	2.9	14.2	2.9	13.5	3.0	13.3	2.8	13.5	2.9
	t	1.66	--			2.88**		1.15		3.50***	
Behavioral Misconceptions	Comparison	33.1	5.3			29.5	5.1	25.9	5.4	30.3	4.2
	Target	31.1	4.4	29.6	4.6	27.8	4.3	26.9	4.4	28.0	4.4
	t	1.67	--			2.10*		-1.46		3.13**	
Pessimism - Hopelessness	Comparison	19.3	3.4			17.7	4.4	16.7	3.8	17.9	2.3
	Target	18.2	3.3	17.6	3.1	16.3	3.0	16.0	3.0	16.1	3.0
	t	1.20	--			1.66		1.37		4.49***	

Note. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Table 9 Chi-Square Test between Target (T) and Comparison (C) Group on Vignette Responses (Senior)(%)

		MH n _c =15 n _t =500				MI n _c =0 n _t =532				PH n _c =31 n _t =543				HI n _c =69 n _t =445				VI n _c =39 n _t =464			
		most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely	most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely	most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely	most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely	most likely	likely	unlikely	most unlikely
Vignette 1	C	40.0*	53.3	6.7	--					50.0	46.7	--	3.3	37.7	53.6	7.2	1.4	25.6	53.8	10.3	10.3
	T	30.3	57.0	7.4	5.2	36.0	52.2	5.6	6.2	44.8	48.4	3.7	3.1	44.5	48.3	5.8	1.3	40.8	52.9	3.0	3.2
	χ ²	1.28				--				1.30				1.18				12.02**			
Vignette 2	C	73.3	13.3	13.3	--					60.0	33.3	--	6.7	69.6	23.2	4.3	2.9	56.4	33.3	5.1	5.1
	T	55.4	33.1	7.6	3.8	68.9	22.6	6.0	2.4	71.8	21.9	5.0	1.3	80.6	14.6	3.4	1.4	71.1	23.1	4.8	1.1
	χ ²	3.77				--				8.93*				4.77				6.92			
Vignette 3	C	46.7	46.7	6.7	--					46.7	50.0	3.3	--	65.2	27.5	5.8	1.4	46.2	38.5	7.7	7.7
	T	54.9	36.0	6.6	2.4	56.1	37.1	4.5	2.3	68.3	27.4	2.9	1.3	62.9	32.6	3.8	0.7	63.1	32.8	3.7	0.4
	χ ²	1.00				--				7.44#				1.56				22.51***			

Note. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001,

#p = 0.059

* a lower score indicates a more favourable attitude

Questionnaires (English and Chinese)

Questionnaire on Students' Attitudes Toward Persons with a Disability (English Version)

There are five versions of questionnaires targeted towards:

- 1) physically handicapped
- 2) mentally handicapped
- 3) ex-mentally-ill persons
- 4) hearing impaired
- 5) visually impaired

Definitions:

A mentally handicapped person refers to somebody who has significant sub-average intellectual functioning and has deficits or impairments in skill areas like communication, self-care, home living and social/interpersonal skills etc.

A physically handicapped person refers to somebody who has disability of orthopaedic, musculoskeletal, or neurological origin and constitute a disadvantage or restriction in daily living activities.

An ex-mentally-ill person refers to somebody who has had mental illness but has been rehabilitated.

A hearing impaired person refers to somebody who has total or partial hearing loss.

A visually impaired person refers to somebody who has total blindness or low vision.

The term 'disabled' or 'disabilities' in the following statements could be substituted by different disability groups. Unless otherwise stated, the format and the content of the questionnaire for different disability groups would be the same.

Measurement on Attitudes Towards Disability:

The response options to choose from for the following 48 statements are: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree.

1. I really would not want a disabled person living in my neighborhood.
2. I do not mind having a service centre for people with disabilities in my residential neighbourhood.
3. Disabled people should live with others of similar disability.
4. Disabled people should be allowed to live where and how they choose.
5. If I have disabled people as my classmates, I would talk to them.
6. For people with a disability, integrative schooling is more preferable than special schooling.
7. Disabled children in regular classrooms cause inconvenience to other children.
8. All students, whether disabled or not can learn from each other in school.
9. I don't think it's nice to call a [(a) physically handicapped, (b) mentally handicapped, (c) ex-mentally-ill, (d) hearing impaired, (e) visually impaired] classmate [(a) 'invalid', (b) 'retard', (c)

- 'mental', (d) 'deaf idiot', (e) 'blind idiot'].
- 10 People with severe disabilities cannot really benefit from an education.
 - 11 Students with disabilities are often just unmotivated.
 - 12 Disabled children should not be provided with a high-school education.
 - 13 Simple repetitive work is appropriate for disabled people.
 - 14 Disabled workers should receive the same wage as compared with the other workers for the same workload.
 - 15 Equal employment opportunities should be available to disabled individuals.
 - 16 Laws to prevent employers from discriminating against disabled people should be passed.
 - 17 Rehabilitation programs for disabled people are too expensive to operate.
 - 18 We have a responsibility to help persons with disabilities.
 - 19 Severely and multiply disabled persons are really "useless eater."
 - 20 The government should take care of persons with disabilities.
 - 21 Disabled individuals can be expected to fit into competitive society.
 - 23 MH: It costs too much money to have special facilities, e.g. equipment in special training and special education etc. for the mentally handicapped.
MI: It costs too much money to have special services, e.g. halfway houses, sheltered workshops etc. for ex-mentally-ill persons.
PH: It costs too much money to have special facilities, e.g. wheelchair accessible ramps, wheelchair accessible toilets etc. for the physically handicapped.
VI: It costs too much money to have special facilities, e.g. Braille, traffic lights with sound alert etc. for the visually impaired.
HI: It costs too much money to have special services, e.g. sign language, subtitle etc. for the hearing impaired.
 - 23 People with disabilities should date and marry each other, not able-bodied person.
 - 24 Disabled people should be prevented from having children.
 - 25 I don't want a disabled person to sit next to me on the bus
 - 26 If I had a disabled brother or sister, I wouldn't tell anyone.
 - 27 Watching a severely disabled person eat makes me nauseous.
 - 28 It is really not a big deal to tease somebody by calling him/her a/an
 [(a) 'invalid', (b) 'retard', (c) 'mental', (d) 'deaf idiot', (e) 'blind idiot'].
 - 29 If a disabled child wanted to play with me and my friends at the park, that would be OK.
 - 30 Most people with disabilities are naturally inferior.
 - 31 Persons with disabilities are handicapped in all situations.
 - 32 Disabled people engage in bizarre activities.
 - 33 People with disabilities are more comfortable with "their own kind."
 - 34 Most persons with disabilities have an "attitude problem" and are difficult to get along with.
 - 35 People with disabilities are different in degree rather than in kind.
 - 36 Persons with disabilities can never really be happy.
 - 37 People with disabilities are no different from others in many ways
 - 38 Our attitudes can have a strong effect on how a person with a disability sees himself or herself. .
 - 39 Most people with disabilities feel resentment and envy toward able-bodied persons.
 - 40 Most people with disabilities are unpredictable and express impulsive behavior.

- 41 A disabled individual is not capable of making moral decisions.
- 42 Keeping severely disabled persons alive is scientifically unnatural and flies in the face of “survival of the fittest.”
- 43 Disabled people when influenced by the environment are easy to develop and express criminal tendencies.
- 44 Disabled people are more accident prone than other people.
- 45 I fear people with disabilities because they are often unpredictable and dangerous. (for questionnaire on ex-mentally-ill persons: ‘I fear ex-mentally-ill persons because they are often unpredictable and violent.’)
- 46 Disabled people show a deviant personality profile.
- 47 Disabled people are not the burden of their family and the society.
- 48 All mentally handicapped people are mentally ill as well. (for MH & MI only)

Vignettes

The response options to choose from for the following vignettes are: very likely, likely, unlikely, and very unlikely (except for vignette 2 for Junior versions)-

Vignette 1

Your classmate, Ah Man, is a disabled person. Ah Man seems to be accepted in class. At lunchtime today, a very good classmate of yours is planning with you about his birthday party. Would you make suggestion to invite Ah Man in joining the group? (Senior and Junior)

Vignette 2

- a) You are on a bus that is almost full, the only vacant seat is next to somebody who appears to be a disabled person. What would you do? (Junior)

The response options are: sit in the vacant seat, rather stand than sit down, go to the upper deck, get off the bus as soon as possible.

- b) You have been chatting with Snowball in ICQ for about six months. He/she is of similar age and hobbies with you. You can chat with Snowball on almost any topic for the whole night. Sometimes, you think it would be a good idea if you can meet Snowball in person. This weekend is your birthday. You have planned to have a party and intended to invite Snowball to come along. However, Snowball has just mentioned to you that he/she is a disabled person. Would you still invite Snowball to your birthday party as planned? (Senior)

Vignette 3

Ah Nam moves next door to you. As the families get to know each other, Ah Nam’s mother confides in you that her son/daughter has a difficult time making friends with youngsters his own age. She asks if you would introduce Ah Nam to the youngsters in the neighbourhood and ease the transition for him/her. You and Ah Nam see a group of youngsters from the neighbourhood playing the next day. Would you introduce Ah Nam to the neighbourhood?

Descriptive Labels

Please choose from the following 'FIVE' wordings or short statements that best describe your feeling towards the disabled people.

Self-confident	Self-pity
Boring	Amiable
Self-cantered	Self-abasement
Naïve	Sophisticated
Pitiable	Optimistic
Sociable	Dangerous
Eager to make progress	Cute
Interesting	Intolerance
Ill-tempered	Scary
Unvigilant	Not easy to get along with
Immature thinking	Like to yell and shout aloud
Should offer help	Trust-worthy
Weird behavior	Lacking self-confidence
Admirable	Constantly strive to improve oneself
Hot-tempered	Aggressive
Easy-going	Considerate
Poor social skills	Self-protective
Not harmful to the others	Poor self-expressing skill
Unpredictably explosive	Just like ordinary people

Demographic Data

Sex: M / F

Age: _____

Grade: _____

Members in the same household: (you may choose more than one)

- Grandfather and/or grandmother
- Father
- Mother
- Siblings
- Others (please specify):_____

Father's Educational Level:

- Primary School or Below
- Secondary School
- Tertiary or Higher

Mother's Educational Level:

- Primary School or Below
- Secondary School
- Tertiary or Higher

Type of Housing:

- Public Housing
- Home Ownership Scheme
- Interim Housing or Temporary Housing

- Sandwich Class Housing Scheme
- Private Residential Flat (Whole flat)
- Private Residential Room (Room)
- Squatter Housing
- Villas/ Bungalows/ Modern village houses
- non-domestic quarters
- others (please specify): _____

How many computer(s) / notebook computer(s) do you have at home?

- none
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- more than 4

Have you ever known or in contact with somebody with a disability?

- no
- yes

if yes, what are your relationship with that person?

- family members
- relatives
- friends
- neighbours
- classmates
- service target
- others (please specify)

When filing in this questionnaire, where does your impression of somebody with disability come from?

- family members/relatives
- friends
- TV programmes
- newspaper and magazines
- personal experience in relating with somebody with a disability
- others (please specify)

In the past year, have you ever watched the following programme or participated in the following activities?

- puppet show/play on equal opportunities
- community roadshows on equal opportunities
- school talks or workshop on equal opportunities
- TV announcements of public interest or docu-drama on TV on equal opportunities
- EOC publications, newsletters or EOC home page
- other programmes or activities on equal opportunities (please specify) _____
- None