

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Special Needs Education

**Prejudice and Discrimination against People with Disabilities as
a Function of Types of Disability**

By:

Tizita Kassahun G/mariam

June 2014

Addis Ababa

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Special Needs Education

**Prejudice and Discrimination against People with Disabilities as
a Function of Types of Disability**

By:

Tizita Kassahun G/mariam

**This thesis is submitted to the Department of Special Needs
Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts Degree in Special Needs Education**

Addis Ababa University
College of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Special Needs Education

**Prejudice and Discrimination against People with Disabilities as
a Function of types of Disability**

By:

Tizita Kassahun G/Mariam

Approval of the Board of Examiners

1. Advisor

Name_____ Signature_____ Date_____

2. Internal Examiner

Name_____ Signature _____ Date _____

3. External Examiner

Name_____ Signature _____ Date _____

Acknowledgment

My deepest and heartfelt gratitude goes to my advisor, Dr. R.S. Kumar for his constructive criticisms, insightful comments, guidance, advice and encouragement throughout the entire research.

I am grateful to Ato Ali Sani for his support during the development of data collection tools & his advice throughout the entire research.

I wish to thank Yekatit 12 preparatory school administrator, teachers and students for their willingness and cooperation during the collection of data for the research.

Finally, my special thanks go to my family and my husband Ato Ephrem Zeleke for their financial and moral support.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgment.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables	vi
List of Acronyms and Abbreviation	
Abstract.....	
CHAPTER ONE	4
Introduction.....	11
1.1 Background of the study	11
1.2. Problem Statement.....	13
1.3 Aim of the study.....	14
1.4. Significance of the Study	15
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	15
1.6. Limitation of the Study.....	15
1.7. Operational Definition of Variables	15
CHAPTER TWO	17
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	17
2.1. Prejudice and Discrimination	17
2.1.1. The concept of Prejudice	17
2.1.2. The Concept of Discrimination.....	18
2.1.3. Relation and Distinction between Prejudice and Discrimination	19
2.2. Forms of Prejudice and Discrimination	20
2.3. Types of Prejudice and Discrimination	21
2.4. Symptoms of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs	22
2.5. Prejudice and Discrimination towards People with Disability	23

2.5.1. History of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs.....	23
2.5.2. History of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs.....	26
2.5.3. Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs at Different Context ..	28
2.6. Prejudice and Discrimination on the Life of PWDs	30
2.7. Legal Frameworks against Disability Prejudice and Discrimination	30
2.7.1. International Policy Documents	30
2.7.2. National documents.....	32
2.8. Measurement of Prejudice and Discrimination.....	33
CHAPTER THREE	35
METHODOLOGY	35
3.1. Research Design.....	35
3.2. Study Area	35
3.3. Sample.....	36
3.4. Data Collection Instruments.....	36
3.5. Pilot study.....	37
3.6. Data Collection Procedure	38
3.7. Analysis of Data	39
3.8. Ethical Considerations	40
CHAPTER FOUR	41
RESULTS	41
4.1 Background information of the students.....	41
4.2 Students experience with PWDs	43
4.3 Nature of Prejudice towards the four types of PWDs.....	44
4.4 Comparison of Prejudice towards people with different types of disability	45
4.5 Students Characteristics and Prejudice	46
4.5.1 Sex and Prejudice	46
4.5.2. Relationship between Age and Prejudice	48
4.5.3. Prejudice and Grade level	48
4.5.4. Prejudice and contact with PWDs	50

4.5.5. Prejudice and extent of contact with PWDs	51
4.5.6. Prejudice and relation with PWDs	53
4.5.7. Prejudice and unpleasant experience with PWDs	56
4.5.8. Prejudice and pleasant experience with PWDs	58
4.5.9. Prejudice and attendance on awareness creation training	59
4.6. Nature of Discrimination towards four types of PWDs	61
4.7. Comparison of discrimination towards people with different types of disability	61
4.8. Students Characteristics and Discrimination.....	62
4.8.1. Sex and Discrimination	62
4.8.2. Discrimination and Grade level.....	64
4.8.3. Relationship between age and discrimination.....	65
4.8.4. Discrimination and contact with PWDs.....	66
4.8.5. Discrimination and extent of contact with PWDs.....	67
4.8.6 Discrimination and type of relation with PWDs	69
4.8.7. Discrimination and unpleasant experience (UPE) with PWDs	72
4.8.9 Discrimination and pleasant experience (PE) with PWDs.....	73
4.8.10 Discrimination and attendance on awareness creation training.....	74
CHAPTER FIVE	76
DISCUSSION	76
5.1 Nature of Prejudice & Discrimination towards four types of PWDs	76
5.2 Prejudice & discrimination Differences among PWDs	77
5.3 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and Sex	78
5.4 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and Age	79
5.5 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and Grade	80
5.6 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and contact with PWDs.....	81
5.7 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and extent of contact with PWDs	180
5.8 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and type of relation with PWDs	181

5.9 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and unpleasant experience with PWDs	184
5.10 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and pleasant experience with PWDs	185
5.11 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and training on PWDs	186
CHAPTER SIX	188
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	188
6.1 Conclusions	190
6.2 Recommendations	192
References	
Appendices	

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

E.C	Ethiopian Calendar
PE	Pleasant Experience
PWD	People with Disability
PWHD	People with Hearing Disability
PWID	People with Intellectual Disability
PWOD	People without Disability
PWPD	People with Physical Disability
PWVD	People with Visual Disability
UPE	Unpleasant Experience

Abstract

The main aim of this study was to examine the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination towards various types of people with disability by preparatory students. The research design used was survey. Two hundred and ninety-three students without disability, who were drawn using multi stage cluster sampling, participated in the study. Data were collected using Feeling & Thinking towards People with Disability Scale and Behavior towards People with Disability Scale. The instruments were administered individually. Descriptive statistics, t-test, one way analysis of variance & repeated measurement of analysis of variance were the specific statistical procedures employed to analyze data. As a major outcome of the study; the nature of prejudice towards all four groups of people with disability layed under the range of medium magnitude. Nature of discrimination towards people with physical and intellectual disability falls under the range of moderate. However, discrimination nature was mild towards people with hearing and visual disability. The study did not end with this result rather it continues whether there is a significant difference between groups of people with disability even though most of them fall in the same range. Hence the result shows that, both prejudice and discrimination towards various groups of people with disability revealed that there is a significant difference between groups of people with disability. Therefore, prejudice and discrimination vary between different types of people with disability. Consequently based on the findings of the study recommendation were forwarded.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

Prejudice is an attitude directed towards people because they are members of a specific social group (Brewer & Brown; 1998 as cited in Bernand and Whitley, 2010). Which means, once an individual join such group he/ she will be generalized by the assumption of the out group people towards the group. While discrimination is treating people differently from others based primarily on membership in a social group (Sue; 2003 as cited in Bernand and Whitley, 2010). Discrimination is something which is practical rather than feeling. As prejudice, people also tend to think of discrimination in negative terms, it also can result in someone's is being treated more positively than he or she otherwise would be based on group membership.

History tells us that people in minority groups including people with disabilities (PWDs) experience and also experiencing prejudice and discrimination by their parents, neighbors, age mates, society and by the community at large in different manner and settings. It is true that people with disability have been present in any society. Despite the presence of disability all over the world, people with disability experience a greater degree of prejudice and discrimination than any other groups (Julie, 2001). Julie also states that prejudice towards people with disability emerges from different factors and all those factors are not sources of prejudice for other minority groups. Therefore, experiencing prejudice does not make PWDs different from other minority groups, but the difference comes at the degree and sources of prejudice towards PWDs. When Devenney (2002) describes the extreme practices towards PWDs "It was common practice for babies with impairments to be killed" (p. 3). Hence people with disabilities encounter different physical, social and psychological abuses. In this regard Tooley (1983) states that, in

ancient Greek individuals were expected to have complete physical, mental and aesthetic perfection. If the newborn children were deemed to be 'weakly' or impaired while they are inspected by the city elders; they were taken and left exposed to the elements to die.

Mostly people without disability perceived that PWDs are unable to do anything & they are in need of others support. In supporting this, Susan (1996) stated that, "disability is socially constructed through the failure or unwillingness to create ability among people who do not fit the physical & mental profile standard of citizens" (p. 107). It reveals that the meanings given for PWDs by the society is, as incapable of doing anything so that PWDs perceived as unable to participate equally because of the disability he/she with. Congruently it also guides their interaction towards people with disabilities. Because interactions are also determined by the attitude developed towards people with disabilities.

Beyond this, individuals with disabilities face different forms of discrimination. Fred (2012) describes the form of discrimination faced by people with disabilities: it is *unique for their situation*. This implies that the way people discriminate people with disability vary as they differ in the disability that they have.

In Ethiopia also poverty and poor health status is a characteristic of people with disability as perceived by the community (Tirussew, 2005). In general the negative attitude towards PWDs had a complete impact on the life of individuals with disability. Is it mainly because disability still perceived mistakenly by the society. In Ethiopia, lack of public information about disabilities has led to negative societal attitudes about PWDs (Tirussew, 2005). Hence negative descriptions of PWDs amplify rejection and marginalization of people with disabilities (Ruffner, 1990; cited in Almaz, 2011).

In general, it's not arguable that people without disability knowingly or unknowingly prejudice and discriminate people with disability at all. Also different researches have been done studies on attitudes of people against

PWDs. Holding in mind that attitude is situational and contextual, in unequal or biased society children can grow up and adjust themselves with opinions and attitudes about disabilities which is familiar in their culture. Therefore, it's mandatory to examine their attitude in order to generate practices and modify wrong attitudes.

1.2. Problem Statement

Studies reveal that all people with disabilities experience prejudice and discrimination. However, different researches state that the intensity of prejudice and discrimination vary as the function of disability is category. Regardless of their disability, severity, social &/or economic status; people with disability are under the group of prejudiced and discriminated people. But it's possible to state the more and less prejudices and discriminated group based on the disability type (Julie, 2001).

An attitude towards PWDs is resulted from the social construct of disability in a given place/country. "Perception of disability labels, expectation of people with disabilities and ascribe meaning of the experience of disability are all shaped by the broader culture" (Albrecht, 1992; as cited in Julie, 2001, p.71). Therefore, the response of people without disability towards people with disability is selective and culturally shaped.

Different studies indicate that studying attitude is important in order to establish opportunities and ensure inclusion of PWDs through its indication towards reduction of attitudinal gaps and intervening PWDs (Chan et al., 2002; Antonak & Livneh, 2000; as cited in Almaz, 2011). Because successful inclusion of PWDs highly determined by the positive attitude of the society.

As stated earlier different literatures describes that both prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs shows discrepancy between different types of PWDs. However, the researcher did not get research based fact in Ethiopia which indicates the magnitude of prejudice and discrimination towards different types of PWDs. Therefore, it is necessary to check whether there is a difference on prejudice and discrimination towards people with different types of disability. Thus, it is necessary to conduct the research on the nature and the difference of prejudice and discrimination against people with different types of disability. The study, more specifically, tries to find answers to the following basic questions

1. What is the nature of prejudice and discrimination of people without disabilities towards people with different disabilities?
2. Is there a statically significant difference in prejudice directed towards people with different disabilities?
3. Is there a statically significant difference in discrimination directed towards people with different disabilities?
4. Is there any difference in prejudice directed towards PWDs as a function of different characteristics (age, sex, educational level, contact, type of contact with PWDs, unpleasant experience with PWDs, pleasant experience with PWDs, extent of contact with PWDs & attending awareness creation training) of students?
5. Is there any difference in discrimination directed towards PWDs as a function of different characteristics (age, sex, educational level, contact, type of contact with PWDs, unpleasant experience with PWDs, pleasant experience with PWDs, extent of contact with PWDs & attending awareness creation training) of students?

1.3 Aim of the study

The study is aimed at investigating the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination towards different types of people with disability.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study will have the following significance:

1. The finding may clearly indicate the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination towards people with different types of disability by students without disability.
2. The finding of this study may serve as an input for different governmental and non-governmental organization who works on disability issues, specifically for those who works towards inclusion of persons with disabilities to see the attitudinal gaps and run their work effectively towards reducing prejudice and discrimination against person with disability and promote social inclusion.
3. It may also be used as an input to future research on related issues.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

The research is delimited to the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination towards people with physical disability, visual disability, hearing disability & intellectual disability. It is also delimited at Yekatit 12 preparatory school, Addis Ababa.

1.6. Limitation of the Study

Due to lack of previous researches which are conducted in the same area and absence of sufficient and relevant literatures which supplement the study, the researcher has been forced to rely on few materials.

1.7. Operational Definition of Variables

Prejudice: - A negative or biased opinion, feeling, thought & prejudgment about the individual in a group with disability.

Discrimination: - Unequal/ unfair practice or action towards individual or group with disability.

Nature: - The extent that prejudice and discrimination appear towards people with disabilities.

Types of disability: - physical disability, hearing disability, visual disability & intellectual disability.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Prejudice and Discrimination

People may confuse with these two terms. Prejudice and discrimination are terms which describe responses towards others. Even though they are an attitude towards others, prejudice is the affective component while discrimination falls under the behavioral component of attitude (Forsyth, 1995; as cited in Tirusew, 2005).

2.1.1. The concept of Prejudice

In different time number of definitions was given for the term prejudice based up on the condition/context they want to give stress. This includes prejudice in relation to disability, race, gender, age, economic status& so on. Even though, different authors gave their definitions, most of the definitions bring almost similar theme.

Of them, Brewer and Brown (as cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010) prejudice is an attitude towards the members of certain social groups. Anne (2007) also define prejudice as an existing biases resulted from the social stereotypes and can result rejection of individuals right due to membership in social groups. Prejudice is “Adverse opinion, often accompanied by irrational suspicion or hatred, formed towards a particular race, religion, or group.” (Richard, Sharon & Kelly, 2007, p. 20). Other definition which is given by Allport (cited in Julie, 2001) describes that prejudice is a hostile attitude towards people in a group simply because of an individual belongs to that group.

Prejudice is a negative attitude towards a group or towards members of the group (Todd, 2009). It is an unreasonable negative attitude towards others because of their membership in a particular group (Harold 2002). Prejudice can be automatic and can influence our behavior even when we are not aware of

that we have such views, and we might even vigorously deny that we hold them (Fazio & Hilden; 1992 cited in Harold, 2002). Also Allport (cited in Harold, 2002) summarize his discussion about the characteristics of prejudice with the following definition: "prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole or toward an individual because he is a member of that group" (P, 9). Despite the influence of prejudice throughout history, the concept of prejudice did not develop until 20th century (Richard et al. 2007).

In addition to this different theories speculate the concept of prejudice.

period	View of prejudice	Theories
1920/1930s	Irrational and un justified attitude	Psychodynamic theory
1930s/1940s	An unconscious defense	Psychodynamic theory
1950s	An expression of pathological needs	Psychodynamic theory
1960s	A social norm	Socio cultural theory
1970s	An expression of group interests and intergroup relation	Intergroup relations theory
1980s to now	An evitable outcome of normal thought processes/evaluation	Cognitive and evolutionary theory

Source: adapted from the social psychology of prejudice by Duckitt, J (cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010, pp. 27).

2.1.2. The Concept of Discrimination

Literatures also give definitions for discrimination. For example, Richard et al. (2007) define discrimination as treating people in different way by favoring to one over the other. This is unfair and based up on subjective standards and norms'. In addition to this, Bernard and Mary (2010) emphasize

that discrimination can be visible in many ways like verbally or behaviorally in different settings.

Not always discrimination appears negatively. It also appears in a way treated more positively than the others. In this regard, Sue (cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010) stated that discrimination can be resulted from more positive treatment than others due to membership of the group.

It is damaging discrepancy towards people belongs to specific group by denying their right concerning to employment, residential housing, political right, educational or recreational opportunities, churches, hospitals or some other rights (Allport cited in Julie, 2001).

2.1.3. Relation and Distinction between Prejudice and Discrimination

In most cases people use the term prejudice and discrimination interchangeably but it's important to understand the differences between these terms even though they may have some similarities. Usually the term prejudice and discrimination used to describe unfair treatment or demeaning manner (Bernard & Mary, 2010). When Julie (2001) states their difference, prejudice is concerning attitudes and beliefs rather discrimination is behavior. The main point is, prejudice is an attitude towards group members and discrimination is behavior towards them but both have a strong cultural component that guides how individuals respond to others. This conception shared by Richard et al. (2007) and they mention that prejudice is not same with discrimination and one can cause/lead to the other. Unlike this view, Harold (2002) states that discrimination is not always based on prejudice, it frequently is, especially if the perpetrator is acting on his own as opposed to on behalf of some institution or authority.

Further explanation also given by Bernard & Mary (2010)

Prejudice is an attitude; it deals with how people think and feel about members of other groups. Discrimination, in contrast, is a behavior; it deals with how people act towards members of other groups. It consists of

behaving differently towards people solely or primarily on their membership in a social group. (p. 370)

Forsyth (cited in Tirusew, 2005) suggested that prejudice consists of an affective (how we feel) and cognitive (how we think) component, while discrimination ascribes to the behavioral component. Which means that the former indicates that the like and dislike towards something / somebody while the second is related with the various types of discriminatory actions. There is a very strong impact on our action towards other resulted from prejudice which arises either from below or our level of awareness (Crystal, 2009).

It seems that impulsive prejudiced behavior starts with learned, prejudiced, implicit evaluations that will be automatically activated when a stigmatized target is present. This activation results in a basic affective reaction that will be accompanied by an impulsive, aversive behavioral reaction towards this target (Ron & Daniel, 2008). Generally, prejudice can be institutional or interpersonal but prejudice is always interpersonal.

2.2. Forms of Prejudice and Discrimination

There are different ways that prejudice and discrimination reveals. According to Benokraitis and Feagin (cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010) there are three major forms of discrimination. These are blatant, subtle and covert discrimination. As they describe:

Blatant discrimination: it's an intentional unfair and dangerous treatment of others. This is easily visible and can be documented type of discrimination.

Subtle Discrimination: consists of unequal and harmful treatment that is typically less visible and obvious than other form of discrimination. Unlike other forms of discrimination, which are often intentional, subtle discrimination is often unintentional. Similarly, Julie (2001) discusses that,

people without disability wrongly respond during the interaction with people with disability and they may not even be aware of their mistakes.

Covert Discrimination consists of unequal and harmful treatment that is hidden, purposeful, and often, maliciously motivated. Covert discrimination tends to be very difficult to document.

Other writers who state the form of discrimination based up on the severity of discriminating practice. This includes extreme form of discrimination; extermination, deliberate killing of certain groups of people. The other form is more subtle form of discrimination including exclusion from social activities and consistently biased activities (Richard et al., 2007).

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that discrimination towards PWDs is treating a person less favorably, because of his or her disability, than a person without disability. That would be treated in the same or similar circumstances (*direct discrimination*). It also covers discrimination where the same treatment applies to people with and without a disability but the impact has disadvantage or exclude people with a disability in a way which is not reasonable (*indirect discrimination*).

2.3. Types of Prejudice and Discrimination

Bernard and Mary (2010) states that four types of discriminations from the view of point of setting /situation;

Interpersonal discrimination: unfair treatment occurs at the individual or person level and may result from stereotypic beliefs and evaluation of a group.

Organizational discrimination: it occurs when the practice, rules and policies of formal organization such as corporations or government agencies have discriminatory outcomes like at workplaces (Benokraitis & Feagin cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010).

Institutional discrimination: it occurs when the norms, policies, and practices associated with a social institution such as the family, religious institution, the educational system and the criminal justice system, result in different outcomes for members of different groups (Benokraitis & Feagin cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010).

Cultural discrimination: it appears within the same culture, one group establish and maintains its dominance by rewarding those values that corresponds to its views and punishing those values that do not. This can result marginalizing those assumed as minority groups (Benokraitis & Feagin cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010).

Furthermore, prejudice occurs as implicit and explicit types (Devine, 1989; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; as cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010). Since implicit prejudice is an attitude towards individuals/ groups this is out of the conscious. If prejudice occurs in a way that people are aware of and can easily control called explicit prejudice.

2.4. Symptoms of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs

Mostly researchers come up with different but related symptoms of prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs. In this regard, Antonak, 1985; Belgrav, 1984; Belgrav & Nills, 1981; Gouvier, Steiner, Jackson, Schlater & Rain, 1984; Grand, Bernier & Strohmer, 1991; Hannah & Midlarsky, 1987; Livneh, 1987; Strohmer, Grand & Purcell, 1984; cited in Julie, 2001) stated the following symptoms are seen during interaction:

- ❖ Shorter duration during contact/ conversation – the person without disability wants to leave as quickly as possible;
- ❖ Less eye contact and physical contact; and
- ❖ Avoidance of personal topics during conversation and a greater focus on impersonal, trivial and polite.

2.5. Prejudice and Discrimination towards People with Disability

2.5.1. History of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs

History tells us the severity of prejudice and discrimination towards people with disability than any other minority groups throughout the world. Julie(2001) suggested that “No other racial, cultural, ethnic, linguistic, religious, political, national, sexual orientation, or gender groups has experienced this degree of pervasive and generalized prejudice and discrimination, which include killing babies with disability, forced sterilization of person with disability, institutionalization and mass murder” (p. 72). Unlike any other group who face prejudice based on race, color, sex, origin, religion, age, the discrimination experienced by people with disability had no legal remedy to compensate such discrimination (ADA, 1990; cited in Julie, 2001). This is mainly resulted from the misunderstanding of people without disability towards people with disability as they share same negative characteristics. In supporting this Richard et al. (2007) discussed that the prejudice against people with disability are rooted in negative stereotyping, stigmatization, psychological discomfort and pity.

People with disability faced discrimination and prejudice in different settings; within the community as well as in the institution they lived in segregated manner. People with disability have been institutionalized afterward they exposed to neglect, abuse and death (Craine, Henson, Colliver & McLeland, 1988; Ulicny, White, Bradford & Matthews, 1990; Waxman, 1991; as cited in Julie, 2001).The stated rational for institutionalize PWDs is to prevent them from danger. Conversely people with disability were hurt and raped by their caregivers in the institution. Furthermore, PWDs were forced to be sterilized (Sobsey, 2001; cited in Julie, 2001). Further, institutional life characterized by staff dominated, depersonalization and a very subsidiary role and status experienced by people with disability (Goffman and Morris, 1993; cited in Colin & Geof, 2006).

On the other hand, even though people with disability live with their family (within the community) they face different types prejudice and discrimination. Violence including attack, beating, robbery, assassin and rape towards people with disability in the community (rather than in an institution) is also much more common than violence towards people without disability (Cole, Sobsey & Mansell, 1999; cited in Julie, 2001). Julie (2001), like any other minority group people with disabilities were considered as inferior and experience avoidance, segregation, marginalization, labeled as deviant [*sic*]. She also describe that, in most cases, this kind of community response emerges from the perceived view that people with disability are threat to the physical safety of the community. Cultural myths held that society needed to be protected from people with disabilities. These practices reflected a common societal fear that the so-called peoples with physical, mental, and moral disability would degrade the human race (Szymanski & Trueba, 1989; cited in Miguel and Katherine, 2010).History also tells us that there were laws which were against the right of PWDs. According to Pfeiffer as cited in Carolyn and Mercar (2006) during 19th& 20th Centuries, laws permit the involuntary sterilization of people with cognitive disability.

However, studies reveals that the degree of prejudice and discrimination vary among disability type. It's clear that there are disability groups which are more prejudiced and discriminate than others. For instance, people with physical disability take the least degree, individual with intellectual and cognitive disability experience more and those who have psychiatric disorder experience the greater degree (Julie, 2001). "There is no equal prejudice towards all people with disabilities" (Abroms & Hodera, 1979; Antonak, 1980; Oberman, 1965; cited in Julie, 2001).

To mention a very few examples of prejudice and discrimination towards people with disability stated by different authors:

- ❖ The 1997 Associated press article entitled “Handicapped [sic] used as Guinea pigs” publicized that Sweden against the will of the individual 60,000 people with disability sterilize between the years of 1935-1976 and hundreds of institutionalize swedes with intellectual disability were fed daily diets of candy for the purpose of research; to prove the relation between eating sugar and tooth decay (cited in Julie, 2001).
- ❖ Most people believe that kids with disability not to be killed rather they should not be born at all (Hubbard cited in Julie, 2001).
- ❖ Many individuals with disability have not been allowed to take part and participate in different social and religious activities due to attitudinal and physical barriers (Julie, 2001).
- ❖ People with disability are more vulnerable and targets of crime, physical, abuse, and sexual abuse (Craine et al., 1988; cited in Julie, 2001).
- ❖ In the early time, in Britain enforced institutionalization of peoples with disability and resulting treating like prisoners has been documented (Thomas 1982; cited in Colin & Geof, 2006).
- ❖ Individual with intellectual &/or mental disability considered as dangerous for the society (Julie, 2001).
- ❖ People with hearing impairment also experience social isolation, perceived as intellectually weak, having problematic behavior and disturbed emotion (Julie, 2001).

In general, it is possible to conclude that most people with disabilities did not experience a decisive advance in their life course and they were excluded from education, employment, and the built environment to leisure and social relationship.

2.5.2. History of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs in Ethiopia

Even though it is difficult to find and refer reliable source &/or documents regarding prejudice and discrimination within the context of Ethiopia; it's possible to mention issues rose in few of available materials with the visible situation faced by people with disabilities in different context.

As any other country, in Ethiopia people with disabilities face different challenging situations in their life. This emerges from societal negative attitude towards them. When Tirusew (2005) describe the attitude of the Ethiopian society, he states that “In Ethiopia, there is a general tendency to think of people with disabilities abilities as weak, hopeless, dependent, and unable to learn and the subject of charity. These kinds of misunderstanding by the general people easily lead them to prejudice and discrimination” (P.7).

Also people prefer to treat their relatives or children with disability only in their home. This is mainly due to fear of societal negative attitude towards them. So that they perceive disability as a shameful event happen in their life of their family. Having the child with disability becomes a source of shame and it results family crisis like divorce. Therefore, mostly parents exclude the child from their surrounding and peers (Tirusew, 2005). Further he describes those children with disability experience different social and emotional deprivation due to neglect, reject by their family as well as their neighbors.

According to Tirusew (2005), the provision of public service and special programs for people with disabilities like health, education, transportation, recreational areas, legal protections are limited. There is also a discriminatory practice in the work places and employment opportunities. He also stated in Ethiopia, the degree of prejudice and discrimination towards people with different types of disability is not the same. People with severe cases like sever motor disorder, profound intellectual disorder and leprosy suffer more stigma and discrimination than others.

To mention some of prejudicing and discriminatory practices towards people with disabilities stated by Tirusew (2005) as follows:

- ❖ Individuals with disability remained hidden behind a home and seen as unable to work, learn and dependent on other.
- ❖ Marginalized interpersonal relationships and participations at family, neighborhood, and community levels.
- ❖ Limited provision of public services and special program like health, educational, transportation, information, recreational activities, and legal perspectives.
- ❖ Restricted involvement in socio-cultural and discriminatory employment opportunities.
- ❖ Children with disabilities are deprived from child- friendly environment in the earliest years of development.
- ❖ Children with disability lack acceptance and support from their family and limited participation with their peers
- ❖ Limited range of participation in community organizations, festivals, weddings and other social occasions.

As it may be same with the other country situation the degree of prejudice and discrimination across different kinds of disability varies. People with Leprosy, with sever motor disorder and profound retardation suffer prejudice and discrimination (Tirusew, 2005).

Generally the participation of people with disabilities in community is limited. It is mainly due to the societal misconception of disability. These resulted rejection, lack of willingness to support, preference of being distant and so on.

2.5.3. Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs at Different Context

In previous section we see that people with disabilities face various types of discrimination and prejudice in different setting. To see major areas:

Employment

Under the ADA concise and precise summary on the history of prejudice and discrimination towards people with disabilities (cited in Julie, 2001) indicated that exclusionary qualification standards and criteria's on job opportunities, other activities and benefits is one of the discriminatory practice towards PWDs. In addition to this, Julie (2001) and Mark (2001) describe that under employment and unemployment rate of people with disabilities are in its peak. Other studies also indicates that even though people with disabilities find the job the salary paid for them is very low and discriminatory (Julie, 2001 & Anne, 2007). In some institutions and organizations discriminatory rules set by individuals and this leads to discriminatory hiring decision and performance evaluation (Brief, 1998; Roberson & Block, 2001, as cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010).

In addition to the fact that many work places are not physically accessible for people with disability, employers often fail to understand that a physical disability does not necessarily involve mental impairment and even fellow workers themselves may be opposed to the employment of persons with disability UN (2003).

Education

People with disabilities are highly behind from their right in terms of education and; training. "Many million people with disability have been denied or excluded from the formal educational altogether" (Mark, 2001). According to Richard et al. (2007) different studies stated that teachers are not in will of teaching students with disability in the general classroom. Additionally parents of students without disability also complain such kinds of teaching strategy.

In all countries, educational institutions are not always accessible to people with disability and in many cases such persons are not admitted to the same schools as other people. The same applies to vocational training and to academic studies (UN report, 2003).

Accessibility to public services

Public service such as public accommodation or buildings, transportations, information & other services which is available for the general public doesn't consider people with disabilities (Tirusew, 2005). Discrimination and prejudice towards people with disabilities also includes inadequate medical care and exclusion (Richard et al., 2007).

Attention is drawn to the highly discriminatory effect of the failure to provide accessible means of transport and the obstacle which that presents to an independent life for disabled persons (UN report, 2003).

Social Institutions

In terms of social institutions people with disabilities discriminated to marry and form their own family, limited range &/or no participation in societal, political, and recreational, activities (Tirusew, 2005). It is noted with surprise that even now, in highly developed countries, buildings which are not accessible to persons with disability. The use of wheelchairs, for instance, it is extremely difficult, or even impossible, in many apartment buildings (UN report, 2003). Similarly, the physical accessibility of schools, hospitals, and even surrounding of home of PWDs characterized by full of tension. The above observations also apply to other premises such as public office buildings, restaurants, cinemas, theatres, libraries, hotels, sports facilities, etc. Apart from the obstacles presented by building design, prejudices often exist which reduce the access of people with disability.

2.6. Prejudice and Discrimination on the Life of PWDs

Clearly, the person who have disabilities has not received proper rehabilitation treatment will grow worse and, in some cases, become acute. If he is discriminated against in the work place because of his disability or he is simply afforded no employment opportunity, his dependence and his isolation will be greater. If the educational system does not provide for his specific situation, person with disability finds himself excluded from it, and without proper instruction his disabilities worsen. If the cultural and sporting activities of society are designed solely for a standard category of person, which does not include him, he will be barred from culture and sport. If means of transport, pavements and buildings are inaccessible to such a person, he will be unable to move about freely (UN report, 2003).

In short, it is such barriers and discrimination which to a large extent create or aggravate disabilities and actually set people apart from society, in many cases making them a burden to the community. This demonstrates conclusively the importance of efforts to achieve the maximum degree of autonomy and independence for persons with disability, not only for their benefit, but also for the benefit of society as a whole.

2.7. Legal Frameworks against Disability Prejudice and Discrimination

2.7.1. International Policy Documents

There are number of international proclamation, rules and policies which oppose the discrimination and prejudice towards people with disability in different aspects. For instance, the foundation for most documents is; The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). “All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law” (UN, 1948). According to this document, being human being is the basis for equal protection from any discrimination and violation.

United Nations Declarations on the Rights of Disabled Persons (1975) also reveals that all people with disabilities have the same civil and political rights as other human beings. It is also must to protect all exploitation against them and all discriminatory, abusive or degrading nature of regulations and treatments should avoid. The declaration also highly gives stress on the right to live with their families or with foster parents and to participate in all social, creative or recreational activities.

The UN Convention on the Right of Child (1989) article 23, sub item 1 demand that those children with mental and physical disability should live their life and the environment that should allow them for full participation and independence.

World Declaration on Education for All (1990), the first document which come up with notion of “Education for All”; tells that every person child, youth and adult have the right to benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs to address these needs the education system should encompass both essential learning tools and necessary qualifications expected from the teachers.

Another document is The UN Standard Rules for the Equalization of Opportunities for People with Disability (1993) clearly states that, it’s the right of all men and women with disability to get to equal opportunity and participate equally in the areas of education, employment, income maintenance and social security, family life and personal integrity, culture, recreation and sports and Religion and those who have the responsibility should ensure their right

In addition to this, The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action (1994) states every child has a fundamental right to education, based on their unique characteristics, interests, abilities and learning needs. The education systems should also be designed and educational programmers implemented to take into account the wide diversity of these characteristics and needs. It also

gives emphasis for students with special needs to enjoy their right in the inclusive school with appropriate educational and welcoming school environment.

The other recent document is; Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006). This declaration states, the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities in any setting is required. In order to do so there must be measures in adapting and implementing appropriate legislative, administration. This is mainly to:

- ❖ Ensure full and effective participation and inclusion in society;
- ❖ Respect for difference and acceptance of persons with disabilities as part of human diversity and humanity;
- ❖ Equality of opportunity;
- ❖ Accessibility; Equality between men and women;
- ❖ Respect for the evolving capacities of children with disabilities and respect for the right of children with disabilities to preserve their identities.

2.7.2. National documents

The Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (1994) article 10, sub item 1 states, “Human rights and freedoms, emanating from the nature of mankind are inalienable and inviolable”. Article 25 also mention that all human beings are equal and should be prevented from any danger without discrimination based on the economic status, color, disability, age or other characteristics of the individual. Article 18 sub item 1 declares that, prohibition against inhuman treatment (which includes abuse, punishment, or other humiliating treatment). Another article also reveals that; every child has the right get their parents/guardians care & support and to be free from any dangerous practices in their education, health and development (article, 36).

The Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia (1994) also states that people with disability should enjoy with education in order to have an active participation in the political, social and economic aspects.

There are also strategies developed (Education sector program I-IV, inclusive education strategy, 2012 and SNE program strategy, 2006) in order to respect the right of people with disabilities and avoid discrimination.

Generally, currently, the law in different countries forbids discrimination in any aspect of employment (including hiring, firing, pay, job assignments, promotions, layoff, training, fringe benefits, and any other term or condition of employment), education, services and participation against people with disability.

2.8. Measurement of Prejudice and Discrimination

A number of literatures stated that it's difficult to measure prejudice. Three measurement techniques of prejudice and discrimination are stated by Miguel and Katherine (2010):

1. Perceptions of Discrimination in Everyday Settings

We notice subtle cues in the ways others around us are treated, or in the ways we ourselves are treated. Most of us can think of at least one instance in which we, or someone close to us, were treated unfairly on the basis of a single status distinction. In these instances, it doesn't take a social scientist to certify the case as discrimination.

Social scientists have capitalized on the insights and interpretations individuals have of their own lived experiences by asking people about their own encounters with discrimination. One startling conclusion from this line of research is the frequency with which discrimination is reported. But what we don't know from this line of research is to what extent these trends represent merely perceptions versus an accurate depiction of reality. While some instances of discrimination leave little room for doubt, many others can be subject to misinterpretation or distortion.

The problem with relying on perceptions for our measure of discrimination is not only that some cases may be blown out of proportion. The opposite can be just as much of an issue-acts of discrimination are often imperceptible to the victim. Due to social norms and legal sanctions,

contemporary forms of discrimination are rarely overt, leaving countless instances of discriminatory action entirely invisible to the very individuals who have been targeted.

2. Self-Reports and Attitude Research on Discrimination

One of the main criticisms of attitude research is its vulnerability to social desirability bias, or the pressure for respondents to give politically correct responses to questions even if this means distorting or lying about their true beliefs. Instead, randomly chosen subsamples of respondents are primed with one of several variants of a survey question to assess responses to a particular group or condition.

Perhaps a larger concern about the use of survey items as proxies for discrimination is the uncertainty with which self-reported attitudes correspond to any meaningful patterns of expected behavior. While it is commonly assumed that there is a close link between attitudes and behaviors, in existing research.

3. Statistical Analyses of Large-Scale Data Sets

Perhaps the most common approach to studying discrimination is to investigate inequality in outcomes between groups. Rather than focusing on the attitudes or perceptions of actors that may be correlated with acts of discrimination, this approach looks to the possible consequences of discrimination in the unequal distribution of employment or other social and economic resources.

Differences in verbal ability, interpersonal skills, motivation, or work habit is could explain some of the observed employment disparities; differences in access to transportation, social networks, and other information resources likewise account for some of the gap (Moss and Tilly, 1996; Farkas 2003; Fernandez and Su 2004).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This section describes, the type of the research design which is employed in this research, sampling technique, instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis and ethical considerations followed.

3.1. Research Design

This study was aimed to examine the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination exhibited by students without disability towards people with certain types of disability. The design used was survey research design. The preference of the design better fits the objective of the research to examine the strength of the relationships of the variables (prejudice between different disability categories as well as discrimination between different disability categories). In addition to this, the study intends to identify the nature of prejudice and discrimination against people with disability in general.

3.2. Study Area

The study was conducted in Addis Ababa Yekatit 12 governmental preparatory school, which is located in Arada sub city behind Addis Ababa University (Sidist Kilo Campus). The school was founded by the wife of Emperor Haile Silasie, Etege Menen in 1923 E.C. It was a boarding school only for female students & named “Girmawi Etege Menen Female School”. Until 1972 E.C the school only enrolls female students. But during that year the school began to accept both female and male students in the regular. The name of the school also changed to “Yekatit 12 Higher Secondary School”. In 1994 E.C based on the new education curriculum, the school changed to preparatory school and it was named “Yekatit 12 Preparatory School”. Currently, the school administers its own kindergarten and accepts only grade 11 & 12 students in the preparatory level. Beside the regular education students are beneficiaries by preparing females sanitary pad with low cost for the society and free for

their female students. The school also participates in different social activities like supporting orphans.

3.3. Sample

In order to know the approximate number of students and decide about the number of samples necessary information were gathered from Yekatit 12 preparatory school. According to the school there are 43 classes in preparatory level, of them 21 classrooms are grade 11 (6 social science classes and 15 natural science classes) and 22 class rooms are grade 12 (6 social science classes and 16 natural science classes). The approximate average number of students in a classroom is 34. Based on that samples were drawn in the following way:

- Samples of students in grade 11 were selected using multistage cluster sampling and the samples frame was 21 classrooms (6 social science classes and 15 natural science classes), of them 2 classes (1 social science class and 1 natural science class), were drawn in stage 1 by using simple random sampling technique. In stage 2 all the available (69) students in the selected classrooms were used as a sample,
- Multistage cluster sampling method also used to select classes from grade 12. There were 22 classes (6 social science classes and 16 natural science classes), 6 classes (2 social science classes and 4 natural science classes) were drawn in stage 1 by using simple random sampling technique. In stage 2 all the available (224) students in the selected classrooms were used as a sample.

3.4. Data Collection Instruments

The data for this study were collected by using the research instrument, in this case close ended questionnaire with two parts. The first part was regarding prejudice and it has five levels of agreement. The second part was regarding discrimination and for each item students can choose any type/s of disability. To generate the items of the questionnaires ideas are taken from

reviewed related literatures regarding prejudice and discrimination against people with disability and discussion with university lecturers in the department of Special Needs Education.

After the generation of the items, to select refined and valid items it was given for 30 students in each grade levels (grade 11 & grade 12) and 3 professionals (1 from the Department of Special Needs Education, 1 from the Department of psychology & 1 from the Department of Sign Language) for expertise check and comment. As a result some items were improved.

- ❖ Students feeling & thinking towards PWDs scale (Prejudice scale): - under this scale 20 items were included and all the students were expected to respond to them. For each types of disability category the minimum possible score of this scale was 20 and the maximum possible score was 100.
- ❖ Student's behavior towards PWDs scale (Discrimination scale): - under this scale 12 items were included. For each types of disability category the minimum possible score of this scale was 0 and the maximum possible score was 12.

3.5. Pilot study

Menilik II preparatory school was selected for the pretest. The school was selected based on cultural similarities of the student to the main research site. The school has only grade 11 and 12 students and is located in Addis Ababa, like Yekatit 12 preparatory school where the main study was conducted and, therefore, a good candidate for the pilot study. For the pilot study, 2 classroom students (1 from grade 11 & 1 from grade 12) participated. Finally, the reliability of the scales was checked out independently for the two scales (Scale for prejudice and scale for discrimination) based on each type's of disability by using Cronbach's alpha and the scales are reliable.

Scales reliability:

No.	Scales		Reliability coefficient on the pilot study	Reliability coefficient on the main study
1	Students feeling & thinking towards PWDs scale	Towards PWPDs	.71	.75
		Towards PWHDs	.60	.76
		Towards PWVDs	.70	.78
		Towards PWIDs	.66	.70
2	Students behavior towards PWDs scale	Towards PWPDs	.68	.75
		Towards PWHDs	.77	.79
		Towards PWVDs	.71	.71
		Towards PWIDs	.75	.82

3.6. Data Collection Procedure

In order to collect the intended data, the following procedures were followed.

- ❖ In order to get the willingness and cooperation of the school, the researcher took official letter from the Department of Special Needs Education and give are it for the school to get the school cooperation.
- ❖ Information about the number of classrooms in each grade level and approximate average number of student in a given classroom was taken from the Director of Yekatit 12 preparatory school.
- ❖ In order to get sample classrooms, arrangements were made with school director and leaders of each grade levels.
- ❖ Before the process of filling the questionnaire all the samples were oriented to understand all about the aim of the research and how to fill the questionnaire.
- ❖ The questionnaire was administered individually in the student's classrooms and the time given was 55 minutes. After completing the questionnaire it return to the researcher.

- ❖ The data collection took 8 days; the first two days was to collect data from grade 11 & the remaining 6 days was to collect data from grade 12.

3.7. Analysis of Data

Data were analyzed quantitatively by using both descriptive and inferential data analyzing techniques. To analyze the background information percentage were used. Nature of prejudice and discrimination were analyzed using descriptive statistics, mean & standard deviation for each types of disability against the median. Due to absence of standards, the researcher tries to categorize the nature of both prejudice and discrimination by three ranges (low, medium & high magnitude for prejudice and mild, moderate & severe for discrimination) by dividing the maximum scores by 3 (which was $100/3$ & $20/3$). Therefore, if the mean score was fallen under the range of 20 to 46.66, the nature of prejudice was considered as low magnitude. If the mean score was fallen under the range of 46.67 to 73.33, the nature of prejudice was considered as medium magnitude. If the mean score was fallen under the range of 73.34 to 100, the nature of prejudice was considered as high magnitude. Also on the nature of discrimination, if the mean score was fallen under the range of 0 to 4, the nature of discrimination was considered as mild. If the mean score was fallen under the range of 5 to 8, the nature of discrimination was considered as moderate. If the mean score was fallen under the range of 9 to 12, the nature of discrimination was considered as severe.

The statistical significant difference in prejudice and discrimination towards different types of PWDs analyzed using a paired sample t-test at alpha 0.05 level of significance. The statistical significant difference in prejudice and discrimination towards different types of PWDs based on various characteristics of students analyzed using a t-test and one way ANOVA at alpha 0.05 level of significance. Finally, Pearson correlation was used to analyze the relationship between age & prejudice as well as age & discrimination.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

The data were gathered with full consent and willingness of the participants. Throughout the study privacy and confidentiality maintained.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter presents descriptive information of the sample and the findings of statistical analysis on the nature of prejudice and discrimination of sample students and difference on prejudice and discrimination among various sub-groups of samples towards people with physical disability, hearing disability, visual disability and intellectual disability.

4.1 Background information of the students

Table 4.1

Background information of the students

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	
Sex	Male	161	54.9
	Female	132	45.1
	Total	293	100%
Age	1)17	40	13.7
	2)18	211	72.0
	3)19	38	13.0
	4)20	4	1.4
	Total	293	100%
Grade	1) Grade 11	69	23.5
	2) Grade 12	224	76.5
	Total	293	100%
Beliefs about cause of disability	Realistic beliefs	33	12%
	Wrong beliefs	213	72.7%
	Both beliefs	47	15.3%
	Total	293	100%
Status of attendance on awareness creation training on disability issues	1)Attended training	30	10.2
	2)Not attended Training	263	89.8
	Total	293	100%

As indicated in the above table, 293 (161 males & 132 females) students without disability participated in the study, of which 54.9% were males & 45.1% were females. Out of them, 40 or 13.7% were 17 years old, the majority (211 or 72%) of students were 18 years old, 38 or 13 % students were 19 years old and the rest (4 or 1.4%) students were 20 years old. Regarding grade, 69 students were from grade 11 and the rest 224 students were from grade 12.

In relation to the beliefs about the cause of disability, 33 (12%) students had realistic beliefs (birth complication & accident), 213 (72.7%) students had wrong belief (punishment of God, parental sins, evil spirit & fortune) and 47 (15.3%) students had realistic and unrealistic beliefs about the cause of disability.

Regarding attendance on awareness creation programs, 30 (10.2%) students attended disability awareness creation program/training and the rest (263 or 89.8%) students had not attended such program/training.

4.2 Students experience with PWDs

Table 4.2

Students' experience with PWDs

Variables		Frequency	Percentage
Did you have any experience/contact with PWDs	1) Yes	81	27.6
	2) No	212	72.4
	Total	293	100%
If you had experience with PWDs how often?	1) Daily	35	27.2
	2) Weekly	11	11.1
	3) At least monthly	13	23.5
	4) Occasionally	22	8.6
	Total	81	100%
Contact with different types of PWDs	1) Visual disability	22	27.2
	2) Hearing disability	9	11.1
	3) Physical disability	19	23.5
	4) Intellectual disability	7	8.6
	5) Both 1 & 2	11	13.6
	6) Both 1 & 3	4	4.9
	7) 1, 2 & 3	3	3.7
	8) All four	6	7.4
	Total	81	100%
Type of relation with PWDs	1) Close family member	21	25.9
	2) Friend	33	40.7
	3) Classmate	16	19.8
	4) Someone seen occasionally	11	13.6
	Total	81	100%
Unpleasant experience with PWDs	1) Yes	34	42
	2) No	47	58
	Total	81	100%
Pleasant experience with PWDs	1) yes	43	53.1
	2) No	38	46.9
	Total	81	100%

In relation to experience/ contact with PWDs, 81 (27.6%) students did not have any contact/experience with PWDs and 212 (72.4%) students had contact/experience with PWDs. Of them 35 (43.2 %) students had daily contact with PWDs, 11 (13.6 %) students had weekly contact, 13 (16 %) students had a contact at least once in a month and the remaining 22 (27.2 %) of the student had contact only occasionally.

Based on the relation with specific type of PWDs, 22 (27.2 %) students had relation with people with visual disability, 9 (11.1 %) students had relation with people with hearing disability, 19 (23.5 %) students had relation with people with physical disability, 7 (8.6 %) students had relation with people with intellectual disability, 11 (13.6 %) students had relation with both people with visual & hearing disability, 4 (4.9 %) students had relation with both people with visual & physical disability, 3 (3.7 %) students had relation with people with hearing, physical & visual disability. The remaining 6 (7.4 %) students had contact with all four groups of PWDs.

Regarding the type of relation with PWDs, 21 (25.9 %) students had close family member with disability, 33 (40.7 %) students had friend with disability, 16 (19.8 %) students had classmates with disability and the rest (11 or 13.6 %) students were occasionally seeing PWDs.

In relation to unpleasant experience with PWDs 34 (42 %) students had unpleasant experience with PWDs and 47 (58 %) students never had any unpleasant experience with PWDs. On the other hand, 43 (53.1 %) students had pleasant experience and 38 (46.9 %) students never had any pleasant experience with PWDs.

4.3 Nature of prejudice towards the four types of PWDs

The table below indicates about the nature of prejudice towards the four types of PWDs. Which indicates, the magnitude of prejudice towards people with physical disability (PWPDs), people with visual disability (PWVDs), people with hearing disability (PWHDs) & people with intellectual disability (PWIDs).

Table 4.3

Descriptive data on the nature of prejudice towards the four types of PWDs

Group	N	No. of Items	Mean(SD)
PWPDs	293	20	59.69 (11.2)
PWHDs	293	20	52.81(10.42)
PWVDs	293	20	58.9 (11.29)
PWIDs	293	20	70.23(9.82)

Possible minimum score = 20, Possible maximum score = 100 & Median = 60

As it can be seen from table 4.3, the mean score given for PWPDs & PWVDs was around the median, 59.69 & 58.9 respectively with the standard deviation of 11.2 & 11.29 respectively. The mean score towards PWHDs (52.81) was below the median, with the standard deviation of 10.42. On the other hand, the mean score which was greater than the median was seen towards PWIDs (70.23), with the standard deviation of 9.82.

4.4 Comparison of prejudice towards people with different types of disability

It was one of the objectives of the present study to look whether there is a considerable disparity on prejudice towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs by students without disability. The paired sample t-test was performed to examine the difference on prejudice towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs. The summarized result presents in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4

Result of paired sample t-test on prejudice among the four types of PWDs

	Paired variables	Mean difference	SD	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)
Pair 1	PWPDs - PWHDs	6.88	9.28	12.69**	292	.00
Pair 2	PWPDs - PWVDs	.79	5.08	2.66**	292	.008
Pair 3	PWPDs - PWIDs	-1.05	8.48	-21.25**	292	.00
Pair 4	PWHDs - PWVDs	-6.09	8.23	12.67**	292	.00
Pair 5	PWHDs - PWIDs	-1.74	11.98	-24.88**	292	.00
Pair 6	PWVDs - PWIDs	-1.13	8.67	-22.34**	292	.00

** P < .01

The comparisons indicated significant mean differences between PWPDs & PWHDs at an $\alpha = .00$ level. Also the comparison between PWPDs & PWVDs reveals that there is a significant mean difference at $\alpha = .008$ level. The comparison between PWPDs & PWIDs had significant mean differences at an $\alpha = .00$ level.

The same was true on the comparison between PWHDs & PWVDs mean, which is significant at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between PWHDs & PWIDs also shows significant differences at $\alpha = .00$. Finally, significant mean differences between PWVDs & PWIDs seen at an $\alpha = .00$ level. Therefore, a type of disability has an effect on the students prejudice.

4.5 Students Characteristics and Prejudice

4.5.1 Sex and Prejudice

Here, the comparison made between males' and females' mean scores towards each group of PWDs is presented. It helps to know whether there was a significant difference on prejudice towards each groups of PWDs based on the sex difference of the samples. Therefore, independent sample t-test was applied

for each group of PWDs to compare mean score given by male & female students.

Table 4.5.1

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between males and females

Variable/ Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)	
PWPDs	M	161	63.09 (8.75)	6.07**	291	.00
	F	132	55.55(12.44)			
PWHDs	M	161	55.92 (9.21)	5.98	291	.00
	F	132	49.0 (10.6)			
PWVDs	M	161	62.04 (9.22)	5.51**	291	.00
	F	132	55.07 (12.4)			
PWIDs	M	161	71.81 (8.13)	3.07**	291	.002
	F	132	68.31 (11.3)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare prejudice by female and male students towards various types of PWDs by using a t-test as a statistical model. The mean score of male & female students towards PWPDs are 63.09 & 55.55 respectively with standard deviations of 8.75 & 12.44 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on prejudice between male & female students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that male students strong prejudice PWPDs than female students. The comparison between the mean score given by males (55.92) & females (49) students towards PWHDs also yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .002$ level. The comparisons between the mean score of male & female students towards PWVDs are 62.04 & 55.07 respectively with standard deviations of 9.22 & 12.4 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between male & female students towards PWVDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that male students highly prejudice PWPDs than female students. Also the comparison between male and female students mean score towards PWIDs was 71.81 & 68.31 respectively with standard deviation of 8.13 & 11.3

respectively. And there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between male & female students towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$.

4.5.2. Relationship between Age and Prejudice

To look at the relationship between prejudice towards various types of PWDs and age of the students, it is essential to examine the strength of relationship, the direction of relationship and to see the statistical significance of the relationship. Therefore, the result was summarized in the table below after being computed by using Pearson Correlation coefficient.

Table 4.5.2

Pearson Correlation between age and prejudice

	PWPDs	PWHDs	PWVDs	PWIDs
Age	-.541**	-.406**	-.530**	-.391**

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As indicated in the above table, prejudice towards PWPDs has a negative and significant relation with age of the student ($r = -.541$). The same was true on the relation between prejudice towards PWHDs and age, has negative and significant relation ($r = -.406$).

Table 4.5.2 also illustrates, prejudice towards PWVDs has negative and significant correlation with age of the students ($r = -.530$). The correlation between prejudice towards PWIDs and age of the students were lower (lower than the relation observed on prejudice towards other types of PWDs and age), negative and significant ($r = -.391$). Moreover, as the table describes prejudice towards all groups of PWDs was negative and significantly correlated with the age of students.

4.5.3. Prejudice and Grade level

The independent sample t-test was computed to examine the difference between the mean score of grade 11 and grade 12 students on prejudice towards various groups of people with disability. The summarized result revealed in Table 4.5.3 below.

Table 4.5.3

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between grade 11 and grade 12

Variable/ Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig	
PWPDs	11	69	69.43(7.09)	9.41**	291	.00
	12	224	56.7(10.52)			
PWHDs	11	69	56.9(9.92)	3.78**	291	.002
	12	224	51.55(10.27)			
PWVDs	11	69	68.72(7.08)	9.42**	291	.00
	12	224	55.88(10.61)			
PWIDs	11	69	78.06(7.74)	8.42**	291	.00
	12	224	67.82(9.13)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare prejudice by grade 11 and grade 12 students towards various types of PWDs by using a t-test as a statistical model. The mean score of grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWPDs are 69.43 & 56.7 respectively with standard deviations of 7.09 & 10.52 respectively. It indicates, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that grade 11 students highly prejudice PWPDs than grade 12 students. The comparisons between the mean score of grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWHDs are 56.9 & 51.55 respectively with standard deviations of 9.92 & 10.27 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWHDs at $\alpha = .002$. Also the comparison between grade 11 & grade 12 students mean score towards PWVDs was 68.72 & 55.88 respectively with standard deviation of 7.08 & 10.61 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on prejudice between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWVDs at $\alpha = .00$. The comparison between the mean score

given by grade 11 (78.06) & grade 12 (67.82) students towards PWIDs yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.5.4. Prejudice and contact with PWDs

To check whether there is a considerable disparity between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs on the prejudice towards each groups of PWDs, the independent sample t-test was computed and the summarized result depicted in the Table 4.5.4 below.

Table 4.5.4

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between students with contact and without contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping Variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs	with contact	81	47.05(9.23)	-16.7**	291	.00
	without contact	212	64.52(7.52)			
PWHDs	with contact	81	43.52(8.03)	-11.3**	291	.00
	without contact	212	56.35(8.94)			
PWVDs	with contact	81	46.36(8.86)	-	29	.00
	without contact	212	63.7(7.94)			
PWIDs	with contact	81	62.81(8.91)	-9.01**	291	.00
	without contact	212	73.1(8.61)			

**P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare prejudice by students who had contact with PWDs and those students who had no contact with PWDs towards various types of PWDs by using a t-test as a statistical model. The mean score towards PWPDs by students who had contact with PWDs are 47.05 & it was 64.52 by those students who had no contact with PWDs with the standard deviation of 9.23 & 7.52 respectively. It indicates, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had contact & those who had no contact with PWDs towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. The mean scores towards PWHDs by those who had contact with PWDs &

those who had no contact with PWDs are 43.52 & 56.35 respectively with standard deviations of 8.03 & 8.94 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in prejudice between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs. The other comparisons between the students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs, towards PWVDs also yields statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level. The same was true towards PWIDs; there was a significant difference between the score given by the two groups of students towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.5.5. Prejudice and extent of contact with PWDs

One of the concerns of the present study was to check whether there is a considerable difference between students who had daily contact with PWDs and those students who had occasional contact with PWDs on their mean score on prejudice towards various groups of PWDs under the study. The independent sample t-test was computed in the course of examining the difference between the prejudice towards various groups of PWDs mean score of students who had daily & occasional contact with PWDs.

Table 4.5.5

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between daily contact and occasional contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs	daily	35	41.63(6.45)	-5.43**	55	.00
	occasionally	22	57.50(7.51)			
PWHDs	daily	67	40.4 (4.68)	-8.59**	55	.00
	occasionally	185	50.73(9.62)			
PWVDs	daily	67	40.88(5.82)	-8.48**	55	.00
	occasionally	185	56.2(7.56)			
PWIDs	daily	67	59.31(8.93)	-4.25**	55	.001
	occasionally	185	69.04(7.48)			

** P < .01

In order to see the effect of extent of contact with PWDs on the prejudicing attitude of students, comparison was made between students who had daily contact with PWDs & who had occasional contact (other two of types of students extent of contact with PWDs were exclude due to insufficient number). The mean score of students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWPDs are 41.63 & 57.5 respectively with standard deviations of 6.45 & 7.51 respectively. It was statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. The mean score of students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWHDs are 40.4 & 50.73 respectively with standard deviations of 4.68 & 9.62 respectively. It was also statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. The comparison between the mean score of students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWVDs are 40.88 & 56.2

respectively with standard deviations of 5.82 & 7.56 respectively. There is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWVDs at $\alpha = .00$. Finally, the comparison between the mean score given by students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWIDs yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .001$ level.

4.5.6. Prejudice and relation with PWDs

To look whether there is a considerable discrepancy between students who had family relation with PWDs, who had friend with disability and those who had classmate with disability on prejudice towards various groups of PWDs (one of students type of relation with PWDs were exclude due to incompatibility number) analysis of variance was computed. Table 12 below presents the summarized result on the difference between the mean score of students who had family, friend & classmate relation with PWDs on prejudice towards various groups of PWDs under the study.

Table 4.5.6

Descriptive data on the student's relation with PWDs

Students relation with PWDs	N	Mean (SD) towards PVPDs	Mean(SD) towards PWHDs	Mean (SD) towards PWVDs	Mean (SD) towards PWIDs
Close family	21	37.09(4.37)	36.5 (3.84)	37.66 (4.7)	54.19(9.72)
Friend	33	52.15 (9.6)	46.78(7.16)	50.3 (10.1)	67.84(7.21)
Classmate	16	60.25 (7.2)	52.56 (8.6)	59.25(9.67)	68.68 (9.3)

Possible minimum score = 20, Possible maximum score = 100 & Median = 60

Table 4.5.6 indicates that the mean score towards each type of PWDs given by students who had family member with disability was lower than the

score given by students who had friend and classmates with disability. The score given by those students who had friend with disabilities towards all types of PWDs was below the score given by students who had classmates with disability.

Table 4.5.6.1

One-Way ANOVA for comparing prejudice difference between student's types of relation with PWDs

Groups	Source	Df	Sum sq.	Ms	F
PWPDs	Between group	4	14979.31	3744.83	49.74**
	Within group	288	21684.65	75.29	
	Total	292	36663.96		
PWHDs	Between group	4	8222.33	2055.58	25.19**
	Within group	288	23500.97	81.60	
	Total	292	31723.29		
PWVDs	Between group	4	14482.68	3620.67	45.86**
	Within group	288	22738.65	78.95	
	Total	292	37221.32		
PWIDs	Between group	4	6569.58	1642.39	21.87**
	Within group	288	21626.64	75.09	
	Total	292	28196.22		

** P < .01

There was statistically significant difference at the P < .01 level in all the three student's types of relation with PWDs scores towards four groups of PWDs. [F (4, 288) = 49.74, p = .00], for prejudice towards PWPDs, [F (4, 288) = 49.74, 25.19, p = .00], for prejudice towards PWHDs, (F = 45.86, p = .00), for prejudice towards PWVDs & (F = 21.87, p = .00), for prejudice towards PWIDs. Therefore, Tukey HSD post Hoc comparison were made in the table below to explore the exact variation in which the prior groups show significantly varying result.

Table 4.5.6.2

Post Hoc (Tukey HSD) Comparison of Prejudice towards various groups of PWDs

Variable	Groups	2	3
Prejudice towards PWPDs	1) Family	**	**
	2) Friend		*
	3) classmate		
prejudice towards PWHDs	1) family	**	**
	2) friend		ns
	3) classmate		
prejudice towards PWVDs	1) family	**	**
	2) friend		**
	3) classmate		
prejudice towards PWIDs	1) family	**	**
	2) friend		ns
	3) classmate		

*P < .05 ** P < .01 ns = >.05

As the above comparison indicates, on prejudice towards PWPDs there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$. There was also a significant difference between the mean score given by students who had classmate with disability & those friend with disability at $\alpha = .02$.

Regarding prejudice towards PWHDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .001$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$.

Regarding prejudice towards PWVDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students

who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$. There was also a significant difference between the mean score given by students who had classmate with disability & those friend with disability at $\alpha = .009$.

The table also reveals on prejudice towards PWIDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$.

4.5.7. Prejudice and unpleasant experience with PWDs

In the table below, attempts were made to check whether there is a substantial difference between students who had unpleasant contact with PWDs & those who had no unpleasant contact with PWDs on prejudice mean score towards each group of PWDs.

The independent sample t-test was computed to examine the difference between the prejudice towards various groups of PWDs by students who had unpleasant contact with PWDs & those who had no unpleasant contact.

Table 4.5.7

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between with unpleasant and without unpleasant experience (UPE) with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	df	Sig
PWPDs	with UPE	34	59.62 (8.39)	9.61**	55	.00
	without UPE	47	43.89(6.33)			
PWHDs	with UPE	34	51.2 (9.54)	6.3**	55	.00
	without UPE	47	40.68(5.41)			
PWVDs	with UPE	34	58.56 (8.25)	9.32**	55	.00
	without UPE	47	43.51 (6.27)			
PWIDs	with UPE	34	70.82 (7.71)	5.13**	55	.00
	without UPE	47	61.34 (8.41)			

** P < .01 UPE= Unpleasant Experience

In order to see the effect of unpleasant experience (UPE) with students prejudice on PWDs, comparison was made between students who had UPE with PWDs & who had no UPE with PWDs. The mean score of students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWPDs are 59.62 & 43.89 respectively with standard deviations of 8.39 & 6.33 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. Also the comparison between the mean score of students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWHDs are 51.2 & 40.68 respectively with standard deviations of 9.54 & 5.41 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWHDs at $\alpha = .00$.

Likely, the comparison between the mean score given by students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWVDs & yields significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level. The obtained result also shows

that, there was a significant difference between the mean score of students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs on the scores towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.5.8. Prejudice and pleasant experience with PWDs

It's true that, most of the time people use their prior experience to other new situations either as it is or with some modification. Also having a good experience with an individual with disability may lead people to judge that all PWDs are good. Therefore, it might result positive outlook towards all PWDs. Due to this thought, independent sample t-test comparison computed to examine the difference between the prejudice towards various groups of PWDs by students who had pleasant contact with PWDs & those who had no pleasant contact.

Table 4.5.8

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between with pleasant and without pleasant experience (PE) with PWDs

Variable/ Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs with PE	43	41.28(6.08)	-12.9**	79	.00
without PE	38	64.29(9.74)			
PWHDs with PE	43	39.39(5.1)	-.69	79	.96
without PE	38	54.31(9.88)			
PWVDs with PE	43	41.44(5.84)	-12.82**	79	.00
without PE	38	64.31(9.91)			
PWIDs with PE	43	58.6(8.44)	-9.51**	79	.00
without PE	38	76.5(8.5)			

* P < .05 PE= Pleasant Experience

As it is revealed by table 4.5.8, comparison was made on prejudice between students who had PE with PWDs & those who had no PE with PWDs

towards various groups of PWDs. Therefore, the mean score towards PWDs by students who had PE with PWDs & those who had no PE with PWDs are 41.28 & 64.29 respectively with standard deviations of 6.08 & 9.74 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in prejudice between students who had PE with PWDs & those who had no PE with PWDs at $\alpha = .00$.

The other comparisons between the students who had PE with PWDs (41.44) & those who had no PE (64.31), towards PWVDs also yields significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level. The other comparison were towards PWIDs between students who had PE with PWDs (58.6) & those who had no PE (76.5) significantly different at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.5.9. Prejudice and attendance on awareness creation training

The independent sample t-test which was computed to examine whether there is a considerable difference between students who attend training on disability issues & those who did not attend training on disability issues on prejudice mean score towards various groups of people with disability under the study. Table 4.5.9 below presents summarized result on the difference.

Table 4.5.9

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between attend and not attend on disability issue training

Variable/	Grouping Variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs	got training	30	43.3(8.44)	-9.72**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	61.56(9.88)			
PWHDs	got training	30	42.23(7.25)	-9.84**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	60.8(10.04)			
PWVDs	got training	30	57.9 (9.81)	-8.0**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	71.64(8.81)			
PWIDs	got training	30	40.43(6.85)	-7.5**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	54.22(9.81)			

** P < .01

In order to see the effect of disability issue training on the prejudicing attitude of students, comparison was made between students who get training & who did not. In the case of towards PWPDs, mean scores of those who get training & those who did not get training are 43.3 & 61.56 respectively with standard deviations of 8.44 & 9.88 respectively. There is a statistical significant difference in prejudice between students who get training on disability and those who did not get training. The comparison between the mean score of students who get training (42.23) & who did not (60.8) towards PWHDs yields significant difference at $\alpha = .00$ level. The same was true on the comparison between the mean score of students who get training (57.9) & who did not (71.64) towards PWVDs. It was significantly different at $\alpha = .00$ level. In the case of towards PWIDs, mean scores of those who get training & those who did not get training are 40.43 & 54.22 respectively with standard deviations of 6.85 & 9.81 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in

prejudice between students who get training on disability and those who did not get training.

4.6. Nature of Discrimination towards four types of PWDs

One of the concerns of the present study was to check whether there is a considerable difference on the nature discrimination towards four types of PWDs. Therefore, descriptive statistic was computed to examine the difference on the magnitude of discrimination towards PWPDs, PWVDs, PWHDs & PWIDs.

Table 4.6

Descriptive data on the nature of discrimination towards four types of PWDs

Group	N	No. of Items	Mean (SD)
PWPDs	293	12	5.92 (2.98)
PWHDs	293	12	3.11 (2.65)
PWVDs	293	12	3.96 (2.49)
PWIDs	293	12	7.88 (3.12)

Possible minimum score = 0, possible maximum score = 12 & median = 6

As indicated in the above table, the mean score given for PWPDs was around the median, 5.92 with the standard deviation of 2.98. The mean score towards PWHDs & PWVDs (3.11 & 3.96 respectively) was below the median, with the standard deviation of 2.65 & 2.49 respectively. On the other hand, the mean score which was greater than the median was seen towards PWIDs (7.88), with the standard deviation of 3.12.

4.7. Comparison of discrimination towards people with different types of disability

It was one of the objectives of the present study was to look whether there is a considerable disparity on discrimination towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs by students without disability. Paired sample t-test was performed to examine the difference on discrimination towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs. The summarized result presents in Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7

Result of paired sample t-test on discrimination among four types of PWDs

	Paired variable	Mean difference	SD	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)
Pair 1	PWPDs - PWHDs	2.80	2.95	16.25**	292	.00
Pair 2	PWPDs - PWVDs	1.95	2.57	12.98**	292	.00
Pair 3	PWPDs - PWIDs	-1.96	3.94	-8.54**	292	.00
Pair 4	PWHDs - PWVDs	-.85	2.84	-5.13**	292	.00
Pair 5	PWHDs - PWIDs	-4.77	3.64	-22.46**	292	.00
Pair 6	PWVDs - PWIDs	-3.92	3.63	-18.49**	292	.00

** P < .01

In the table above, the comparison indicates that significant mean differences between PWPDs & PWHDs at an $\alpha = .00$ level. Also the comparison between PWPDs & PWVDs reveals that there is a significant mean difference at $\alpha = .00$ level. The comparison between PWPDs & PWIDs had significant mean differences at an $\alpha = .00$ level.

The same was true on the comparison between PWHDs & PWVDs mean, which is significant at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between PWHDs & PWIDs also shows significant differences at $\alpha = .00$. Finally, significant mean differences between PWVDs & PWIDs seen at an $\alpha = .00$ level. Therefore, types of disability have an effect on the student's discrimination.

4.8. Students Characteristics and Discrimination

4.8.1. Sex and Discrimination

Here, the comparisons were made between males' and females' mean scores towards each group of PWDs and it helps to know whether there was a significant difference on discrimination towards each groups of PWDs based on the sex difference of the samples. Therefore, independent sample t-test was applied.

Table 4.8.1

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between males and females

Variable/	Grouping					
Variable	N	Mean (SD)	t	Df	Sig	
PWPDs	M	161	6.32(1.57)	5.65**	291	.00
	F	132	5.24(1.67)			
PWHDs	M	161	5.23(1.64)	5.44**	291	.00
	F	132	4.11(1.87)			
PWVDs	M	161	6.12(1.49)	5.54**	291	.00
	F	132	5.03(1.86)			
PWIDs	M	161	7.84(1.82)	5.43**	291	.00
	F	132	6.62(2.03)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare discrimination by female and male students towards various types of PWDs by using a T-test as a statistical model. The mean score of male & female students towards PWPDs are 6.32 & 5.24 respectively with standard deviations of 1.57 & 1.67 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on discrimination between male & female students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may infer that male students highly discriminate PWPDs than female students. The comparisons between the mean score of male & female students towards PWHDs are 5.23 & 4.11 respectively with standard deviations of 1.64 & 1.87 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on discrimination between male & female students towards PWHDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that both male & female students not strongly discriminate PWHDs but male students' discrimination was higher than female students.

Also the comparison between male and female students mean score towards PWVDs was 6.12 & 5.03 respectively with standard deviation of 1.49 &

1.86 respectively. The difference on discrimination between male & female students towards PWIDs is statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$. The comparison between male and female students mean score towards PWVDs was 7.84 & 6.62 respectively with standard deviation of 1.82 & 2.03 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on discrimination between male & female students towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that both male & female students strongly discriminate PWIDs but male students' discrimination was higher than female students.

4.8.2. Discrimination and Grade level

The independent sample t-test was computed to examine the difference between the mean score of grade 11 and grade 12 students on discrimination towards various groups of people with disability. The summarized result displayed in Table 4.8.2 below.

Table 4.8.2

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between grade 11 and grade 12

Variable/	Grouping	N	Mean (SD)	T	df	Sig
	variable					
PWPDs	11	69	7.26(1.54)	8.99**	291	.00
	12	224	5.39(1.49)			
PWHDs	11	69	5.66(1.45)	5.07**	291	.00
	12	224	4.44(1.84)			
PWVDs	11	69	6.78(1.36)	6.72**	291	.00
	12	224	5.27(1.71)			
PWIDs	11	69	8.97(1.71)	8.94**	291	.00
	12	224	6.77(1.8)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare discrimination by grade 11 and grade 12 students towards various types of PWDs by using a T-test as a statistical model. The mean score grade 11 and grade 12 students towards PWPDs are 7.26 & 5.39 respectively with standard

deviations of 1.54 & 1.49 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on discrimination between 11 and grade 12 students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. The mean score of grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWHDs are 5.66 & 4.44 respectively with standard deviations of 1.45 & 1.84 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may indicate that both grade 11 students not strongly discriminate PWHDs but grade 11 students highly discriminate PWHDs than grade 12 students. Also the comparison between male and female students mean score towards PWVDs was 6.78 & 5.27 respectively with standard deviation of 1.36 & 1.71 respectively. It shows that there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between male & female students towards PWVDs at $\alpha = .00$. Likely, the comparison between the mean score given by grade 11 & (8.97) grade 12 (6.77) students towards PWIDs yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.8.3. Relationship between age and discrimination

To look at the relationship between discrimination towards various types of PWDs and age of the students, it is essential to examine the strength of relationship, the direction of relationship and to see the statistical significance of the relationship. Therefore, the result was summarized in table below after being computed by using Pearson Correlation coefficient.

Table 4.8.3

Pearson Correlation between age and discrimination

	PWPDs	PWHDs	PWVDs	PWIDs
Age	-.479**	-.486**	-.495**	-.501**

** . Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As indicated in the above table, discrimination towards PWPDs has a negative and significant ($r = -.541$) relation with age of the student. The same

was true on the relation between discrimination towards PWHDs and age, has negative and significant ($r = -.406$) relation.

Table 4.8.3 also illustrates, discrimination towards PWVDs has negative and significant ($r = -.530$) correlation with age of the students. The correlation between discrimination towards PWIDs and age of the students were lower (lower than the relation observed on discrimination towards other types of PWDs and age), negative and significant ($r = -.391$). Moreover, as the table describes discrimination towards all groups of PWDs was negative and significantly correlated.

4.8.4. Discrimination and contact with PWDs

To check whether there is a considerable difference between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs on the discrimination towards each groups of PWDs, the independent sample t-test was computed and the summarized result depicted in the Table 4.8.4 below.

Table 4.8.4

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between students with contact and without contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	Df	Si g
PWPDs	with contact	81	3.96 (1.48)	-15.84**	291	.00
	without contact	212	6.55 (1.15)			
PWHDs	with contact	81	2.80 (1.79)	-14.61**	291	.00
	without contact	212	5.46 (1.2)			
PWVDs	with contact	81	3.65 (1.71)	-16.56**	291	.00
	without contact	212	6.38 (1.04)			
PWIDs	with contact	81	5.18 (1.52)	-14.58**	291	.00
	without contact	212	8.09 (1.53)			

** $P < .01$

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare discrimination by students who had contact with PWDs and those students who had no contact with PWDs towards various types of PWDs by using a T-

test as a statistical model. The mean scores towards PWDs by students who had contact with PWDs & those who had no contact with PWDs are 3.96 & 6.55 respectively with standard deviations of 1.48 & 1.15 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in discrimination between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs at $\alpha = .00$. The comparisons on the mean score towards PWDs by students who had contact with PWDs & those who had no contact with PWDs are 2.80 & 5.46 respectively with standard deviations of 1.79 & 1.2 respectively. Also there was statistical significant difference $\alpha = .00$.

Also the comparison between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs on discrimination mean score towards PWDs was 3.65 & 6.38 respectively with standard deviation of 1.71 & 1.04 respectively. It shows that there is a statistically significant difference on discrimination between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs towards PWDs at $\alpha = .00$. The other comparison between the students who had contact with PWDs (5.18) and those who had no contact with PWDs (8.09) on discrimination towards PWDs yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.8.5. Discrimination and extent of contact with PWDs

The comparison of discrimination towards various groups of PWDs between students who had daily contact with PWDs and those who had occasional contact with PWDs was summarized in table 4.8.5 below. The statistics employed to compare prejudice mean scores, as measured by the student's extent of contact of daily and occasionally was an independent sample t-test.

Table 4.8.5

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between daily contact and occasional contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	df	Sig
PWPDs	daily	35	4.86(3.11)	-1.99*	55	.02
	occasionally	22	5.32(3.98)			
PWHDs	daily	35	2.77(1.85)	-2.81**	55	.001
	occasionally	22	3.93(2.99)			
PWVDs	daily	35	3.34(2.87)	-.74	55	.35
	occasionally	22	3.95(2.64)			
PWIDs	daily	35	6.43(3.5)	-.53	55	.42
	occasionally	22	7.32(3.48)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the table above, there was significant difference on discrimination towards PWPDs by students who had daily contact with PWDs (5.32) & those who had occasional contact with PWDs (4.86) with standard deviations of 3.11 & 3.98 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in discrimination between students who had daily contact with PWDs and those who had occasional contact with PWDs at $\alpha = .02$. The comparisons on the mean score towards PWHDs by students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact with PWDs are 2.77 & 3.93 respectively with standard deviations of 1.85 & 2.99 respectively. Also there was statistical significant difference at $\alpha = .001$.

The other comparisons between students who had daily contact with PWDs and those who had occasional contact with PWDs on discrimination mean score towards PWVDs & PWIDs did not yield significant difference at $\alpha = .05$.

4.8.6 Discrimination and type of relation with PWDs

A One-Way analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of types of relation with PWDs on discrimination towards PWDs, as measured by close family, friend & classmate relation with PWDs. The result of the analysis was summarized in table 4.8.6 & 4.8.6.1 below.

Table 4.8.6

Descriptive data on the student's relation with PWDs

Relation with PWDs	N	Mean(SD) towards PWPDs	Mean(SD) towards PWHDs	Mean(SD) towards PWVDs	Mean(SD) towards PWIDs
Close family	21	3.33(1.32)	2.24(1.18)	2.66(1.68)	4.52 (1.7)
Friend	33	4.18(1.79)	2.57(2.03)	3.94(1.93)	5.61(1.95)
Classmate	16	5.87(1.02)	4.62 (1.5)	6.0 (1.15)	8.0 (1.89)

Possible minimum score = 0, possible maximum score = 12 & median = 6

Table 4.8.6 indicates that the mean score towards each type of PWDs given by students who had family member with disability was lower than the score given by students who had friend and classmates with disability. The score given by those students who had friend with disabilities towards all types of PWDs was below the score given by students who had classmates with disability.

Table 4.8.6.1

Data and result of analysis of variance on discrimination between students type of relation with PWDs

Groups	Source	d. f	Sum of sq.	Ms	F
PWPDs	Between group	4	272.39	68.097	34.14**
	Within group	288	574.42	1.994	
	Total	292	846.805		
PWHDs	Between group	4	353.63	88.407	40.64**
	Within group	288	626.53	2.175	
	Total	292	980.157		
PWVDs	Between group	4	337.04	84.261	43.23**
	Within group	288	561.41	1.949	
	Total	292	898.451		
PWIDs	Between group	4	311.47	77.867	25.86**
	Within group	288	867.288	3.011	
	Total	292	1178.758		

** P < .01

As it is indicated in the above table, there was statistically significant difference at the $P < .01$ level in all the three student's types of relation with PWDs scores towards four groups of PWDs. [F (4,288)= 34.14, $p = .00$], for discrimination towards PWPDs, [F (4,288) = 40.64, $p = .00$], for discrimination towards PWHDs, [F (4,288) = 43.23, $p = .00$], for discrimination towards PWVDs & [F (4,288) = 25.86, $p = .00$], for discrimination towards PWIDs. Therefore, Tukey HSD post Hoc comparison were made in the table below to explore the exact variation in which the prior groups show significantly varying result.

Table 4.8.6.2

Post Hoc Comparison on discrimination towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs& PWIDs as students types of relation with PWDs

Variable	Groups	2	3
discrimination towards PWPDs	1) family	ns	**
	2) friend		**
	3) classmate		
discrimination towards PWHDs	1) family	ns	**
	2) friend		**
	3) classmate		
discrimination towards PWVDs	1) family	**	**
	2) friend		**
	3) classmate		
discrimination towards PWIDs	1) family	ns	**
	2) friend		**
	3) classmate		

** P < .01 ns > .05

As the above comparison indicates, on discrimination towards PWPDs there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability at $\alpha = .00$. There was also a significant difference between the mean score given by students who had classmate with disability & those friend with disability at $\alpha = .001$.

Regarding discrimination towards PWHDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had friend with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$.

Regarding discrimination towards PWVDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .011$. The mean difference

between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$. There was also a significant difference between the mean score given by students who had classmate with disability & those friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$.

The table also reveals on prejudice towards PWIDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had friend with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$.

4.8.7. Discrimination and unpleasant experience (UPE) with PWDs

To analyze differences in discrimination towards various groups of PWDs between students who had UPE with PWDs & those students who did not had UPE, an independent sample t-test was conducted for each type of PWDs. the summarized result illustrated in table 4.8.7 below.

Table 4.8.7

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between with UPE and without UPE with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping Variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	df	Sig
PWPDs	with UPE	34	7.64 (4.05)	3.86**	79	.00
	without UPE	47	5.23 (3.31)			
PWHDs	with UPE	34	3.35 (2.74)	-.054	79	.19
	without UPE	47	2.63 (2.16)			
PWVDs	with UPE	34	3.88 (2.63)	1.31	79	.95
	without UPE	47	3.91 (2.71)			
PWIDs	with UPE	34	7.82 (4.18)	2.97**	79	.001
	without UPE	47	5.34 (3.27)			

** P < .01 UPE= Unpleasant Experience

As indicated in the table above, there was statistically significant difference on discrimination towards PWPDs between the mean score given by

students who had UPE (7.64) and who had never had any UPE with PWDs (5.23) at $\alpha = .00$. The same was true on discrimination towards PWIDs between students who had UPE (7.82) and who had no any UPE with PWDs (5.34) at $\alpha = .001$. The other comparisons did not yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .05$ level.

4.8.9 Discrimination and pleasant experience (PE) with PWDs

Whether or not there exists a difference in discrimination towards different groups of PWDs between students who had PE with PWDs & those students who did not, an independent sample t-test was employed. The result of the analysis was summarized in table 4.8.9 below.

Table 4.8.9

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between with pleasant and without pleasant contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping Variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	df	Sig
PWPDs	with PE	43	5.09(3.23)	-3.67**	79	.00
	without PE	38	6.26(3.16)			
PWHDs	with PE	43	2.91(2.11)	-1.99*	79	.02
	without PE	38	3.98(2.94)			
PWVDs	with PE	43	3.42(2.76)	-.55	79	.58
	without PE	38	4.42(2.43)			
PWIDs	with PE	43	5.38 (3.91)	-2.04*	79	.05
	without PE	38	8.55 (2.95)			

*P < .05 ** P < .01 PE= Pleasant Experience

As shown in the table above, on discrimination towards PWPDs, there was statistically significant difference between the mean score given by students who had PE (5.09) and who had no PE with PWDs (6.26) at $\alpha = .00$. There was also highly statistically significant difference on discrimination towards PWHDs (with the mean score given by students who had PE were 2.91 and who had no PE with PWDs were 3.98) and significantly different at $\alpha = .02$.

The comparison between scores given by students who had PE with PWDs and those who had no PE on discrimination towards PWIDs also yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .05$ level.

4.8.10 Discrimination and attendance on awareness creation training

Training is one of the most known ways of awareness creation techniques. Therefore, whether training change/shape students behavior or not, the comparison among those who attend training and who didn't attend training is done. Comparison between two groups of students on discrimination towards PWDs was done by using independent sample t- test technique.

Table 4.8.10

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between attend and not attend on disability issue training

Variable	Grouping variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs	get training	30	3.56 (1.55)	-8.6**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	6.09 (1.52)			
PWHDs	get training	30	2.16 (1.51)	-9.15**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	5.02 (1.63)			
PWVDs	get training	30	3.23 (1.81)	-8.88**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	5.9 (1.53)			
PWIDs	get training	30	4.96 (1.24)	-7.3**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	7.56 (1.91)			

*P < .05 ** P < .01

As indicated in the table above, the mean score towards PWPDs of those students who attend training and who did not attend training was 3.56 & 6.09 respectively with the standard deviations of 1.55 & 1.52 respectively. Although it was significant at $\alpha = .00$. The comparison on the score towards PWHDs between students who attend training and who did not attend training was 2.16 & 5.02 respectively with the standard deviations of 1.51 & 1.63

respectively. There was a significant difference on the scores towards PWHDs given by students who attend training and who did not attend training. In the case of PWVDs, the mean score which was given by those students attend training were 3.32 & the mean score by students who did not attend training were 5.9. Therefore, it was statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$. Statistical significant difference found out between the mean score given by students who attend training (3.56) and who did not attend training (6.09) with the standard deviations of 1.55 & 1.52 respectively discrimination towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

In this section, an attempt is made to answer the research questions and to examine findings in relation to each variables of the study (nature and difference in prejudice and discrimination towards different disability types). The effect of the characteristics of student's (age, sex, grade, contact with PWDs, extent of contact with PWDs, unpleasant experience with PWDs, pleasant experience with PWDs, types of relation with PWDs & attending disability issue training) on students prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs also discussed.

5.1 Nature of prejudice & discrimination towards four types of PWDs

The present study shows that there is no difference on the nature of prejudice among PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs. The mean score given for all four groups of PWDs fallen under the range of 46.67 to 73.33. Therefore, prejudice towards all four groups PWDs has medium magnitude. Even though, all the groups of PWDs fall under the same range of prejudice, there might be a difference among them.

Table 4.6 also indicates that, discrimination mean score given to both PWHDs & PWVDs ranged from 0 to 4. Hence, discrimination towards both groups of PWDs was mild. But the calculated mean score of discrimination for PWPDs & PWIDs were between 5 & 8. This indicates that, the nature of discrimination towards PWPDs & PWIDs was moderate.

The implication the difference on discrimination between groups could be the perception of students towards each type of disability. For instance, students may have a fear of being hurt to contact with PWIDs rather than people with other types of disability. And there could be also many reasons behind, for discrepancy of discrimination towards the groups of PWDs, like wrongly perceived causes for the disabling condition, perceiving as the

disability contagious, restricted movement in restrictive environment, less contact with them could be reasons for experiencing more discrimination. The least discrimination was towards PWHDs & this may be due to the invisibility of the disability.

As discussed above, even though there was prejudice and discrimination towards the four groups of PWDs; difference in the nature of discrimination was observed. In this regard literature also indicates that there is no equal discrimination towards all PWDs, rather those who have intellectual disabilities are targets for the greater degree of discrimination (Julie, 2001). However, in contrary to this result, Harold (2002) stated that due to the absence of speech PWHDs are the most socially isolated groups than PWVDs and other long-life diseases. However the result shows that discrimination towards PWHDs was mild & it is least than any other groups of PWDs under the study.

5.2 Prejudice & discrimination differences among PWDs

As it is stated in the previous chapter, the questions that is to be answered in the study was whether there is a significant difference in prejudice and discrimination among various groups of PWDs. As shown in table 4.4, prejudice towards compared groups of PWDs had statistically significant mean variation ($p < .01$).

For example, prejudice towards PWPDs were statistically significantly different from the prejudice towards PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of 6.88, .79 & -1.05 respectively at $\alpha = .00$ level except the comparison between PWPDs & PWVDs, which was significant at $\alpha = .008$.

Similarly, prejudice towards PWHDs were significantly different from the prejudice towards PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of -6.09 & -1.74 at $\alpha = .00$. The same was true between PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of -1.13 highly significant at $\alpha = .00$.

This indicates that, even though there was medium magnitude of prejudice towards all four groups of PWDs there were highly significant mean variations among them. For example, prejudice towards PWIDs were strong than the other groups; then PWPDs, PWVDs & PWHDs respectively.

The same was true for discrimination (table, 4.7 & 4.7.1). There were highly statistically significant differences on discrimination towards the types of PWDs ($p < .01$). In each comparison, difference among the groups yields high statistical difference. Discrimination towards PWPDs was statistically different ($\alpha = .00$) with the score given to PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of 2.8, 1.95 & -1.96 respectively. There was also a high statistical significant difference between the score given for PWHDs ($\alpha = .00$) and the score given for PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of -.85 & -4.77 respectively. The same was true between PWVDs & PWIDs with a highly statistically significantly different at $\alpha = .00$ level & the mean difference was -3.92.

5.3 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and Sex

Prejudice score towards various groups of PWDs of students was examined in line with the respondent sex. As presented in table 4.5.1, the male groups had strong prejudice towards all four groups of PWDs than female groups and the difference in prejudice for all groups of PWDs was significant at $\alpha = .00$.

T-test also computed to compare discrimination towards different types of PWDs with student's sex. As presented in table 4.8.1, discrimination score towards each type of PWDs was observed where male students behavior highly negative than female students. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that males were strongly discriminated PWDs than female students. The statistically significant mean variation among female & male students on discrimination towards all four groups of PWDs was at $\alpha = .00$.

Here two things are mainly observed. One, there was strong prejudice towards all types of PWDs by male than female students. This could be due to the high social interaction passion of females than males and sympathetic behavior of females. This result is similar to the study which compares the attitude of students towards PWDs in different level of educational settings done by Royal & Roberts, 1987; as cited in Almaz, 2011.

The other core point is even though there was a mean difference in prejudice & discrimination towards all PWDs by male & female students, there was similarities in the types of disability which are labeled either strong or weak prejudice & discrimination by both sexes. This means both females and males students had similar tendency towards all types of disability with variability of extents. For instance, both male & female students have less prejudice & discrimination towards PWHs but both female & male students have high prejudice & discrimination towards PWIDs than the other groups of PWDs.

5.4 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and age

As indicated in table 4.5.2, there was negative correlation between age of the students and prejudice towards each type of PWDs. For example, age was negatively correlated with prejudice towards PVPDs with correlation coefficient of -.54. The same was true on age & prejudice towards PWHs with correlation coefficient of -.41. Age & prejudice towards PVPDs also negatively correlated with coefficient of -.53. Similarly, age & prejudice towards PWIDs was negatively correlated at -.39. There was also highly statistical significant difference between age and prejudice towards four types of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$. In the case of age & prejudice towards PVPDs & PVPDs were highly correlated & their correlation were negative. This means the change on the age highly influences the extent of prejudice towards this group of PWDs and the increasing in age results decrease in prejudice.

Regarding age and prejudice towards PWHs & PWIDs correlation were moderate and negative. This indicates that, the increment in age does not highly influences the prejudice towards PWHs & PWIDs like of PWPDs & PWVDs.

In table 4.8.3 also, discrimination and age are highly negatively correlated to each other. For instance, discrimination towards PWPDs, PWHs, PWVDs & PWIDs were highly correlated with age with correlation coefficient of -.479, -.486, -.495 & -.501 respectively. Here, the correlation between age & discrimination towards PWIDs were higher than other. This might have an indication that, discriminatory behavior towards PWIDs was highly influenced by age or vice versa than the others relation.

In general, as discussed above, there was a negative relation between age and prejudice as well as discrimination towards PWDs. This might be most of the time children molded & grow up by their families guide. But when they become developed mentally starts to think and see thing out of box & gradually disclosed with the prior thinking filled by their family. There for changes may appear due to their opportunity to get information and think broadly than the previous time. Bernard (2010) also states that, children learn about PWDs from their parents, teachers or friends and lives through it unless they get opportunity to know new things.

5.5 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and grade

Prejudice and discrimination towards various types of PWDs were compared with the student's grade. As it is indicated in table 4.5.3, prejudice towards all four groups of PWDs by grade 11 students was stronger than grade 12 students and the difference was significant $\alpha = .00$ except towards PWHs which was significant at $\alpha = .002$. The findings suggest that prejudice towards PWDs decreased as grade of the students increase.

Like prejudice, comparison made between grade 11 students & grade 12 students on discrimination towards various groups of PWDs. Table 4.8.4 shows

that, discrimination towards all four groups of PWDs by grade 11 students compared to discrimination by grade 12 students, the result is discrimination by grade 11 students was higher than by grade 12 students. Moreover the difference is significant at $\alpha = .00$.

This might be, when grade level increase there is also increasing in age so that, there is a natural development to see things rationally and there is an exposure to acquire new knowledge & experience. Also, situation & possibilities become favor to dig for realities in grade 12 than grade 11. A study support this result were done by Upton and Harper; 2002 and Pitman and Slate; 1994 (as cited in Almaz, 2011). The research's suggested that the students spent more years on education the more positive attitudes exhibited towards PWDs. More education is highly correlated with positive attitudes (Yuker, 1994; cited in Almaz, 2011). Therefore, education has an effect on the prejudice and attitude of students towards PWDs.

5.6 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and contact with PWDs

Table 4.5.4, describes the statistical significance difference between prejudice towards PWDs by students who had & had no contact with PWDs. As indicated there, there were mean score difference between students who had contact with PWDs & those had not contact with PWDs on prejudice towards each type of PWDs. Statistical significant difference also observed between scores given by students with contact and those who were without contact with PWDs on prejudice towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$.

Table 4.8.5, describes that differences in discrimination mean score towards various groups of PWDs among those students who had contact & who had no contact with PWDs. The mean score given by those students who were with contact with PWDs towards PWPDs (3.96), PWHDs (2.80), PWVDs (3.65) & PWIDs (5.18) was below the median (6). Unlikely, those students who were without contact with PWDs gives the scores towards PWPDs (6.55), PWHDs (5.46), PWVDs (6.38) & PWIDs (8.09) were above the median except the score

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Special Needs Education

**Prejudice and Discrimination against People with Disabilities as
a Function of Types of Disability**

By:

Tizita Kassahun G/mariam

June 2014

Addis Ababa

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Special Needs Education

**Prejudice and Discrimination against People with Disabilities as
a Function of Types of Disability**

By:

Tizita Kassahun G/mariam

**This thesis is submitted to the Department of Special Needs
Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master of Arts Degree in Special Needs Education**

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

Department of Special Needs Education

**Prejudice and Discrimination against People with Disabilities as
a Function of types of Disability**

By:

Tizita Kassahun G/Mariam

Approval of the Board of Examiners

4. Advisor

Name_____ Signature_____ Date_____

5. Internal Examiner

Name_____ Signature _____ Date _____

6. External Examiner

Name_____ Signature _____ Date _____

Acknowledgment

My deepest and heartfelt gratitude goes to my advisor, Dr. R.S. Kumar for his constructive criticisms, insightful comments, guidance, advice and encouragement throughout the entire research.

I am grateful to Ato Ali Sani for his support during the development of data collection tools & his advice throughout the entire research.

I wish to thank Yekatit 12 preparatory school administrator, teachers and students for their willingness and cooperation during the collection of data for the research.

Finally, my special thanks go to my family and my husband Ato Ephrem Zeleke for their financial and moral support.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgment.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables	vi
List of Acronyms and Abbreviation	
Abstract.....	
CHAPTER ONE	4
Introduction.....	11
1.1 Background of the study	11
1.2. Problem Statement.....	13
1.3 Aim of the study.....	14
1.4. Significance of the Study	15
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	15
1.6. Limitation of the Study.....	15
1.7. Operational Definition of Variables	15
CHAPTER TWO	17
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	17
2.1. Prejudice and Discrimination	17
2.1.1. The concept of Prejudice	17
2.1.2. The Concept of Discrimination.....	18
2.1.3. Relation and Distinction between Prejudice and Discrimination	19
2.2. Forms of Prejudice and Discrimination	20
2.3. Types of Prejudice and Discrimination	21
2.4. Symptoms of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs	22
2.5. Prejudice and Discrimination towards People with Disability	23

2.5.1. History of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs.....	23
2.5.2. History of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs.....	26
2.5.3. Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs at Different Context ..	28
2.6. Prejudice and Discrimination on the Life of PWDs	30
2.7. Legal Frameworks against Disability Prejudice and Discrimination	30
2.7.1. International Policy Documents	30
2.7.2. National documents.....	32
2.8. Measurement of Prejudice and Discrimination.....	33
CHAPTER THREE	35
METHODOLOGY	35
3.1. Research Design.....	35
3.2. Study Area	35
3.3. Sample.....	36
3.4. Data Collection Instruments.....	36
3.5. Pilot study.....	37
3.6. Data Collection Procedure	38
3.7. Analysis of Data	39
3.8. Ethical Considerations	40
CHAPTER FOUR	41
RESULTS	41
4.1 Background information of the students.....	41
4.2 Students experience with PWDs	43
4.3 Nature of Prejudice towards the four types of PWDs.....	44
4.4 Comparison of Prejudice towards people with different types of disability	45
4.5 Students Characteristics and Prejudice	46
4.5.1 Sex and Prejudice	46
4.5.2. Relationship between Age and Prejudice	48
4.5.3. Prejudice and Grade level	48
4.5.4. Prejudice and contact with PWDs	50

4.5.5. Prejudice and extent of contact with PWDs	51
4.5.6. Prejudice and relation with PWDs	53
4.5.7. Prejudice and unpleasant experience with PWDs	56
4.5.8. Prejudice and pleasant experience with PWDs	58
4.5.9. Prejudice and attendance on awareness creation training	59
4.6. Nature of Discrimination towards four types of PWDs	61
4.7. Comparison of discrimination towards people with different types of disability	61
4.8. Students Characteristics and Discrimination.....	62
4.8.1. Sex and Discrimination	62
4.8.2. Discrimination and Grade level.....	64
4.8.3. Relationship between age and discrimination.....	65
4.8.4. Discrimination and contact with PWDs.....	66
4.8.5. Discrimination and extent of contact with PWDs.....	67
4.8.6 Discrimination and type of relation with PWDs	69
4.8.7. Discrimination and unpleasant experience (UPE) with PWDs	72
4.8.9 Discrimination and pleasant experience (PE) with PWDs.....	73
4.8.10 Discrimination and attendance on awareness creation training.....	74
CHAPTER FIVE	76
DISCUSSION	76
5.1 Nature of Prejudice & Discrimination towards four types of PWDs	76
5.2 Prejudice & discrimination Differences among PWDs	77
5.3 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and Sex	78
5.4 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and Age	79
5.5 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and Grade	80
5.6 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and contact with PWDs.....	81
5.7 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and extent of contact with PWDs	180
5.8 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and type of relation with PWDs	181

5.9 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and unpleasant experience with PWDs	184
5.10 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and pleasant experience with PWDs	185
5.11 Prejudice & Discrimination towards PWDs and training on PWDs	186
CHAPTER SIX	188
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	188
6.1 Conclusions	190
6.2 Recommendations	192
References	
Appendices	

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

E.C	Ethiopian Calendar
PE	Pleasant Experience
PWD	People with Disability
PWHD	People with Hearing Disability
PWID	People with Intellectual Disability
PWOD	People without Disability
PWPD	People with Physical Disability
PWVD	People with Visual Disability
UPE	Unpleasant Experience

Abstract

The main aim of this study was to examine the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination towards various types of people with disability by preparatory students. The research design used was survey. Two hundred and ninety-three students without disability, who were drawn using multi stage cluster sampling, participated in the study. Data were collected using Feeling & Thinking towards People with Disability Scale and Behavior towards People with Disability Scale. The instruments were administered individually. Descriptive statistics, t-test, one way analysis of variance & repeated measurement of analysis of variance were the specific statistical procedures employed to analyze data. As a major outcome of the study; the nature of prejudice towards all four groups of people with disability layed under the range of medium magnitude. Nature of discrimination towards people with physical and intellectual disability falls under the range of moderate. However, discrimination nature was mild towards people with hearing and visual disability. The study did not end with this result rather it continues whether there is a significant difference between groups of people with disability even though most of them fall in the same range. Hence the result shows that, both prejudice and discrimination towards various groups of people with disability revealed that there is a significant difference between groups of people with disability. Therefore, prejudice and discrimination vary between different types of people with disability. Consequently based on the findings of the study recommendation were forwarded.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

Prejudice is an attitude directed towards people because they are members of a specific social group (Brewer & Brown; 1998 as cited in Bernand and Whitley, 2010). Which means, once an individual join such group he/ she will be generalized by the assumption of the out group people towards the group. While discrimination is treating people differently from others based primarily on membership in a social group (Sue; 2003 as cited in Bernand and Whitley, 2010). Discrimination is something which is practical rather than feeling. As prejudice, people also tend to think of discrimination in negative terms, it also can result in someone's is being treated more positively than he or she otherwise would be based on group membership.

History tells us that people in minority groups including people with disabilities (PWDs) experience and also experiencing prejudice and discrimination by their parents, neighbors, age mates, society and by the community at large in different manner and settings. It is true that people with disability have been present in any society. Despite the presence of disability all over the world, people with disability experience a greater degree of prejudice and discrimination than any other groups (Julie, 2001). Julie also states that prejudice towards people with disability emerges from different factors and all those factors are not sources of prejudice for other minority groups. Therefore, experiencing prejudice does not make PWDs different from other minority groups, but the difference comes at the degree and sources of prejudice towards PWDs. When Devenney (2002) describes the extreme practices towards PWDs "It was common practice for babies with impairments to be killed" (p. 3). Hence people with disabilities encounter different physical, social and psychological abuses. In this regard Tooley (1983) states that, in

ancient Greek individuals were expected to have complete physical, mental and aesthetic perfection. If the newborn children were deemed to be 'weakly' or impaired while they are inspected by the city elders; they were taken and left exposed to the elements to die.

Mostly people without disability perceived that PWDs are unable to do anything & they are in need of others support. In supporting this, Susan (1996) stated that, "disability is socially constructed through the failure or unwillingness to create ability among people who do not fit the physical & mental profile standard of citizens" (p. 107). It reveals that the meanings given for PWDs by the society is, as incapable of doing anything so that PWDs perceived as unable to participate equally because of the disability he/she with. Congruently it also guides their interaction towards people with disabilities. Because interactions are also determined by the attitude developed towards people with disabilities.

Beyond this, individuals with disabilities face different forms of discrimination. Fred (2012) describes the form of discrimination faced by people with disabilities: it is *unique for their situation*. This implies that the way people discriminate people with disability vary as they differ in the disability that they have.

In Ethiopia also poverty and poor health status is a characteristic of people with disability as perceived by the community (Tirussew, 2005). In general the negative attitude towards PWDs had a complete impact on the life of individuals with disability. Is it mainly because disability still perceived mistakenly by the society. In Ethiopia, lack of public information about disabilities has led to negative societal attitudes about PWDs (Tirussew, 2005). Hence negative descriptions of PWDs amplify rejection and marginalization of people with disabilities (Ruffner, 1990; cited in Almaz, 2011).

In general, it's not arguable that people without disability knowingly or unknowingly prejudice and discriminate people with disability at all. Also different researches have been done studies on attitudes of people against

PWDs. Holding in mind that attitude is situational and contextual, in unequal or biased society children can grow up and adjust themselves with opinions and attitudes about disabilities which is familiar in their culture. Therefore, it's mandatory to examine their attitude in order to generate practices and modify wrong attitudes.

1.2. Problem Statement

Studies reveal that all people with disabilities experience prejudice and discrimination. However, different researches state that the intensity of prejudice and discrimination vary as the function of disability is category. Regardless of their disability, severity, social &/or economic status; people with disability are under the group of prejudiced and discriminated people. But it's possible to state the more and less prejudices and discriminated group based on the disability type (Julie, 2001).

An attitude towards PWDs is resulted from the social construct of disability in a given place/country. "Perception of disability labels, expectation of people with disabilities and ascribe meaning of the experience of disability are all shaped by the broader culture" (Albrecht, 1992; as cited in Julie, 2001, p.71). Therefore, the response of people without disability towards people with disability is selective and culturally shaped.

Different studies indicate that studying attitude is important in order to establish opportunities and ensure inclusion of PWDs through its indication towards reduction of attitudinal gaps and intervening PWDs (Chan et al., 2002; Antonak & Livneh, 2000; as cited in Almaz, 2011). Because successful inclusion of PWDs highly determined by the positive attitude of the society.

As stated earlier different literatures describes that both prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs shows discrepancy between different types of PWDs. However, the researcher did not get research based fact in Ethiopia which indicates the magnitude of prejudice and discrimination towards different types of PWDs. Therefore, it is necessary to check whether there is a difference on prejudice and discrimination towards people with different types of disability. Thus, it is necessary to conduct the research on the nature and the difference of prejudice and discrimination against people with different types of disability. The study, more specifically, tries to find answers to the following basic questions

6. What is the nature of prejudice and discrimination of people without disabilities towards people with different disabilities?
7. Is there a statically significant difference in prejudice directed towards people with different disabilities?
8. Is there a statically significant difference in discrimination directed towards people with different disabilities?
9. Is there any difference in prejudice directed towards PWDs as a function of different characteristics (age, sex, educational level, contact, type of contact with PWDs, unpleasant experience with PWDs, pleasant experience with PWDs, extent of contact with PWDs & attending awareness creation training) of students?
10. Is there any difference in discrimination directed towards PWDs as a function of different characteristics (age, sex, educational level, contact, type of contact with PWDs, unpleasant experience with PWDs, pleasant experience with PWDs, extent of contact with PWDs & attending awareness creation training) of students?

1.3 Aim of the study

The study is aimed at investigating the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination towards different types of people with disability.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study will have the following significance:

4. The finding may clearly indicate the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination towards people with different types of disability by students without disability.
5. The finding of this study may serve as an input for different governmental and non-governmental organization who works on disability issues, specifically for those who works towards inclusion of persons with disabilities to see the attitudinal gaps and run their work effectively towards reducing prejudice and discrimination against person with disability and promote social inclusion.
6. It may also be used as an input to future research on related issues.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

The research is delimited to the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination towards people with physical disability, visual disability, hearing disability & intellectual disability. It is also delimited at Yekatit 12 preparatory school, Addis Ababa.

1.6. Limitation of the Study

Due to lack of previous researches which are conducted in the same area and absence of sufficient and relevant literatures which supplement the study, the researcher has been forced to rely on few materials.

1.7. Operational Definition of Variables

Prejudice: - A negative or biased opinion, feeling, thought & prejudgment about the individual in a group with disability.

Discrimination: - Unequal/ unfair practice or action towards individual or group with disability.

Nature: - The extent that prejudice and discrimination appear towards people with disabilities.

Types of disability: - physical disability, hearing disability, visual disability & intellectual disability.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Prejudice and Discrimination

People may confuse with these two terms. Prejudice and discrimination are terms which describe responses towards others. Even though they are an attitude towards others, prejudice is the affective component while discrimination falls under the behavioral component of attitude (Forsyth, 1995; as cited in Tirusew, 2005).

2.1.1. The concept of Prejudice

In different time number of definitions was given for the term prejudice based up on the condition/context they want to give stress. This includes prejudice in relation to disability, race, gender, age, economic status& so on. Even though, different authors gave their definitions, most of the definitions bring almost similar theme.

Of them, Brewer and Brown (as cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010) prejudice is an attitude towards the members of certain social groups. Anne (2007) also define prejudice as an existing biases resulted from the social stereotypes and can result rejection of individuals right due to membership in social groups. Prejudice is “Adverse opinion, often accompanied by irrational suspicion or hatred, formed towards a particular race, religion, or group.” (Richard, Sharon & Kelly, 2007, p. 20). Other definition which is given by Allport (cited in Julie, 2001) describes that prejudice is a hostile attitude towards people in a group simply because of an individual belongs to that group.

Prejudice is a negative attitude towards a group or towards members of the group (Todd, 2009). It is an unreasonable negative attitude towards others because of their membership in a particular group (Harold 2002). Prejudice can be automatic and can influence our behavior even when we are not aware of

that we have such views, and we might even vigorously deny that we hold them (Fazio & Hilden; 1992 cited in Harold, 2002). Also Allport (cited in Harold, 2002) summarize his discussion about the characteristics of prejudice with the following definition: "prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole or toward an individual because he is a member of that group" (P, 9). Despite the influence of prejudice throughout history, the concept of prejudice did not develop until 20th century (Richard et al. 2007).

In addition to this different theories speculate the concept of prejudice.

period	View of prejudice	Theories
1920/1930s	Irrational and un justified attitude	Psychodynamic theory
1930s/1940s	An unconscious defense	Psychodynamic theory
1950s	An expression of pathological needs	Psychodynamic theory
1960s	A social norm	Socio cultural theory
1970s	An expression of group interests and intergroup relation	Intergroup relations theory
1980s to now	An evitable outcome of normal thought processes/evaluation	Cognitive and evolutionary theory

Source: adapted from the social psychology of prejudice by Duckitt, J (cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010, pp. 27).

2.1.2. The Concept of Discrimination

Literatures also give definitions for discrimination. For example, Richard et al. (2007) define discrimination as treating people in different way by favoring to one over the other. This is unfair and based up on subjective standards and norms'. In addition to this, Bernard and Mary (2010) emphasize

that discrimination can be visible in many ways like verbally or behaviorally in different settings.

Not always discrimination appears negatively. It also appears in a way treated more positively than the others. In this regard, Sue (cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010) stated that discrimination can be resulted from more positive treatment than others due to membership of the group.

It is damaging discrepancy towards people belongs to specific group by denying their right concerning to employment, residential housing, political right, educational or recreational opportunities, churches, hospitals or some other rights (Allport cited in Julie, 2001).

2.1.3. Relation and Distinction between Prejudice and Discrimination

In most cases people use the term prejudice and discrimination interchangeably but it's important to understand the differences between these terms even though they may have some similarities. Usually the term prejudice and discrimination used to describe unfair treatment or demeaning manner (Bernard & Mary, 2010). When Julie (2001) states their difference, prejudice is concerning attitudes and beliefs rather discrimination is behavior. The main point is, prejudice is an attitude towards group members and discrimination is behavior towards them but both have a strong cultural component that guides how individuals respond to others. This conception shared by Richard et al. (2007) and they mention that prejudice is not same with discrimination and one can cause/lead to the other. Unlike this view, Harold (2002) states that discrimination is not always based on prejudice, it frequently is, especially if the perpetrator is acting on his own as opposed to on behalf of some institution or authority.

Further explanation also given by Bernard & Mary (2010)

Prejudice is an attitude; it deals with how people think and feel about members of other groups. Discrimination, in contrast, is a behavior; it deals with how people act towards members of other groups. It consists of

behaving differently towards people solely or primarily on their membership in a social group. (p. 370)

Forsyth (cited in Tirusew, 2005) suggested that prejudice consists of an affective (how we feel) and cognitive (how we think) component, while discrimination ascribes to the behavioral component. Which means that the former indicates that the like and dislike towards something / somebody while the second is related with the various types of discriminatory actions. There is a very strong impact on our action towards other resulted from prejudice which arises either from below or our level of awareness (Crystal, 2009).

It seems that impulsive prejudiced behavior starts with learned, prejudiced, implicit evaluations that will be automatically activated when a stigmatized target is present. This activation results in a basic affective reaction that will be accompanied by an impulsive, aversive behavioral reaction towards this target (Ron & Daniel, 2008). Generally, prejudice can be institutional or interpersonal but prejudice is always interpersonal.

2.2. Forms of Prejudice and Discrimination

There are different ways that prejudice and discrimination reveals. According to Benokraitis and Feagin (cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010) there are three major forms of discrimination. These are blatant, subtle and covert discrimination. As they describe:

Blatant discrimination: it's an intentional unfair and dangerous treatment of others. This is easily visible and can be documented type of discrimination.

Subtle Discrimination: consists of unequal and harmful treatment that is typically less visible and obvious than other form of discrimination. Unlike other forms of discrimination, which are often intentional, subtle discrimination is often unintentional. Similarly, Julie (2001) discusses that,

people without disability wrongly respond during the interaction with people with disability and they may not even be aware of their mistakes.

Covert Discrimination consists of unequal and harmful treatment that is hidden, purposeful, and often, maliciously motivated. Covert discrimination tends to be very difficult to document.

Other writers who state the form of discrimination based up on the severity of discriminating practice. This includes extreme form of discrimination; extermination, deliberate killing of certain groups of people. The other form is more subtle form of discrimination including exclusion from social activities and consistently biased activities (Richard et al., 2007).

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that discrimination towards PWDs is treating a person less favorably, because of his or her disability, than a person without disability. That would be treated in the same or similar circumstances (*direct discrimination*). It also covers discrimination where the same treatment applies to people with and without a disability but the impact has disadvantage or exclude people with a disability in a way which is not reasonable (*indirect discrimination*).

2.3. Types of Prejudice and Discrimination

Bernard and Mary (2010) states that four types of discriminations from the view of point of setting /situation;

Interpersonal discrimination: unfair treatment occurs at the individual or person level and may result from stereotypic beliefs and evaluation of a group.

Organizational discrimination: it occurs when the practice, rules and policies of formal organization such as corporations or government agencies have discriminatory outcomes like at workplaces (Benokraitis & Feagin cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010).

Institutional discrimination: it occurs when the norms, policies, and practices associated with a social institution such as the family, religious institution, the educational system and the criminal justice system, result in different outcomes for members of different groups (Benokraitis & Feagin cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010).

Cultural discrimination: it appears within the same culture, one group establish and maintains its dominance by rewarding those values that corresponds to its views and punishing those values that do not. This can result marginalizing those assumed as minority groups (Benokraitis & Feagin cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010).

Furthermore, prejudice occurs as implicit and explicit types (Devine, 1989; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; as cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010). Since implicit prejudice is an attitude towards individuals/ groups this is out of the conscious. If prejudice occurs in a way that people are aware of and can easily control called explicit prejudice.

2.4. Symptoms of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs

Mostly researchers come up with different but related symptoms of prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs. In this regard, Antonak, 1985; Belgrav, 1984; Belgrav & Nills, 1981; Gouvier, Steiner, Jackson, Schlater & Rain, 1984; Grand, Bernier & Strohmer, 1991; Hannah & Midlarsky, 1987; Livneh, 1987; Strohmer, Grand & Purcell, 1984; cited in Julie, 2001) stated the following symptoms are seen during interaction:

- ❖ Shorter duration during contact/ conversation – the person without disability wants to leave as quickly as possible;
- ❖ Less eye contact and physical contact; and
- ❖ Avoidance of personal topics during conversation and a greater focus on impersonal, trivial and polite.

2.5. Prejudice and Discrimination towards People with Disability

2.5.1. History of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs

History tells us the severity of prejudice and discrimination towards people with disability than any other minority groups throughout the world. Julie(2001) suggested that “No other racial, cultural, ethnic, linguistic, religious, political, national, sexual orientation, or gender groups has experienced this degree of pervasive and generalized prejudice and discrimination, which include killing babies with disability, forced sterilization of person with disability, institutionalization and mass murder” (p. 72). Unlike any other group who face prejudice based on race, color, sex, origin, religion, age, the discrimination experienced by people with disability had no legal remedy to compensate such discrimination (ADA, 1990; cited in Julie, 2001). This is mainly resulted from the misunderstanding of people without disability towards people with disability as they share same negative characteristics. In supporting this Richard et al. (2007) discussed that the prejudice against people with disability are rooted in negative stereotyping, stigmatization, psychological discomfort and pity.

People with disability faced discrimination and prejudice in different settings; within the community as well as in the institution they lived in segregated manner. People with disability have been institutionalized afterward they exposed to neglect, abuse and death (Craine, Henson, Colliver & McLeland, 1988; Ulicny, White, Bradford & Matthews, 1990; Waxman, 1991; as cited in Julie, 2001).The stated rational for institutionalize PWDs is to prevent them from danger. Conversely people with disability were hurt and raped by their caregivers in the institution. Furthermore, PWDs were forced to be sterilized (Sobsey, 2001; cited in Julie, 2001). Further, institutional life characterized by staff dominated, depersonalization and a very subsidiary role and status experienced by people with disability (Goffman and Morris, 1993; cited in Colin & Geof, 2006).

On the other hand, even though people with disability live with their family (within the community) they face different types prejudice and discrimination. Violence including attack, beating, robbery, assassin and rape towards people with disability in the community (rather than in an institution) is also much more common than violence towards people without disability (Cole, Sobsey & Mansell, 1999; cited in Julie, 2001). Julie (2001), like any other minority group people with disabilities were considered as inferior and experience avoidance, segregation, marginalization, labeled as deviant [*sic*]. She also describe that, in most cases, this kind of community response emerges from the perceived view that people with disability are threat to the physical safety of the community. Cultural myths held that society needed to be protected from people with disabilities. These practices reflected a common societal fear that the so-called peoples with physical, mental, and moral disability would degrade the human race (Szymanski & Trueba, 1989; cited in Miguel and Katherine, 2010).History also tells us that there were laws which were against the right of PWDs. According to Pfeiffer as cited in Carolyn and Mercar (2006) during 19th& 20th Centuries, laws permit the involuntary sterilization of people with cognitive disability.

However, studies reveals that the degree of prejudice and discrimination vary among disability type. It's clear that there are disability groups which are more prejudiced and discriminate than others. For instance, people with physical disability take the least degree, individual with intellectual and cognitive disability experience more and those who have psychiatric disorder experience the greater degree (Julie, 2001). "There is no equal prejudice towards all people with disabilities" (Abroms & Hodera, 1979; Antonak, 1980; Oberman, 1965; cited in Julie, 2001).

To mention a very few examples of prejudice and discrimination towards people with disability stated by different authors:

- ❖ The 1997 Associated press article entitled “Handicapped [sic] used as Guinea pigs” publicized that Sweden against the will of the individual 60,000 people with disability sterilize between the years of 1935-1976 and hundreds of institutionalize swedes with intellectual disability were fed daily diets of candy for the purpose of research; to prove the relation between eating sugar and tooth decay (cited in Julie, 2001).
- ❖ Most people believe that kids with disability not to be killed rather they should not be born at all (Hubbard cited in Julie, 2001).
- ❖ Many individuals with disability have not been allowed to take part and participate in different social and religious activities due to attitudinal and physical barriers (Julie, 2001).
- ❖ People with disability are more vulnerable and targets of crime, physical, abuse, and sexual abuse (Craine et al., 1988; cited in Julie, 2001).
- ❖ In the early time, in Britain enforced institutionalization of peoples with disability and resulting treating like prisoners has been documented (Thomas 1982; cited in Colin & Geof, 2006).
- ❖ Individual with intellectual &/or mental disability considered as dangerous for the society (Julie, 2001).
- ❖ People with hearing impairment also experience social isolation, perceived as intellectually weak, having problematic behavior and disturbed emotion (Julie, 2001).

In general, it is possible to conclude that most people with disabilities did not experience a decisive advance in their life course and they were excluded from education, employment, and the built environment to leisure and social relationship.

2.5.2. History of Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs in Ethiopia

Even though it is difficult to find and refer reliable source &/or documents regarding prejudice and discrimination within the context of Ethiopia; it's possible to mention issues rose in few of available materials with the visible situation faced by people with disabilities in different context.

As any other country, in Ethiopia people with disabilities face different challenging situations in their life. This emerges from societal negative attitude towards them. When Tirusew (2005) describe the attitude of the Ethiopian society, he states that “In Ethiopia, there is a general tendency to think of people with disabilities abilities as weak, hopeless, dependent, and unable to learn and the subject of charity. These kinds of misunderstanding by the general people easily lead them to prejudice and discrimination” (P.7).

Also people prefer to treat their relatives or children with disability only in their home. This is mainly due to fear of societal negative attitude towards them. So that they perceive disability as a shameful event happen in their life of their family. Having the child with disability becomes a source of shame and it results family crisis like divorce. Therefore, mostly parents exclude the child from their surrounding and peers (Tirusew, 2005). Further he describes those children with disability experience different social and emotional deprivation due to neglect, reject by their family as well as their neighbors.

According to Tirusew (2005), the provision of public service and special programs for people with disabilities like health, education, transportation, recreational areas, legal protections are limited. There is also a discriminatory practice in the work places and employment opportunities. He also stated in Ethiopia, the degree of prejudice and discrimination towards people with different types of disability is not the same. People with severe cases like sever motor disorder, profound intellectual disorder and leprosy suffer more stigma and discrimination than others.

To mention some of prejudicing and discriminatory practices towards people with disabilities stated by Tirusew (2005) as follows:

- ❖ Individuals with disability remained hidden behind a home and seen as unable to work, learn and dependent on other.
- ❖ Marginalized interpersonal relationships and participations at family, neighborhood, and community levels.
- ❖ Limited provision of public services and special program like health, educational, transportation, information, recreational activities, and legal perspectives.
- ❖ Restricted involvement in socio-cultural and discriminatory employment opportunities.
- ❖ Children with disabilities are deprived from child- friendly environment in the earliest years of development.
- ❖ Children with disability lack acceptance and support from their family and limited participation with their peers
- ❖ Limited range of participation in community organizations, festivals, weddings and other social occasions.

As it may be same with the other country situation the degree of prejudice and discrimination across different kinds of disability varies. People with Leprosy, with sever motor disorder and profound retardation suffer prejudice and discrimination (Tirusew, 2005).

Generally the participation of people with disabilities in community is limited. It is mainly due to the societal misconception of disability. These resulted rejection, lack of willingness to support, preference of being distant and so on.

2.5.3. Prejudice and Discrimination towards PWDs at Different Context

In previous section we see that people with disabilities face various types of discrimination and prejudice in different setting. To see major areas:

Employment

Under the ADA concise and precise summary on the history of prejudice and discrimination towards people with disabilities (cited in Julie, 2001) indicated that exclusionary qualification standards and criteria's on job opportunities, other activities and benefits is one of the discriminatory practice towards PWDs. In addition to this, Julie (2001) and Mark (2001) describe that under employment and unemployment rate of people with disabilities are in its peak. Other studies also indicates that even though people with disabilities find the job the salary paid for them is very low and discriminatory (Julie, 2001 & Anne, 2007). In some institutions and organizations discriminatory rules set by individuals and this leads to discriminatory hiring decision and performance evaluation (Brief, 1998; Roberson & Block, 2001, as cited in Bernard & Mary, 2010).

In addition to the fact that many work places are not physically accessible for people with disability, employers often fail to understand that a physical disability does not necessarily involve mental impairment and even fellow workers themselves may be opposed to the employment of persons with disability UN (2003).

Education

People with disabilities are highly behind from their right in terms of education and; training. "Many million people with disability have been denied or excluded from the formal educational altogether" (Mark, 2001). According to Richard et al. (2007) different studies stated that teachers are not in will of teaching students with disability in the general classroom. Additionally parents of students without disability also complain such kinds of teaching strategy.

In all countries, educational institutions are not always accessible to people with disability and in many cases such persons are not admitted to the same schools as other people. The same applies to vocational training and to academic studies (UN report, 2003).

Accessibility to public services

Public service such as public accommodation or buildings, transportations, information & other services which is available for the general public doesn't consider people with disabilities (Tirusew, 2005). Discrimination and prejudice towards people with disabilities also includes inadequate medical care and exclusion (Richard et al., 2007).

Attention is drawn to the highly discriminatory effect of the failure to provide accessible means of transport and the obstacle which that presents to an independent life for disabled persons (UN report, 2003).

Social Institutions

In terms of social institutions people with disabilities discriminated to marry and form their own family, limited range &/or no participation in societal, political, and recreational, activities (Tirusew, 2005). It is noted with surprise that even now, in highly developed countries, buildings which are not accessible to persons with disability. The use of wheelchairs, for instance, it is extremely difficult, or even impossible, in many apartment buildings (UN report, 2003). Similarly, the physical accessibility of schools, hospitals, and even surrounding of home of PWDs characterized by full of tension. The above observations also apply to other premises such as public office buildings, restaurants, cinemas, theatres, libraries, hotels, sports facilities, etc. Apart from the obstacles presented by building design, prejudices often exist which reduce the access of people with disability.

2.6. Prejudice and Discrimination on the Life of PWDs

Clearly, the person who have disabilities has not received proper rehabilitation treatment will grow worse and, in some cases, become acute. If he is discriminated against in the work place because of his disability or he is simply afforded no employment opportunity, his dependence and his isolation will be greater. If the educational system does not provide for his specific situation, person with disability finds himself excluded from it, and without proper instruction his disabilities worsen. If the cultural and sporting activities of society are designed solely for a standard category of person, which does not include him, he will be barred from culture and sport. If means of transport, pavements and buildings are inaccessible to such a person, he will be unable to move about freely (UN report, 2003).

In short, it is such barriers and discrimination which to a large extent create or aggravate disabilities and actually set people apart from society, in many cases making them a burden to the community. This demonstrates conclusively the importance of efforts to achieve the maximum degree of autonomy and independence for persons with disability, not only for their benefit, but also for the benefit of society as a whole.

2.7. Legal Frameworks against Disability Prejudice and Discrimination

2.7.1. International Policy Documents

There are number of international proclamation, rules and policies which oppose the discrimination and prejudice towards people with disability in different aspects. For instance, the foundation for most documents is; The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). “All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law” (UN, 1948). According to this document, being human being is the basis for equal protection from any discrimination and violation.

United Nations Declarations on the Rights of Disabled Persons (1975) also reveals that all people with disabilities have the same civil and political rights as other human beings. It is also must to protect all exploitation against them and all discriminatory, abusive or degrading nature of regulations and treatments should avoid. The declaration also highly gives stress on the right to live with their families or with foster parents and to participate in all social, creative or recreational activities.

The UN Convention on the Right of Child (1989) article 23, sub item 1 demand that those children with mental and physical disability should live their life and the environment that should allow them for full participation and independence.

World Declaration on Education for All (1990), the first document which come up with notion of "Education for All"; tells that every person child, youth and adult have the right to benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs to address these needs the education system should encompass both essential learning tools and necessary qualifications expected from the teachers.

Another document is The UN Standard Rules for the Equalization of Opportunities for People with Disability (1993) clearly states that, it's the right of all men and women with disability to get to equal opportunity and participate equally in the areas of education, employment, income maintenance and social security, family life and personal integrity, culture, recreation and sports and Religion and those who have the responsibility should ensure their right

In addition to this, The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action (1994) states every child has a fundamental right to education, based on their unique characteristics, interests, abilities and learning needs. The education systems should also be designed and educational programmers implemented to take into account the wide diversity of these characteristics and needs. It also

gives emphasis for students with special needs to enjoy their right in the inclusive school with appropriate educational and welcoming school environment.

The other recent document is; Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006). This declaration states, the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities in any setting is required. In order to do so there must be measures in adapting and implementing appropriate legislative, administration. This is mainly to:

- ❖ Ensure full and effective participation and inclusion in society;
- ❖ Respect for difference and acceptance of persons with disabilities as part of human diversity and humanity;
- ❖ Equality of opportunity;
- ❖ Accessibility; Equality between men and women;
- ❖ Respect for the evolving capacities of children with disabilities and respect for the right of children with disabilities to preserve their identities.

2.7.2. National documents

The Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (1994) article 10, sub item 1 states, “Human rights and freedoms, emanating from the nature of mankind are inalienable and inviolable”. Article 25 also mention that all human beings are equal and should be prevented from any danger without discrimination based on the economic status, color, disability, age or other characteristics of the individual. Article 18 sub item 1 declares that, prohibition against inhuman treatment (which includes abuse, punishment, or other humiliating treatment). Another article also reveals that; every child has the right get their parents/guardians care & support and to be free from any dangerous practices in their education, health and development (article, 36).

The Education and Training Policy of Ethiopia (1994) also states that people with disability should enjoy with education in order to have an active participation in the political, social and economic aspects.

There are also strategies developed (Education sector program I-IV, inclusive education strategy, 2012 and SNE program strategy, 2006) in order to respect the right of people with disabilities and avoid discrimination.

Generally, currently, the law in different countries forbids discrimination in any aspect of employment (including hiring, firing, pay, job assignments, promotions, layoff, training, fringe benefits, and any other term or condition of employment), education, services and participation against people with disability.

2.8. Measurement of Prejudice and Discrimination

A number of literatures stated that it's difficult to measure prejudice. Three measurement techniques of prejudice and discrimination are stated by Miguel and Katherine (2010):

4. Perceptions of Discrimination in Everyday Settings

We notice subtle cues in the ways others around us are treated, or in the ways we ourselves are treated. Most of us can think of at least one instance in which we, or someone close to us, were treated unfairly on the basis of a single status distinction. In these instances, it doesn't take a social scientist to certify the case as discrimination.

Social scientists have capitalized on the insights and interpretations individuals have of their own lived experiences by asking people about their own encounters with discrimination. One startling conclusion from this line of research is the frequency with which discrimination is reported. But what we don't know from this line of research is to what extent these trends represent merely perceptions versus an accurate depiction of reality. While some instances of discrimination leave little room for doubt, many others can be subject to misinterpretation or distortion.

The problem with relying on perceptions for our measure of discrimination is not only that some cases may be blown out of proportion. The opposite can be just as much of an issue-act of discrimination are often imperceptible to the victim. Due to social norms and legal sanctions,

contemporary forms of discrimination are rarely overt, leaving countless instances of discriminatory action entirely invisible to the very individuals who have been targeted.

5. Self-Reports and Attitude Research on Discrimination

One of the main criticisms of attitude research is its vulnerability to social desirability bias, or the pressure for respondents to give politically correct responses to questions even if this means distorting or lying about their true beliefs. Instead, randomly chosen subsamples of respondents are primed with one of several variants of a survey question to assess responses to a particular group or condition.

Perhaps a larger concern about the use of survey items as proxies for discrimination is the uncertainty with which self-reported attitudes correspond to any meaningful patterns of expected behavior. While it is commonly assumed that there is a close link between attitudes and behaviors, in existing research.

6. Statistical Analyses of Large-Scale Data Sets

Perhaps the most common approach to studying discrimination is to investigate inequality in outcomes between groups. Rather than focusing on the attitudes or perceptions of actors that may be correlated with acts of discrimination, this approach looks to the possible consequences of discrimination in the unequal distribution of employment or other social and economic resources.

Differences in verbal ability, interpersonal skills, motivation, or work habit is could explain some of the observed employment disparities; differences in access to transportation, social networks, and other information resources likewise account for some of the gap (Moss and Tilly, 1996; Farkas 2003; Fernandez and Su 2004).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This section describes, the type of the research design which is employed in this research, sampling technique, instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis and ethical considerations followed.

3.1. Research Design

This study was aimed to examine the nature and difference of prejudice and discrimination exhibited by students without disability towards people with certain types of disability. The design used was survey research design. The preference of the design better fits the objective of the research to examine the strength of the relationships of the variables (prejudice between different disability categories as well as discrimination between different disability categories). In addition to this, the study intends to identify the nature of prejudice and discrimination against people with disability in general.

3.2. Study Area

The study was conducted in Addis Ababa Yekatit 12 governmental preparatory school, which is located in Arada sub city behind Addis Ababa University (Sidist Kilo Campus). The school was founded by the wife of Emperor Haile Silasie, Etege Menen in 1923 E.C. It was a boarding school only for female students & named "Girmawi Etege Menen Female School". Until 1972 E.C the school only enrolls female students. But during that year the school began to accept both female and male students in the regular. The name of the school also changed to "Yekatit 12 Higher Secondary School". In 1994 E.C based on the new education curriculum, the school changed to preparatory school and it was named "Yekatit 12 Preparatory School". Currently, the school administers its own kindergarten and accepts only grade 11 & 12 students in the preparatory level. Beside the regular education students are beneficiaries by preparing females sanitary pad with low cost for the society and free for

their female students. The school also participates in different social activities like supporting orphans.

3.3. Sample

In order to know the approximate number of students and decide about the number of samples necessary information were gathered from Yekatit 12 preparatory school. According to the school there are 43 classes in preparatory level, of them 21 classrooms are grade 11 (6 social science classes and 15 natural science classes) and 22 class rooms are grade 12 (6 social science classes and 16 natural science classes). The approximate average number of students in a classroom is 34. Based on that samples were drawn in the following way:

- Samples of students in grade 11 were selected using multistage cluster sampling and the samples frame was 21 classrooms (6 social science classes and 15 natural science classes), of them 2 classes (1 social science class and 1 natural science class), were drawn in stage 1 by using simple random sampling technique. In stage 2 all the available (69) students in the selected classrooms were used as a sample,
- Multistage cluster sampling method also used to select classes from grade 12. There were 22 classes (6 social science classes and 16 natural science classes), 6 classes (2 social science classes and 4 natural science classes) were drawn in stage 1 by using simple random sampling technique. In stage 2 all the available (224) students in the selected classrooms were used as a sample.

3.4. Data Collection Instruments

The data for this study were collected by using the research instrument, in this case close ended questionnaire with two parts. The first part was regarding prejudice and it has five levels of agreement. The second part was regarding discrimination and for each item students can choose any type/s of disability. To generate the items of the questionnaires ideas are taken from

reviewed related literatures regarding prejudice and discrimination against people with disability and discussion with university lecturers in the department of Special Needs Education.

After the generation of the items, to select refined and valid items it was given for 30 students in each grade levels (grade 11 & grade 12) and 3 professionals (1 from the Department of Special Needs Education, 1 from the Department of psychology & 1 from the Department of Sign Language) for expertise check and comment. As a result some items were improved.

- ❖ Students feeling & thinking towards PWDs scale (Prejudice scale): - under this scale 20 items were included and all the students were expected to respond to them. For each types of disability category the minimum possible score of this scale was 20 and the maximum possible score was 100.
- ❖ Student's behavior towards PWDs scale (Discrimination scale): - under this scale 12 items were included. For each types of disability category the minimum possible score of this scale was 0 and the maximum possible score was 12.

3.5. Pilot study

Menilik II preparatory school was selected for the pretest. The school was selected based on cultural similarities of the student to the main research site. The school has only grade 11 and 12 students and is located in Addis Ababa, like Yekatit 12 preparatory school where the main study was conducted and, therefore, a good candidate for the pilot study. For the pilot study, 2 classroom students (1 from grade 11 & 1 from grade 12) participated. Finally, the reliability of the scales was checked out independently for the two scales (Scale for prejudice and scale for discrimination) based on each type's of disability by using Cronbach's alpha and the scales are reliable.

Scales reliability:

No.	Scales		Reliability coefficient on the pilot study	Reliability coefficient on the main study
3	Students feeling & thinking towards PWDs scale	Towards PWPDs	.71	.75
		Towards PWHDs	.60	.76
		Towards PWVDs	.70	.78
		Towards PWIDs	.66	.70
4	Students behavior towards PWDs scale	Towards PWPDs	.68	.75
		Towards PWHDs	.77	.79
		Towards PWVDs	.71	.71
		Towards PWIDs	.75	.82

3.6. Data Collection Procedure

In order to collect the intended data, the following procedures were followed.

- ❖ In order to get the willingness and cooperation of the school, the researcher took official letter from the Department of Special Needs Education and give are it for the school to get the school cooperation.
- ❖ Information about the number of classrooms in each grade level and approximate average number of student in a given classroom was taken from the Director of Yekatit 12 preparatory school.
- ❖ In order to get sample classrooms, arrangements were made with school director and leaders of each grade levels.
- ❖ Before the process of filling the questionnaire all the samples were oriented to understand all about the aim of the research and how to fill the questionnaire.
- ❖ The questionnaire was administered individually in the student's classrooms and the time given was 55 minutes. After completing the questionnaire it return to the researcher.

- ❖ The data collection took 8 days; the first two days was to collect data from grade 11 & the remaining 6 days was to collect data from grade 12.

3.7. Analysis of Data

Data were analyzed quantitatively by using both descriptive and inferential data analyzing techniques. To analyze the background information percentage were used. Nature of prejudice and discrimination were analyzed using descriptive statistics, mean & standard deviation for each types of disability against the median. Due to absence of standards, the researcher tries to categorize the nature of both prejudice and discrimination by three ranges (low, medium & high magnitude for prejudice and mild, moderate & severe for discrimination) by dividing the maximum scores by 3 (which was $100/3$ & $20/3$). Therefore, if the mean score was fallen under the range of 20 to 46.66, the nature of prejudice was considered as low magnitude. If the mean score was fallen under the range of 46.67 to 73.33, the nature of prejudice was considered as medium magnitude. If the mean score was fallen under the range of 73.34 to 100, the nature of prejudice was considered as high magnitude. Also on the nature of discrimination, if the mean score was fallen under the range of 0 to 4, the nature of discrimination was considered as mild. If the mean score was fallen under the range of 5 to 8, the nature of discrimination was considered as moderate. If the mean score was fallen under the range of 9 to 12, the nature of discrimination was considered as severe.

The statistical significant difference in prejudice and discrimination towards different types of PWDs analyzed using a paired sample t-test at alpha 0.05 level of significance. The statistical significant difference in prejudice and discrimination towards different types of PWDs based on various characteristics of students analyzed using a t-test and one way ANOVA at alpha 0.05 level of significance. Finally, Pearson correlation was used to analyze the relationship between age & prejudice as well as age & discrimination.

3.9. Ethical Considerations

The data were gathered with full consent and willingness of the participants. Throughout the study privacy and confidentiality maintained.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter presents descriptive information of the sample and the findings of statistical analysis on the nature of prejudice and discrimination of sample students and difference on prejudice and discrimination among various sub-groups of samples towards people with physical disability, hearing disability, visual disability and intellectual disability.

4.1 Background information of the students

Table 4.1

Background information of the students

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	
Sex	Male	161	54.9
	Female	132	45.1
	Total	293	100%
Age	1)17	40	13.7
	2)18	211	72.0
	3)19	38	13.0
	4)20	4	1.4
	Total	293	100%
Grade	3) Grade 11	69	23.5
	4) Grade 12	224	76.5
	Total	293	100%
Beliefs about cause of disability	Realistic beliefs	33	12%
	Wrong beliefs	213	72.7%
	Both beliefs	47	15.3%
	Total	293	100%
Status of attendance on awareness creation training on disability issues	1)Attended training	30	10.2
	2)Not attended Training	263	89.8
	Total	293	100%

As indicated in the above table, 293 (161 males & 132 females) students without disability participated in the study, of which 54.9% were males & 45.1% were females. Out of them, 40 or 13.7% were 17 years old, the majority (211 or 72%) of students were 18 years old, 38 or 13 % students were 19 years old and the rest (4 or 1.4%) students were 20 years old. Regarding grade, 69 students were from grade 11 and the rest 224 students were from grade 12.

In relation to the beliefs about the cause of disability, 33 (12%) students had realistic beliefs (birth complication & accident), 213 (72.7%) students had wrong belief (punishment of God, parental sins, evil spirit & fortune) and 47 (15.3%) students had realistic and unrealistic beliefs about the cause of disability.

Regarding attendance on awareness creation programs, 30 (10.2%) students attended disability awareness creation program/training and the rest (263 or 89.8%) students had not attended such program/training.

4.2 Students experience with PWDs

Table 4.2

Students' experience with PWDs

Variables		Frequency	Percentage
Did you have any experience/contact with PWDs	9) Yes	81	27.6
	10) No	212	72.4
	Total	293	100%
If you had experience with PWDs how often?	5) Daily	35	27.2
	6) Weekly	11	11.1
	7) At least monthly	13	23.5
	8) Occasionally	22	8.6
	Total	81	100%
Contact with different types of PWDs	3) Visual disability	22	27.2
	4) Hearing disability	9	11.1
	11) Physical disability	19	23.5
	12) Intellectual disability	7	8.6
	13) Both 1 & 2	11	13.6
	14) Both 1 & 3	4	4.9
	15) 1, 2 & 3	3	3.7
	16) All four	6	7.4
Total	81	100%	
Type of relation with PWDs	5) Close family member	21	25.9
	6) Friend	33	40.7
	7) Classmate	16	19.8
	8) Someone seen occasionally	11	13.6
	Total	81	100%
Unpleasant experience with PWDs	3) Yes	34	42
	4) No	47	58
	Total	81	100%
Pleasant experience with PWDs	3) yes	43	53.1
	4) No	38	46.9
	Total	81	100%

In relation to experience/ contact with PWDs, 81 (27.6%) students did not have any contact/experience with PWDs and 212 (72.4%) students had contact/experience with PWDs. Of them 35 (43.2 %) students had daily contact with PWDs, 11 (13.6 %) students had weekly contact, 13 (16 %) students had a contact at least once in a month and the remaining 22 (27.2 %) of the student had contact only occasionally.

Based on the relation with specific type of PWDs, 22 (27.2 %) students had relation with people with visual disability, 9 (11.1 %) students had relation with people with hearing disability, 19 (23.5 %) students had relation with people with physical disability, 7 (8.6 %) students had relation with people with intellectual disability, 11 (13.6 %) students had relation with both people with visual & hearing disability, 4 (4.9 %) students had relation with both people with visual & physical disability, 3 (3.7 %) students had relation with people with hearing, physical & visual disability. The remaining 6 (7.4 %) students had contact with all four groups of PWDs.

Regarding the type of relation with PWDs, 21 (25.9 %) students had close family member with disability, 33 (40.7 %) students had friend with disability, 16 (19.8 %) students had classmates with disability and the rest (11 or 13.6 %) students were occasionally seeing PWDs.

In relation to unpleasant experience with PWDs 34 (42 %) students had unpleasant experience with PWDs and 47 (58 %) students never had any unpleasant experience with PWDs. On the other hand, 43 (53.1 %) students had pleasant experience and 38 (46.9 %) students never had any pleasant experience with PWDs.

4.3 Nature of prejudice towards the four types of PWDs

The table below indicates about the nature of prejudice towards the four types of PWDs. Which indicates, the magnitude of prejudice towards people with physical disability (PWPDs), people with visual disability (PWVDs), people with hearing disability (PWHDs) & people with intellectual disability (PWIDs).

Table 4.3

Descriptive data on the nature of prejudice towards the four types of PWDs

Group	N	No. of Items	Mean(SD)
PWPDs	293	20	59.69 (11.2)
PWHDs	293	20	52.81(10.42)
PWVDs	293	20	58.9 (11.29)
PWIDs	293	20	70.23(9.82)

Possible minimum score = 20, Possible maximum score = 100 & Median = 60

As it can be seen from table 4.3, the mean score given for PWPDs & PWVDs was around the median, 59.69 & 58.9 respectively with the standard deviation of 11.2 & 11.29 respectively. The mean score towards PWHDs (52.81) was below the median, with the standard deviation of 10.42. On the other hand, the mean score which was greater than the median was seen towards PWIDs (70.23), with the standard deviation of 9.82.

4.6 Comparison of prejudice towards people with different types of disability

It was one of the objectives of the present study to look whether there is a considerable disparity on prejudice towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs by students without disability. The paired sample t-test was performed to examine the difference on prejudice towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs. The summarized result presents in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4

Result of paired sample t-test on prejudice among the four types of PWDs

	Paired variables	Mean difference	SD	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)
Pair 1	PWPDs - PWHDs	6.88	9.28	12.69**	292	.00
Pair 2	PWPDs - PWVDs	.79	5.08	2.66**	292	.008
Pair 3	PWPDs - PWIDs	-1.05	8.48	-21.25**	292	.00
Pair 4	PWHDs - PWVDs	-6.09	8.23	12.67**	292	.00
Pair 5	PWHDs - PWIDs	-1.74	11.98	-24.88**	292	.00
Pair 6	PWVDs - PWIDs	-1.13	8.67	-22.34**	292	.00

** P < .01

The comparisons indicated significant mean differences between PWPDs & PWHDs at an $\alpha = .00$ level. Also the comparison between PWPDs & PWVDs reveals that there is a significant mean difference at $\alpha = .008$ level. The comparison between PWPDs & PWIDs had significant mean differences at an $\alpha = .00$ level.

The same was true on the comparison between PWHDs & PWVDs mean, which is significant at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between PWHDs & PWIDs also shows significant differences at $\alpha = .00$. Finally, significant mean differences between PWVDs & PWIDs seen at an $\alpha = .00$ level. Therefore, a type of disability has an effect on the students prejudice.

4.7 Students Characteristics and Prejudice

4.7.1 Sex and Prejudice

Here, the comparison made between males' and females' mean scores towards each group of PWDs is presented. It helps to know whether there was a significant difference on prejudice towards each groups of PWDs based on the sex difference of the samples. Therefore, independent sample t-test was applied

for each group of PWDs to compare mean score given by male & female students.

Table 4.5.1

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between males and females

Variable/ Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)	
PWPDs	M	161	63.09 (8.75)	6.07**	291	.00
	F	132	55.55(12.44)			
PWHDs	M	161	55.92 (9.21)	5.98	291	.00
	F	132	49.0 (10.6)			
PWVDs	M	161	62.04 (9.22)	5.51**	291	.00
	F	132	55.07 (12.4)			
PWIDs	M	161	71.81 (8.13)	3.07**	291	.002
	F	132	68.31 (11.3)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare prejudice by female and male students towards various types of PWDs by using a t-test as a statistical model. The mean score of male & female students towards PWPDs are 63.09 & 55.55 respectively with standard deviations of 8.75 & 12.44 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on prejudice between male & female students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that male students strong prejudice PWPDs than female students. The comparison between the mean score given by males (55.92) & females (49) students towards PWHDs also yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .002$ level. The comparisons between the mean score of male & female students towards PWVDs are 62.04 & 55.07 respectively with standard deviations of 9.22 & 12.4 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between male & female students towards PWVDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that male students highly prejudice PWPDs than female students. Also the comparison between male and female students mean score towards PWIDs was 71.81 & 68.31 respectively with standard deviation of 8.13 & 11.3

respectively. And there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between male & female students towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$.

4.5.2. Relationship between Age and Prejudice

To look at the relationship between prejudice towards various types of PWDs and age of the students, it is essential to examine the strength of relationship, the direction of relationship and to see the statistical significance of the relationship. Therefore, the result was summarized in the table below after being computed by using Pearson Correlation coefficient.

Table 4.5.2

Pearson Correlation between age and prejudice

	PWPDs	PWHDs	PWVDs	PWIDs
Age	-.541**	-.406**	-.530**	-.391**

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As indicated in the above table, prejudice towards PWPDs has a negative and significant relation with age of the student ($r = -.541$). The same was true on the relation between prejudice towards PWHDs and age, has negative and significant relation ($r = -.406$).

Table 4.5.2 also illustrates, prejudice towards PWVDs has negative and significant correlation with age of the students ($r = -.530$). The correlation between prejudice towards PWIDs and age of the students were lower (lower than the relation observed on prejudice towards other types of PWDs and age), negative and significant ($r = -.391$). Moreover, as the table describes prejudice towards all groups of PWDs was negative and significantly correlated with the age of students.

4.5.3. Prejudice and Grade level

The independent sample t-test was computed to examine the difference between the mean score of grade 11 and grade 12 students on prejudice towards various groups of people with disability. The summarized result revealed in Table 4.5.3 below.

Table 4.5.3

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between grade 11 and grade 12

Variable/ Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig	
PWPDs	11	69	69.43(7.09)	9.41**	291	.00
	12	224	56.7(10.52)			
PWHDs	11	69	56.9(9.92)	3.78**	291	.002
	12	224	51.55(10.27)			
PWVDs	11	69	68.72(7.08)	9.42**	291	.00
	12	224	55.88(10.61)			
PWIDs	11	69	78.06(7.74)	8.42**	291	.00
	12	224	67.82(9.13)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare prejudice by grade 11 and grade 12 students towards various types of PWDs by using a t-test as a statistical model. The mean score of grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWPDs are 69.43 & 56.7 respectively with standard deviations of 7.09 & 10.52 respectively. It indicates, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that grade 11 students highly prejudice PWPDs than grade 12 students. The comparisons between the mean score of grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWHDs are 56.9 & 51.55 respectively with standard deviations of 9.92 & 10.27 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWHDs at $\alpha = .002$. Also the comparison between grade 11 & grade 12 students mean score towards PWVDs was 68.72 & 55.88 respectively with standard deviation of 7.08 & 10.61 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on prejudice between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWVDs at $\alpha = .00$. The comparison between the mean score

given by grade 11 (78.06) & grade 12 (67.82) students towards PWIDs yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.5.4. Prejudice and contact with PWDs

To check whether there is a considerable disparity between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs on the prejudice towards each groups of PWDs, the independent sample t-test was computed and the summarized result depicted in the Table 4.5.4 below.

Table 4.5.4

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between students with contact and without contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping Variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs	with contact	81	47.05(9.23)	-16.7**	291	.00
	without contact	212	64.52(7.52)			
PWHDs	with contact	81	43.52(8.03)	-11.3**	291	.00
	without contact	212	56.35(8.94)			
PWVDs	with contact	81	46.36(8.86)	-	29	.00
	without contact	212	63.7(7.94)			
PWIDs	with contact	81	62.81(8.91)	-9.01**	291	.00
	without contact	212	73.1(8.61)			

**P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare prejudice by students who had contact with PWDs and those students who had no contact with PWDs towards various types of PWDs by using a t-test as a statistical model. The mean score towards PWPDs by students who had contact with PWDs are 47.05 & it was 64.52 by those students who had no contact with PWDs with the standard deviation of 9.23 & 7.52 respectively. It indicates, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had contact & those who had no contact with PWDs towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. The mean scores towards PWHDs by those who had contact with PWDs &

those who had no contact with PWDs are 43.52 & 56.35 respectively with standard deviations of 8.03 & 8.94 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in prejudice between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs. The other comparisons between the students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs, towards PWVDs also yields statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level. The same was true towards PWIDs; there was a significant difference between the score given by the two groups of students towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.5.5. Prejudice and extent of contact with PWDs

One of the concerns of the present study was to check whether there is a considerable difference between students who had daily contact with PWDs and those students who had occasional contact with PWDs on their mean score on prejudice towards various groups of PWDs under the study. The independent sample t-test was computed in the course of examining the difference between the prejudice towards various groups of PWDs mean score of students who had daily & occasional contact with PWDs.

Table 4.5.5

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between daily contact and occasional contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs	daily	35	41.63(6.45)	-5.43**	55	.00
	occasionally	22	57.50(7.51)			
PWHDs	daily	67	40.4 (4.68)	-8.59**	55	.00
	occasionally	185	50.73(9.62)			
PWVDs	daily	67	40.88(5.82)	-8.48**	55	.00
	occasionally	185	56.2(7.56)			
PWIDs	daily	67	59.31(8.93)	-4.25**	55	.001
	occasionally	185	69.04(7.48)			

** P < .01

In order to see the effect of extent of contact with PWDs on the prejudicing attitude of students, comparison was made between students who had daily contact with PWDs & who had occasional contact (other two of types of students extent of contact with PWDs were exclude due to insufficient number). The mean score of students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWPDs are 41.63 & 57.5 respectively with standard deviations of 6.45 & 7.51 respectively. It was statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. The mean score of students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWHDs are 40.4 & 50.73 respectively with standard deviations of 4.68 & 9.62 respectively. It was also statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. The comparison between the mean score of students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWVDs are 40.88 & 56.2

respectively with standard deviations of 5.82 & 7.56 respectively. There is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWVDs at $\alpha = .00$. Finally, the comparison between the mean score given by students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact towards PWIDs yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .001$ level.

4.5.6. Prejudice and relation with PWDs

To look whether there is a considerable discrepancy between students who had family relation with PWDs, who had friend with disability and those who had classmate with disability on prejudice towards various groups of PWDs (one of students type of relation with PWDs were exclude due to incompatibility number) analysis of variance was computed. Table 12 below presents the summarized result on the difference between the mean score of students who had family, friend & classmate relation with PWDs on prejudice towards various groups of PWDs under the study.

Table 4.5.6

Descriptive data on the student's relation with PWDs

Students relation with PWDs	N	Mean (SD) towards PVPDs	Mean(SD) towards PWHDs	Mean (SD) towards PWVDs	Mean (SD) towards PWIDs
Close family	21	37.09(4.37)	36.5 (3.84)	37.66 (4.7)	54.19(9.72)
Friend	33	52.15 (9.6)	46.78(7.16)	50.3 (10.1)	67.84(7.21)
Classmate	16	60.25 (7.2)	52.56 (8.6)	59.25(9.67)	68.68 (9.3)

Possible minimum score = 20, Possible maximum score = 100 & Median = 60

Table 4.5.6 indicates that the mean score towards each type of PWDs given by students who had family member with disability was lower than the

score given by students who had friend and classmates with disability. The score given by those students who had friend with disabilities towards all types of PWDs was below the score given by students who had classmates with disability.

Table 4.5.6.1

One-Way ANOVA for comparing prejudice difference between student's types of relation with PWDs

Groups	Source	Df	Sum sq.	Ms	F
PWPDs	Between group	4	14979.31	3744.83	49.74**
	Within group	288	21684.65	75.29	
	Total	292	36663.96		
PWHDs	Between group	4	8222.33	2055.58	25.19**
	Within group	288	23500.97	81.60	
	Total	292	31723.29		
PWVDs	Between group	4	14482.68	3620.67	45.86**
	Within group	288	22738.65	78.95	
	Total	292	37221.32		
PWIDs	Between group	4	6569.58	1642.39	21.87**
	Within group	288	21626.64	75.09	
	Total	292	28196.22		

** P < .01

There was statistically significant difference at the $P < .01$ level in all the three student's types of relation with PWDs scores towards four groups of PWDs. [$F(4, 288) = 49.74, p = .00$], for prejudice towards PWPDs, [$F(4, 288) = 49.74, 25.19, p = .00$], for prejudice towards PWHDs, ($F = 45.86, p = .00$), for prejudice towards PWVDs & ($F = 21.87, p = .00$), for prejudice towards PWIDs. Therefore, Tukey HSD post Hoc comparison were made in the table below to explore the exact variation in which the prior groups show significantly varying result.

Table 4.5.6.2

Post Hoc (Tukey HSD) Comparison of Prejudice towards various groups of PWDs

Variable	Groups	2	3
Prejudice towards PWPDs	4) Family	**	**
	5) Friend		*
	6) classmate		
prejudice towards PWHDs	4) family	**	**
	5) friend		ns
	6) classmate		
prejudice towards PWVDs	4) family	**	**
	5) friend		**
	6) classmate		
prejudice towards PWIDs	4) family	**	**
	5) friend		ns
	6) classmate		

*P < .05 ** P < .01 ns = >.05

As the above comparison indicates, on prejudice towards PWPDs there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$. There was also a significant difference between the mean score given by students who had classmate with disability & those friend with disability at $\alpha = .02$.

Regarding prejudice towards PWHDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .001$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$.

Regarding prejudice towards PWVDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students

who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$. There was also a significant difference between the mean score given by students who had classmate with disability & those friend with disability at $\alpha = .009$.

The table also reveals on prejudice towards PWIDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$.

4.5.7. Prejudice and unpleasant experience with PWDs

In the table below, attempts were made to check whether there is a substantial difference between students who had unpleasant contact with PWDs & those who had no unpleasant contact with PWDs on prejudice mean score towards each group of PWDs.

The independent sample t-test was computed to examine the difference between the prejudice towards various groups of PWDs by students who had unpleasant contact with PWDs & those who had no unpleasant contact.

Table 4.5.7

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between with unpleasant and without unpleasant experience (UPE) with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	df	Sig
PWPDs	with UPE	34	59.62 (8.39)	9.61**	55	.00
	without UPE	47	43.89(6.33)			
PWHDs	with UPE	34	51.2 (9.54)	6.3**	55	.00
	without UPE	47	40.68(5.41)			
PWVDs	with UPE	34	58.56 (8.25)	9.32**	55	.00
	without UPE	47	43.51 (6.27)			
PWIDs	with UPE	34	70.82 (7.71)	5.13**	55	.00
	without UPE	47	61.34 (8.41)			

** P < .01 UPE= Unpleasant Experience

In order to see the effect of unpleasant experience (UPE) with students prejudice on PWDs, comparison was made between students who had UPE with PWDs & who had no UPE with PWDs. The mean score of students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWPDs are 59.62 & 43.89 respectively with standard deviations of 8.39 & 6.33 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. Also the comparison between the mean score of students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWHDs are 51.2 & 40.68 respectively with standard deviations of 9.54 & 5.41 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWHDs at $\alpha = .00$.

Likely, the comparison between the mean score given by students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs towards PWVDs & yields significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level. The obtained result also shows

that, there was a significant difference between the mean score of students who had UPE with PWDs & those who had no UPE with PWDs on the scores towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.5.8. Prejudice and pleasant experience with PWDs

It's true that, most of the time people use their prior experience to other new situations either as it is or with some modification. Also having a good experience with an individual with disability may lead people to judge that all PWDs are good. Therefore, it might result positive outlook towards all PWDs. Due to this thought, independent sample t-test comparison computed to examine the difference between the prejudice towards various groups of PWDs by students who had pleasant contact with PWDs & those who had no pleasant contact.

Table 4.5.8

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between with pleasant and without pleasant experience (PE) with PWDs

Variable/ Grouping variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs with PE	43	41.28(6.08)	-12.9**	79	.00
without PE	38	64.29(9.74)			
PWHDs with PE	43	39.39(5.1)	-.69	79	.96
without PE	38	54.31(9.88)			
PWVDs with PE	43	41.44(5.84)	-12.82**	79	.00
without PE	38	64.31(9.91)			
PWIDs with PE	43	58.6(8.44)	-9.51**	79	.00
without PE	38	76.5(8.5)			

* P < .05 PE= Pleasant Experience

As it is revealed by table 4.5.8, comparison was made on prejudice between students who had PE with PWDs & those who had no PE with PWDs

towards various groups of PWDs. Therefore, the mean score towards PWDs by students who had PE with PWDs & those who had no PE with PWDs are 41.28 & 64.29 respectively with standard deviations of 6.08 & 9.74 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in prejudice between students who had PE with PWDs & those who had no PE with PWDs at $\alpha = .00$.

The other comparisons between the students who had PE with PWDs (41.44) & those who had no PE (64.31), towards PWVDs also yields significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level. The other comparison were towards PWIDs between students who had PE with PWDs (58.6) & those who had no PE (76.5) significantly different at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.5.9. Prejudice and attendance on awareness creation training

The independent sample t-test which was computed to examine whether there is a considerable difference between students who attend training on disability issues & those who did not attend training on disability issues on prejudice mean score towards various groups of people with disability under the study. Table 4.5.9 below presents summarized result on the difference.

Table 4.5.9

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on prejudice between attend and not attend on disability issue training

Variable/	Grouping Variable	N	Mean (SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs	got training	30	43.3(8.44)	-9.72**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	61.56(9.88)			
PWHDs	got training	30	42.23(7.25)	-9.84**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	60.8(10.04)			
PWVDs	got training	30	57.9 (9.81)	-8.0**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	71.64(8.81)			
PWIDs	got training	30	40.43(6.85)	-7.5**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	54.22(9.81)			

** P < .01

In order to see the effect of disability issue training on the prejudicing attitude of students, comparison was made between students who get training & who did not. In the case of towards PWPDs, mean scores of those who get training & those who did not get training are 43.3 & 61.56 respectively with standard deviations of 8.44 & 9.88 respectively. There is a statistical significant difference in prejudice between students who get training on disability and those who did not get training. The comparison between the mean score of students who get training (42.23) & who did not (60.8) towards PWHDs yields significant difference at $\alpha = .00$ level. The same was true on the comparison between the mean score of students who get training (57.9) & who did not (71.64) towards PWVDs. It was significantly different at $\alpha = .00$ level. In the case of towards PWIDs, mean scores of those who get training & those who did not get training are 40.43 & 54.22 respectively with standard deviations of 6.85 & 9.81 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in

prejudice between students who get training on disability and those who did not get training.

4.6. Nature of Discrimination towards four types of PWDs

One of the concerns of the present study was to check whether there is a considerable difference on the nature discrimination towards four types of PWDs. Therefore, descriptive statistic was computed to examine the difference on the magnitude of discrimination towards PWPDs, PWVDs, PWHDs & PWIDs.

Table 4.6

Descriptive data on the nature of discrimination towards four types of PWDs

Group	N	No. of Items	Mean (SD)
PWPDs	293	12	5.92 (2.98)
PWHDs	293	12	3.11 (2.65)
PWVDs	293	12	3.96 (2.49)
PWIDs	293	12	7.88 (3.12)

Possible minimum score = 0, possible maximum score = 12 & median = 6

As indicated in the above table, the mean score given for PWPDs was around the median, 5.92 with the standard deviation of 2.98. The mean score towards PWHDs & PWVDs (3.11 & 3.96 respectively) was below the median, with the standard deviation of 2.65 & 2.49 respectively. On the other hand, the mean score which was greater than the median was seen towards PWIDs (7.88), with the standard deviation of 3.12.

4.7. Comparison of discrimination towards people with different types of disability

It was one of the objectives of the present study was to look whether there is a considerable disparity on discrimination towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs by students without disability. Paired sample t-test was performed to examine the difference on discrimination towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs. The summarized result presents in Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7

Result of paired sample t-test on discrimination among four types of PWDs

	Paired variable	Mean difference	SD	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)
Pair 1	PWPDs - PWHDs	2.80	2.95	16.25**	292	.00
Pair 2	PWPDs - PWVDs	1.95	2.57	12.98**	292	.00
Pair 3	PWPDs - PWIDs	-1.96	3.94	-8.54**	292	.00
Pair 4	PWHDs - PWVDs	-.85	2.84	-5.13**	292	.00
Pair 5	PWHDs - PWIDs	-4.77	3.64	-22.46**	292	.00
Pair 6	PWVDs - PWIDs	-3.92	3.63	-18.49**	292	.00

** P < .01

In the table above, the comparison indicates that significant mean differences between PWPDs & PWHDs at an $\alpha = .00$ level. Also the comparison between PWPDs & PWVDs reveals that there is a significant mean difference at $\alpha = .00$ level. The comparison between PWPDs & PWIDs had significant mean differences at an $\alpha = .00$ level.

The same was true on the comparison between PWHDs & PWVDs mean, which is significant at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between PWHDs & PWIDs also shows significant differences at $\alpha = .00$. Finally, significant mean differences between PWVDs & PWIDs seen at an $\alpha = .00$ level. Therefore, types of disability have an effect on the student's discrimination.

4.8. Students Characteristics and Discrimination

4.8.1. Sex and Discrimination

Here, the comparisons were made between males' and females' mean scores towards each group of PWDs and it helps to know whether there was a significant difference on discrimination towards each groups of PWDs based on the sex difference of the samples. Therefore, independent sample t-test was applied.

Table 4.8.1

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between males and females

Variable/	Grouping					
Variable	N	Mean (SD)	t	Df	Sig	
PWPDs	M	161	6.32(1.57)	5.65**	291	.00
	F	132	5.24(1.67)			
PWHDs	M	161	5.23(1.64)	5.44**	291	.00
	F	132	4.11(1.87)			
PWVDs	M	161	6.12(1.49)	5.54**	291	.00
	F	132	5.03(1.86)			
PWIDs	M	161	7.84(1.82)	5.43**	291	.00
	F	132	6.62(2.03)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare discrimination by female and male students towards various types of PWDs by using a T-test as a statistical model. The mean score of male & female students towards PWPDs are 6.32 & 5.24 respectively with standard deviations of 1.57 & 1.67 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on discrimination between male & female students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may infer that male students highly discriminate PWPDs than female students. The comparisons between the mean score of male & female students towards PWHDs are 5.23 & 4.11 respectively with standard deviations of 1.64 & 1.87 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on discrimination between male & female students towards PWHDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that both male & female students not strongly discriminate PWHDs but male students' discrimination was higher than female students.

Also the comparison between male and female students mean score towards PWVDs was 6.12 & 5.03 respectively with standard deviation of 1.49 &

1.86 respectively. The difference on discrimination between male & female students towards PWIDs is statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$. The comparison between male and female students mean score towards PWVDs was 7.84 & 6.62 respectively with standard deviation of 1.82 & 2.03 respectively. There is also a statistically significant difference on discrimination between male & female students towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may imply that both male & female students strongly discriminate PWIDs but male students' discrimination was higher than female students.

4.8.2. Discrimination and Grade level

The independent sample t-test was computed to examine the difference between the mean score of grade 11 and grade 12 students on discrimination towards various groups of people with disability. The summarized result displayed in Table 4.8.2 below.

Table 4.8.2

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between grade 11 and grade 12

Variable/	Grouping	N	Mean (SD)	T	df	Sig
	variable					
PWPDs	11	69	7.26(1.54)	8.99**	291	.00
	12	224	5.39(1.49)			
PWHDs	11	69	5.66(1.45)	5.07**	291	.00
	12	224	4.44(1.84)			
PWVDs	11	69	6.78(1.36)	6.72**	291	.00
	12	224	5.27(1.71)			
PWIDs	11	69	8.97(1.71)	8.94**	291	.00
	12	224	6.77(1.8)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare discrimination by grade 11 and grade 12 students towards various types of PWDs by using a T-test as a statistical model. The mean score grade 11 and grade 12 students towards PWPDs are 7.26 & 5.39 respectively with standard

deviations of 1.54 & 1.49 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on discrimination between 11 and grade 12 students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. The mean score of grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWHDs are 5.66 & 4.44 respectively with standard deviations of 1.45 & 1.84 respectively. Hence, there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$. This may indicate that both grade 11 students not strongly discriminate PWHDs but grade 11 students highly discriminate PWHDs than grade 12 students. Also the comparison between male and female students mean score towards PWVDs was 6.78 & 5.27 respectively with standard deviation of 1.36 & 1.71 respectively. It shows that there is a statistically significant difference on prejudice between male & female students towards PWVDs at $\alpha = .00$. Likely, the comparison between the mean score given by grade 11 & (8.97) grade 12 (6.77) students towards PWIDs yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.8.3. Relationship between age and discrimination

To look at the relationship between discrimination towards various types of PWDs and age of the students, it is essential to examine the strength of relationship, the direction of relationship and to see the statistical significance of the relationship. Therefore, the result was summarized in table below after being computed by using Pearson Correlation coefficient.

Table 4.8.3

Pearson Correlation between age and discrimination

	PWPDs	PWHDs	PWVDs	PWIDs
Age	-.479**	-.486**	-.495**	-.501**

** . Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As indicated in the above table, discrimination towards PWPDs has a negative and significant ($r = -.541$) relation with age of the student. The same

was true on the relation between discrimination towards PWHDs and age, has negative and significant ($r = -.406$) relation.

Table 4.8.3 also illustrates, discrimination towards PWVDs has negative and significant ($r = -.530$) correlation with age of the students. The correlation between discrimination towards PWIDs and age of the students were lower (lower than the relation observed on discrimination towards other types of PWDs and age), negative and significant ($r = -.391$). Moreover, as the table describes discrimination towards all groups of PWDs was negative and significantly correlated.

4.8.4. Discrimination and contact with PWDs

To check whether there is a considerable difference between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs on the discrimination towards each groups of PWDs, the independent sample t-test was computed and the summarized result depicted in the Table 4.8.4 below.

Table 4.8.4

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between students with contact and without contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	Df	Si g
PWPDs	with contact	81	3.96 (1.48)	-15.84**	291	.00
	without contact	212	6.55 (1.15)			
PWHDs	with contact	81	2.80 (1.79)	-14.61**	291	.00
	without contact	212	5.46 (1.2)			
PWVDs	with contact	81	3.65 (1.71)	-16.56**	291	.00
	without contact	212	6.38 (1.04)			
PWIDs	with contact	81	5.18 (1.52)	-14.58**	291	.00
	without contact	212	8.09 (1.53)			

** $P < .01$

As indicated in the above table, an attempt was made to compare discrimination by students who had contact with PWDs and those students who had no contact with PWDs towards various types of PWDs by using a T-

test as a statistical model. The mean scores towards PWDs by students who had contact with PWDs & those who had no contact with PWDs are 3.96 & 6.55 respectively with standard deviations of 1.48 & 1.15 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in discrimination between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs at $\alpha = .00$. The comparisons on the mean score towards PWDs by students who had contact with PWDs & those who had no contact with PWDs are 2.80 & 5.46 respectively with standard deviations of 1.79 & 1.2 respectively. Also there was statistical significant difference $\alpha = .00$.

Also the comparison between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs on discrimination mean score towards PWDs was 3.65 & 6.38 respectively with standard deviation of 1.71 & 1.04 respectively. It shows that there is a statistically significant difference on discrimination between students who had contact with PWDs and those who had no contact with PWDs towards PWDs at $\alpha = .00$. The other comparison between the students who had contact with PWDs (5.18) and those who had no contact with PWDs (8.09) on discrimination towards PWDs yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .00$ level.

4.8.5. Discrimination and extent of contact with PWDs

The comparison of discrimination towards various groups of PWDs between students who had daily contact with PWDs and those who had occasional contact with PWDs was summarized in table 4.8.5 below. The statistics employed to compare prejudice mean scores, as measured by the student's extent of contact of daily and occasionally was an independent sample t-test.

Table 4.8.5

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between daily contact and occasional contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	df	Sig
PWPDs	daily	35	4.86(3.11)	-1.99*	55	.02
	occasionally	22	5.32(3.98)			
PWHDs	daily	35	2.77(1.85)	-2.81**	55	.001
	occasionally	22	3.93(2.99)			
PWVDs	daily	35	3.34(2.87)	-.74	55	.35
	occasionally	22	3.95(2.64)			
PWIDs	daily	35	6.43(3.5)	-.53	55	.42
	occasionally	22	7.32(3.48)			

** P < .01

As indicated in the table above, there was significant difference on discrimination towards PWPDs by students who had daily contact with PWDs (5.32) & those who had occasional contact with PWDs (4.86) with standard deviations of 3.11 & 3.98 respectively. Therefore, there is a statistical significant difference in discrimination between students who had daily contact with PWDs and those who had occasional contact with PWDs at $\alpha = .02$. The comparisons on the mean score towards PWHDs by students who had daily contact with PWDs & those who had occasional contact with PWDs are 2.77 & 3.93 respectively with standard deviations of 1.85 & 2.99 respectively. Also there was statistical significant difference at $\alpha = .001$.

The other comparisons between students who had daily contact with PWDs and those who had occasional contact with PWDs on discrimination mean score towards PWVDs & PWIDs did not yield significant difference at $\alpha = .05$.

4.8.6 Discrimination and type of relation with PWDs

A One-Way analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of types of relation with PWDs on discrimination towards PWDs, as measured by close family, friend & classmate relation with PWDs. The result of the analysis was summarized in table 4.8.6 & 4.8.6.1 below.

Table 4.8.6

Descriptive data on the student's relation with PWDs

Relation with PWDs	N	Mean(SD) towards PWPDs	Mean(SD) towards PWHDs	Mean(SD) towards PWVDs	Mean(SD) towards PWIDs
Close family	21	3.33(1.32)	2.24(1.18)	2.66(1.68)	4.52 (1.7)
Friend	33	4.18(1.79)	2.57(2.03)	3.94(1.93)	5.61(1.95)
Classmate	16	5.87(1.02)	4.62 (1.5)	6.0 (1.15)	8.0 (1.89)

Possible minimum score = 0, possible maximum score = 12 & median = 6

Table 4.8.6 indicates that the mean score towards each type of PWDs given by students who had family member with disability was lower than the score given by students who had friend and classmates with disability. The score given by those students who had friend with disabilities towards all types of PWDs was below the score given by students who had classmates with disability.

Table 4.8.6.1

Data and result of analysis of variance on discrimination between students type of relation with PWDs

Groups	Source	d. f	Sum of sq.	Ms	F
PWPDs	Between group	4	272.39	68.097	34.14**
	Within group	288	574.42	1.994	
	Total	292	846.805		
PWHDs	Between group	4	353.63	88.407	40.64**
	Within group	288	626.53	2.175	
	Total	292	980.157		
PWVDs	Between group	4	337.04	84.261	43.23**
	Within group	288	561.41	1.949	
	Total	292	898.451		
PWIDs	Between group	4	311.47	77.867	25.86**
	Within group	288	867.288	3.011	
	Total	292	1178.758		

** P < .01

As it is indicated in the above table, there was statistically significant difference at the P < .01 level in all the three student's types of relation with PWDs scores towards four groups of PWDs. [F (4,288)= 34.14, p = .00], for discrimination towards PWPDs, [F (4,288) = 40.64, p = .00], for discrimination towards PWHDs, [F (4,288) = 43.23, p = .00), for discrimination towards PWVDs & [F (4,288) = 25.86, p = .00], for discrimination towards PWIDs. Therefore, Tukey HSD post Hoc comparison were made in the table below to explore the exact variation in which the prior groups show significantly varying result.

Table 4.8.6.2

Post Hoc Comparison on discrimination towards PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs& PWIDs as students types of relation with PWDs

Variable	Groups	2	3
discrimination towards PWPDs	4) family	ns	**
	5) friend		**
	6) classmate		
discrimination towards PWHDs	4) family	ns	**
	5) friend		**
	6) classmate		
discrimination towards PWVDs	4) family	**	**
	5) friend		**
	6) classmate		
discrimination towards PWIDs	4) family	ns	**
	5) friend		**
	6) classmate		

** P < .01 ns > .05

As the above comparison indicates, on discrimination towards PWPDs there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability at $\alpha = .00$. There was also a significant difference between the mean score given by students who had classmate with disability & those friend with disability at $\alpha = .001$.

Regarding discrimination towards PWHDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had friend with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$.

Regarding discrimination towards PWVDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .011$. The mean difference

between the score given by students who had family member with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$. There was also a significant difference between the mean score given by students who had classmate with disability & those friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$.

The table also reveals on prejudice towards PWIDs, there was a mean score difference between the students who had family member with disability & those students who had friend with disability at $\alpha = .00$. The mean difference between the score given by students who had friend with disability & those students who had classmate with disability also significant at $\alpha = .00$.

4.8.7. Discrimination and unpleasant experience (UPE) with PWDs

To analyze differences in discrimination towards various groups of PWDs between students who had UPE with PWDs & those students who did not had UPE, an independent sample t-test was conducted for each type of PWDs. the summarized result illustrated in table 4.8.7 below.

Table 4.8.7

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between with UPE and without UPE with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping Variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	df	Sig
PWPDs	with UPE	34	7.64 (4.05)	3.86**	79	.00
	without UPE	47	5.23 (3.31)			
PWHDs	with UPE	34	3.35 (2.74)	-.054	79	.19
	without UPE	47	2.63 (2.16)			
PWVDs	with UPE	34	3.88 (2.63)	1.31	79	.95
	without UPE	47	3.91 (2.71)			
PWIDs	with UPE	34	7.82 (4.18)	2.97**	79	.001
	without UPE	47	5.34 (3.27)			

** P < .01 UPE= Unpleasant Experience

As indicated in the table above, there was statistically significant difference on discrimination towards PWPDs between the mean score given by

students who had UPE (7.64) and who had never had any UPE with PWDs (5.23) at $\alpha = .00$. The same was true on discrimination towards PWIDs between students who had UPE (7.82) and who had no any UPE with PWDs (5.34) at $\alpha = .001$. The other comparisons did not yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .05$ level.

4.8.9 Discrimination and pleasant experience (PE) with PWDs

Whether or not there exists a difference in discrimination towards different groups of PWDs between students who had PE with PWDs & those students who did not, an independent sample t-test was employed. The result of the analysis was summarized in table 4.8.9 below.

Table 4.8.9

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between with pleasant and without pleasant contact with PWDs

Variable/	Grouping Variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	df	Sig
PWPDs	with PE	43	5.09(3.23)	-3.67**	79	.00
	without PE	38	6.26(3.16)			
PWHDs	with PE	43	2.91(2.11)	-1.99*	79	.02
	without PE	38	3.98(2.94)			
PWVDs	with PE	43	3.42(2.76)	-.55	79	.58
	without PE	38	4.42(2.43)			
PWIDs	with PE	43	5.38 (3.91)	-2.04*	79	.05
	without PE	38	8.55 (2.95)			

*P < .05 ** P < .01 PE= Pleasant Experience

As shown in the table above, on discrimination towards PWPDs, there was statistically significant difference between the mean score given by students who had PE (5.09) and who had no PE with PWDs (6.26) at $\alpha = .00$. There was also highly statistically significant difference on discrimination towards PWHDs (with the mean score given by students who had PE were 2.91 and who had no PE with PWDs were 3.98) and significantly different at $\alpha = .02$.

The comparison between scores given by students who had PE with PWDs and those who had no PE on discrimination towards PWIDs also yield statistically significant differences at $\alpha = .05$ level.

4.8.10 Discrimination and attendance on awareness creation training

Training is one of the most known ways of awareness creation techniques. Therefore, whether training change/shape students behavior or not, the comparison among those who attend training and who didn't attend training is done. Comparison between two groups of students on discrimination towards PWDs was done by using independent sample t- test technique.

Table 4.8.10

Data and Result of Independent sample t-test on Discrimination between attend and not attend on disability issue training

Variable	Grouping variable	N	Mean(SD)	T	Df	Sig
PWPDs	get training	30	3.56 (1.55)	-8.6**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	6.09 (1.52)			
PWHDs	get training	30	2.16 (1.51)	-9.15**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	5.02 (1.63)			
PWVDs	get training	30	3.23 (1.81)	-8.88**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	5.9 (1.53)			
PWIDs	get training	30	4.96 (1.24)	-7.3**	291	.00
	didn't get training	263	7.56 (1.91)			

*P < .05 ** P < .01

As indicated in the table above, the mean score towards PWPDs of those students who attend training and who did not attend training was 3.56 & 6.09 respectively with the standard deviations of 1.55 & 1.52 respectively. Although it was significant at $\alpha = .00$. The comparison on the score towards PWHDs between students who attend training and who did not attend training was 2.16 & 5.02 respectively with the standard deviations of 1.51 & 1.63

respectively. There was a significant difference on the scores towards PWHDs given by students who attend training and who did not attend training. In the case of PWVDs, the mean score which was given by those students attend training were 3.32 & the mean score by students who did not attend training were 5.9. Therefore, it was statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$. Statistical significant difference found out between the mean score given by students who attend training (3.56) and who did not attend training (6.09) with the standard deviations of 1.55 & 1.52 respectively discrimination towards PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

In this section, an attempt is made to answer the research questions and to examine findings in relation to each variables of the study (nature and difference in prejudice and discrimination towards different disability types). The effect of the characteristics of student's (age, sex, grade, contact with PWDs, extent of contact with PWDs, unpleasant experience with PWDs, pleasant experience with PWDs, types of relation with PWDs & attending disability issue training) on students prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs also discussed.

5.1 Nature of prejudice & discrimination towards four types of PWDs

The present study shows that there is no difference on the nature of prejudice among PWPDs, PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs. The mean score given for all four groups of PWDs fallen under the range of 46.67 to 73.33. Therefore, prejudice towards all four groups PWDs has medium magnitude. Even though, all the groups of PWDs fall under the same range of prejudice, there might be a difference among them.

Table 4.6 also indicates that, discrimination mean score given to both PWHDs & PWVDs ranged from 0 to 4. Hence, discrimination towards both groups of PWDs was mild. But the calculated mean score of discrimination for PWPDs & PWIDs were between 5 & 8. This indicates that, the nature of discrimination towards PWPDs & PWIDs was moderate.

The implication the difference on discrimination between groups could be the perception of students towards each type of disability. For instance, students may have a fear of being hurt to contact with PWIDs rather than people with other types of disability. And there could be also many reasons behind, for discrepancy of discrimination towards the groups of PWDs, like wrongly perceived causes for the disabling condition, perceiving as the

disability contagious, restricted movement in restrictive environment, less contact with them could be reasons for experiencing more discrimination. The least discrimination was towards PWHDs & this may be due to the invisibility of the disability.

As discussed above, even though there was prejudice and discrimination towards the four groups of PWDs; difference in the nature of discrimination was observed. In this regard literature also indicates that there is no equal discrimination towards all PWDs, rather those who have intellectual disabilities are targets for the greater degree of discrimination (Julie, 2001). However, in contrary to this result, Harold (2002) stated that due to the absence of speech PWHDs are the most socially isolated groups than PWVDs and other long-life diseases. However the result shows that discrimination towards PWHDs was mild & it is least than any other groups of PWDs under the study.

5.2 Prejudice & discrimination differences among PWDs

As it is stated in the previous chapter, the questions that is to be answered in the study was whether there is a significant difference in prejudice and discrimination among various groups of PWDs. As shown in table 4.4, prejudice towards compared groups of PWDs had statistically significant mean variation ($p < .01$).

For example, prejudice towards PWPDs were statistically significantly different from the prejudice towards PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of 6.88, .79 & -1.05 respectively at $\alpha = .00$ level except the comparison between PWPDs & PWVDs, which was significant at $\alpha = .008$.

Similarly, prejudice towards PWHDs were significantly different from the prejudice towards PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of -6.09 & -1.74 at $\alpha = .00$. The same was true between PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of -1.13 highly significant at $\alpha = .00$.

This indicates that, even though there was medium magnitude of prejudice towards all four groups of PWDs there were highly significant mean variations among them. For example, prejudice towards PWIDs were strong than the other groups; then PWPDs, PWVDs & PWHDs respectively.

The same was true for discrimination (table, 4.7 & 4.7.1). There were highly statistically significant differences on discrimination towards the types of PWDs ($p < .01$). In each comparison, difference among the groups yields high statistical difference. Discrimination towards PWPDs was statistically different ($\alpha = .00$) with the score given to PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of 2.8, 1.95 & -1.96 respectively. There was also a high statistical significant difference between the score given for PWHDs ($\alpha = .00$) and the score given for PWVDs & PWIDs with the mean difference of -.85 & -4.77 respectively. The same was true between PWVDs & PWIDs with a highly statistically significantly different at $\alpha = .00$ level & the mean difference was -3.92.

5.3 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and Sex

Prejudice score towards various groups of PWDs of students was examined in line with the respondent sex. As presented in table 4.5.1, the male groups had strong prejudice towards all four groups of PWDs than female groups and the difference in prejudice for all groups of PWDs was significant at $\alpha = .00$.

T-test also computed to compare discrimination towards different types of PWDs with student's sex. As presented in table 4.8.1, discrimination score towards each type of PWDs was observed where male students behavior highly negative than female students. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that males were strongly discriminated PWDs than female students. The statistically significant mean variation among female & male students on discrimination towards all four groups of PWDs was at $\alpha = .00$.

Here two things are mainly observed. One, there was strong prejudice towards all types of PWDs by male than female students. This could be due to the high social interaction passion of females than males and sympathetic behavior of females. This result is similar to the study which compares the attitude of students towards PWDs in different level of educational settings done by Royal & Roberts, 1987; as cited in Almaz, 2011.

The other core point is even though there was a mean difference in prejudice & discrimination towards all PWDs by male & female students, there was similarities in the types of disability which are labeled either strong or weak prejudice & discrimination by both sexes. This means both females and males students had similar tendency towards all types of disability with variability of extents. For instance, both male & female students have less prejudice & discrimination towards PWHs but both female & male students have high prejudice & discrimination towards PWIDs than the other groups of PWDs.

5.4 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and age

As indicated in table 4.5.2, there was negative correlation between age of the students and prejudice towards each type of PWDs. For example, age was negatively correlated with prejudice towards PVPDs with correlation coefficient of -.54. The same was true on age & prejudice towards PWHs with correlation coefficient of -.41. Age & prejudice towards PVPDs also negatively correlated with coefficient of -.53. Similarly, age & prejudice towards PWIDs was negatively correlated at -.39. There was also highly statistical significant difference between age and prejudice towards four types of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$. In the case of age & prejudice towards PVPDs & PVPDs were highly correlated & their correlation were negative. This means the change on the age highly influences the extent of prejudice towards this group of PWDs and the increasing in age results decrease in prejudice.

Regarding age and prejudice towards PWHs & PWIDs correlation were moderate and negative. This indicates that, the increment in age does not highly influences the prejudice towards PWHs & PWIDs like of PWPDs & PWVDs.

In table 4.8.3 also, discrimination and age are highly negatively correlated to each other. For instance, discrimination towards PWPDs, PWHs, PWVDs & PWIDs were highly correlated with age with correlation coefficient of -.479, -.486, -.495 & -.501 respectively. Here, the correlation between age & discrimination towards PWIDs were higher than other. This might have an indication that, discriminatory behavior towards PWIDs was highly influenced by age or vice versa than the others relation.

In general, as discussed above, there was a negative relation between age and prejudice as well as discrimination towards PWDs. This might be most of the time children molded & grow up by their families guide. But when they become developed mentally starts to think and see thing out of box & gradually disclosed with the prior thinking filled by their family. There for changes may appear due to their opportunity to get information and think broadly than the previous time. Bernard (2010) also states that, children learn about PWDs from their parents, teachers or friends and lives through it unless they get opportunity to know new things.

5.5 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and grade

Prejudice and discrimination towards various types of PWDs were compared with the student's grade. As it is indicated in table 4.5.3, prejudice towards all four groups of PWDs by grade 11 students was stronger than grade 12 students and the difference was significant $\alpha = .00$ except towards PWHs which was significant at $\alpha = .002$. The findings suggest that prejudice towards PWDs decreased as grade of the students increase.

Like prejudice, comparison made between grade 11 students & grade 12 students on discrimination towards various groups of PWDs. Table 4.8.4 shows

that, discrimination towards all four groups of PWDs by grade 11 students compared to discrimination by grade 12 students, the result is discrimination by grade 11 students was higher than by grade 12 students. Moreover the difference is significant at $\alpha = .00$.

This might be, when grade level increase there is also increasing in age so that, there is a natural development to see things rationally and there is an exposure to acquire new knowledge & experience. Also, situation & possibilities become favor to dig for realities in grade 12 than grade 11. A study support this result were done by Upton and Harper; 2002 and Pitman and Slate; 1994 (as cited in Almaz, 2011). The research's suggested that the students spent more years on education the more positive attitudes exhibited towards PWDs. More education is highly correlated with positive attitudes (Yuker, 1994; cited in Almaz, 2011). Therefore, education has an effect on the prejudice and attitude of students towards PWDs.

5.6 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and contact with PWDs

Table 4.5.4, describes the statistical significance difference between prejudice towards PWDs by students who had & had no contact with PWDs. As indicated there, there were mean score difference between students who had contact with PWDs & those had not contact with PWDs on prejudice towards each type of PWDs. Statistical significant difference also observed between scores given by students with contact and those who were without contact with PWDs on prejudice towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$.

Table 4.8.5, describes that differences in discrimination mean score towards various groups of PWDs among those students who had contact & who had no contact with PWDs. The mean score given by those students who were with contact with PWDs towards PWPDs (3.96), PWHDs (2.80), PWVDs (3.65) & PWIDs (5.18) was below the median (6). Unlikely, those students who were without contact with PWDs gives the scores towards PWPDs (6.55), PWHDs (5.46), PWVDs (6.38) & PWIDs (8.09) were above the median except the score

towards PWHs. There was also high statistical significant difference between the scores given by the two groups of students towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$.

Generally this indicates that, there was strong prejudice & discrimination by those students who were without contact with PWDs. however prejudice & discrimination was weak by those students who were with contact with PWDs.

Like the above comparisons there was hierarchy of prejudice towards PWDs. This was strong prejudice towards PWIDs, moderately strong prejudice towards PWPDs & PWVDs and weak prejudice towards PWHs. Furthermore it indicated that, it's difficult to conclude that having contact with PWDs reduce prejudice towards PWDs in general. Which means having contact with PWDs did not a guarantee for less prejudice towards PWDs. For example, even if there was a contact with PWDs, there was high prejudice towards PWIDs. This might be due to the type & duration of contact that the students had, the perceived cause of disability & other causes. In this regard, Yuker (as cited in Julie, 2001) states that, contact between majority and minority groups did not decrease prejudice, rather it may increase prejudice unless the contact is based on equal social status, willingness & having same goals. In general the prejudice and discrimination were less by students who had contact with PWDs than those who did not have. Regard this, Amsel and Fichten (as cited in Almaz, 2011) describes that "contact is a key variable in order to reduce negative attitude towards PWDs" p.108.

5.7 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and extent of contact with PWDs

As it is indicated above in table 4.5.5, there were a mean difference between students who had daily contact with PWDs and students who had occasional contact with PWDs on prejudice towards various types of PWDs. The

statistical significance differences were seen between the score given by two groups of students towards all groups of PWDs.

Concerning discrimination table 4.8.6 indicates that, the score given by students who were in daily contact with PWDs were below the median towards all four types of PWDs except the score towards PWIDs. All scores given by students who were in occasional contact with PWDs was below the median except the score towards PWIDs. There was also statistical significant difference between scores given by two groups of students towards PWPDs & PWHDs at $\alpha = .02$ & $\alpha = .001$ respectively.

In general, there was weak prejudice & discrimination by students who had daily contact with PWDs than who had occasional contact across the four types of PWDs; but there were also difference on prejudice between the four types of PWDs with in the same extent of contact. As a result, those who had daily contact with PWDs were had weak prejudice towards the three types of PWDs & highly prejudice PWIDs. The same was true for students who had occasional contact with PWDs; there was greater degree of prejudice towards PWIDs than the rest. This indicates, the differences on prejudice were not only based on the extent of contact rather it may also based on the type of disability, healthy contact with PWDs, sharing of experiences & developing familiarity, having common sense or other factors. For this reason, there was solely less prejudice & discrimination towards PWHDs & greater prejudice & discrimination towards PWIDs among each extent of contact with PWDs.

5.8 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and type of relation with PWDs

As it is indicated in table 4.5.6, there was a comparison between the scores given for prejudice towards each group PWDs based on the students different type of relation with PWDs. Therefore, the mean score given by students who had different type of relation with PWDs (family, friend & classmate) towards PWPDs was below the median except those students who

had classmate relation with PWDs, and it was statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$ level. Therefore, there was strong prejudice towards PWDs by students who had classmate relation with PWDs and weak prejudice by students who had friend & family relation with PWDs. Again differences seen between these two groups of students; prejudice emerges from those students who had family member with disability very weak than those who had friends with disability.

The mean score towards PWDs were below the median across the three types of student's relationship with PWDs (family, friend & classmate) therefore, prejudice were not strong. But there was high statistically significant difference at $\alpha = .00$. This means, Even though all mean scores were below the median there was difference between the prejudice level as the student's relation with PWDs varies. Therefore, the appeared prejudice were very weak by students who had family, weak by students who had friends & moderately weak by students who had classmates with disability.

The same was true for PWVDs, all the mean scores towards PWVDs were below the median regardless of the types of relation that the students had and it was statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$ level. Therefore, prejudice towards PWVDs was also not strong and there was a difference among the three types of relation on prejudice like the prejudice towards PWDs.

Whereas, the mean scores towards PWIDs were above the median except the score by students who had family relationship with PWDs. Therefore, prejudices directed to PWIDs were strong as regards to student's relationship (friend & classmate) with PWDs. The statistical significance difference among the scores given by the students with different three relation with PWDs were at $\alpha = .00$ level.

Generally, the mean score for each type of PWDs were with the inclination of more prejudice towards all four types of disability by those who

had classmate relationship with PWDs, then those who had friend and family relation with PWDs follows.

In table 4.8.7, the comparison goes to discrimination towards the four types of PWDs as student's types of relations with PWDs. Discrimination towards PWPDs & PWHDs was below the mean by all students who had family, friend & classmates with disability. There was also a high statistical significant difference between the scores given by three groups of students towards PWPDs & PWHDs with same level at $\alpha = .00$. In both case (PWPDs & PWHDs), all scores are below the median; but there was level of discrimination. When discrimination describes in ascending order; discrimination emerges from those who had family member then from those who had friend and those who had classmates with disability. This order was within the range of weak discrimination because all the scores are below the median.

In the case of PWVDs, the score given by students who had classmates with disability were equal to the median (6) and the scores by students who had family and friend with disability were below the median. The scores were highly statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$ level. Here also classifications of discrimination based on the mean score. Therefore, discrimination from those students who had family member was very weak, those who had friend with disability were weak and those students who had classmates with disability moderately discriminate PWVDs. The same was true for the score given for PWIDs. Those students who had classmate with disability score were 8 (above the median) whereas; other scores were below the median and like other comparison there was high statistically significant difference at $\alpha = .00$. Hierarchy of discrimination towards PWIDs was strong discrimination by students who had classmates with disability and weak discrimination by those students who had family & friends with disability.

In general, this can be also an indication that people with different kinds of disability strong prejudice & discriminate by the students who had no family

relation or friendship with PWDs and it could be, students may not have good & close friendship with PWDs, limited contact with PWDs or other. But in both prejudice & discrimination comparisons PWHs receive weak prejudice and discrimination by any group of students than other types of PWDs. Moreover, research done by Ladd, Munson and Miller (as cited in Harold, 2002), stated that, most PWHs are socially interactive if they once built relation.

5.9 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and unpleasant experience with PWDs

As it was indicated in table 4.5.7, for all four types PWDs the mean score of students who had unpleasant experience with PWDs were greater than the mean score of students who had no unpleasant experience with PWDs. Therefore, there was mean difference among each groups of PWDs based up on unpleasant experience, statistically significant difference has been seen between students who had unpleasant & no unpleasant experience with PWDs towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$. This indicates that, students prejudice towards PWDs has substantially influenced by the student's unpleasant experience with PWDs.

Also table 4.8.8 indicates that, there were higher mean score on discrimination scale for each disability types by students who had unpleasant experience with PWDs than those who had no unpleasant experience with PWDs. Unlike prejudice, statistical significance difference on discrimination was seen between those students who had unpleasant & no unpleasant experience with PWDs towards PWDs & PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$ & $\alpha = .001$ respectively. The result also indicates that, discrimination towards PWDs has noticeably influenced by the students having or not having unpleasant experience with PWDs.

In general, prejudice & discrimination has been strong by those students who had unpleasant experience with PWDs than those students who had no unpleasant experience. This indicates, there were influences of their prior

unpleasant relation with PWDs on their attitude or perceptions towards all PWDs.

But also similarities occur between both group of students on the level of prejudice & discrimination towards four groups of PWDs. Therefore, there was strong prejudice & discrimination towards PWIDs then, PWPDs, PWVDs & less prejudice & discrimination towards PWHDs. This might emerge from; the students rooted stereotyping attitude towards different types of PWDs like generalizing that PWDs are emotional and aggressive rather than their prior unpleasant experience with PWDs. Yuker (as cited in Almaz, 2011) stressed that the nature and type contact that the person have with PWDs is most influential variable to the attitude towards PWDs.

5.10 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and pleasant experience with PWDs

As indicated in table 4.8.9, the mean score towards PWPDs, PWHDs & PWVDs, on prejudice scale were less than the median by students who had pleasant relation with PWDs. Therefore, prejudice by students who had pleasant experience with PWDs. However, the mean scores for PWPDs, PWVDs & PWIDs were above the median and the score for PWHDs (56.61) were below the median by those students who had no pleasant experience with PWDs. Here, prejudice by students who had no pleasant experience with PWDs was weak towards PWHDs and strong towards three groups of PWDs. The statistical significance difference occurs between students who had and had no pleasant experience with PWDs towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$ except towards PWHDs. This indicates having pleasant experience with PWDs has strong influence on the prejudice towards PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs.

Table 4.8.9 indicates that, the mean score on discrimination scale was below the median for all groups of PWDs by students who had pleasant experience with PWDs & the score given by students had no pleasant experience with PWDs were above the median towards PWPDs & PWIDs. There

were also high statistical significant difference between the score of students who had and who had no any pleasant experience with PWDs on discrimination towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$ level and towards PWHDs at $\alpha = .02$ & PWIDs at $\alpha = .05$ level. Therefore, student's pleasant experience with PWDs determines the level of discrimination towards PWDs.

5.11 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and training on PWDs

Among the students there are students who had attended disability issue training and those who did not have. Prejudice as well as discrimination comparison was made to see the impact of disability issue training on students prejudice & discrimination towards each type of PWDs. As it is presented on table 4.5.9, prejudice towards groups of PWDs by those students who get disability issue training was weak than those who did not get. The mean score between two groups of students also significantly different at $\alpha = .00$. This communicates, even though there was no significant difference between the scores of the two groups of students towards the three groups of PWDs, training modify students attitude towards all groups PWDs.

Regarding discrimination, table 4.8.10 indicates that, discrimination was weak towards all groups of PWDs by students who get training on PWDs with low mean scores from the median. While, the score given by students who had not taken training was strong discrimination towards PWPDs & PWIDs and weak discrimination towards PWHDs & PWVDs. And the statistical significant difference emerges between students who had & had not taken training about PWDs towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$ level.

There was an opposite result towards PWIDs on prejudice and discrimination; which was less prejudice & strong discrimination by the students who does not take training. This could be due to some other outside influences towards student's action against PWIDs than what they really act. For instance, friend and family pressure; students may worry about losing their relation and affection with their friends as well as families through acting

positively with PWIDs. Also sometime having information and take it in to practice are very different things. There for even though students got information they may not take it in to practical state. In this regard, Harold (2002) stated that, it is frequently happens that discrimination not always based on prejudice rather it may coerce by some other group like parent/neighbor. Also Anne (2007) states that many prejudicial behaviors are picked up at a young age by children imitating their elders' way of thinking and speaking, with no malice intended on the child's part.

In general, prejudice and discrimination emerges from those students who doesn't attend training were strong and it becomes weak by the students who taken training. This result clearly indicates that awareness creation training modify students prejudiced attitude and discriminatory behavior. The necessity of training also described by Anne (2007) information should be prepared and disseminated to improve and that will avoid reinforcing traditional stereotypes and prejudices by the public towards PWDs.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The objective of this study was to examine the nature and differences of prejudice and discrimination by students without disability towards various types of PWDs. survey research design were used, in which multistage cluster sampling techniques were employed to select 2 classroom (cluster) samples from grade 11 & 6 classroom samples from grade 12. Tool development passed through stages of item generation and item selection and professionals from the Department of Special Needs Education, Department of Psychology and Department of Sign Language commented the instrument based on some criteria like clarity of the items, meaning and equivalence of the Amharic and English version.

Before collecting the necessary data from the samples, letter of cooperation was taken from the Department of Special Needs Education and lists of sample frame from Yekatit 12 preparatory school. Then by using simple lottery way, samples were drawn on simple random technique. Using a computer program (, the collected data were analyzed and for further analysis, Pearson correlation, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-test computations were used.

The findings of the study were presented under different table variables in chapter four. For example on prejudice towards PWDs scale, the mean score of prejudice by students towards PVPDs & PVVDs were around the median. Whereas, the mean score given for PVHDs were below the median. But the mean score given for PVIDs was above the median. Therefore, prejudice towards PVPDs & PVVDs was weak and it was very weak towards PVHDs. Strong prejudice by the samples was towards PVIDs. Moreover, high statistical significant mean score differences are found out in each comparisons of groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$.

Regarding prejudice and discrimination towards various groups of PWDs based on samples sex, all the groups PWDs deserve mean score by male students which is greater than the female students. As a result, male students were highly prejudiced all groups of PWDs than female students. There was also significant difference the mean score given by female and male students on prejudice against all groups of PWDs. There was also a high statistically significant difference in discrimination of male & female students towards all groups of PWDs.

High negative correlation was found out between the age of samples and prejudice as well as discrimination across all groups of PWDs.

There are a mean difference in the prejudice & discrimination between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards all groups of PWDs. The mean score by grade 11 students was greater than the score given by grade 12 students. Although significant difference on prejudice & discrimination was seen between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWDs.

Students prejudice and discrimination mean score towards all groups of PWDs shown different due to contact with PWDs. Statistical significant difference on prejudice due to contact has shown on the score towards all groups of PWDs. On discrimination score also statistical significant difference has shown towards all groups PWDs.

The findings that prejudice and discrimination among students who had daily contact with PWDs points out that they held mild prejudice and discrimination than students with occasional contact with PWDs. The statistical significant difference appears between the two groups of students on the score of prejudice towards all groups of PWDs. On the discrimination score the statistical significant difference appears between the two groups of students towards PWPDs & PWHDs.

The finding revealed that prejudice and discrimination towards all groups of PWDs by students who had classmate relation with PWDs is strong than the students who had friend with disabilities. The least prejudice and discrimination score is given by students who had family with disability. Furthermore, the score given by the three groups of students is significant on both prejudice & discrimination towards all groups of PWDs.

The finding also shows that the impact of unpleasant experience with PWDs on prejudices & discrimination. The finding of the study pointed out that pleasant experience with PWDs has effects on both prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs.

Finally, the result shows that training on the issue of PWDs results change in the students prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs.

6.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussion above, the following conclusions are drawn. By looking on the mean score given for compared groups, it is possible to conclude that, nature of prejudice towards all groups of PWDs was similar which was in medium magnitude. While nature of discrimination towards PWPDs & PWIDs was moderate and towards PWHDs & PWVDs was mild. Therefore, it is possible to conclude nature of prejudice towards the groups of PWDs were similar and there was difference in the nature of discrimination among groups of PWDs.

As per the findings of the study, there is difference in both prejudice and discrimination among the different groups of PWDs. The hierarchy of prejudice & discrimination in its descending order as; towards PWIDs then towards PWPDs, PWVDs follows & PWHDs were the least group.

The study also revealed that, male students prejudice and discrimination is strong than female students. Similarly grade 11 students had strong prejudice and discrimination towards all groups of PWDs than grade 12 students. The study also reveals, the increment in age decreases both prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs.

The study also discloses, students who had no contact with PWDs has strong prejudice and discrimination against PWDs that those students who had contact with PWDs. The extent of contact also affects prejudice and discrimination. Students who had daily contact have weak prejudice and discrimination towards all groups of PWDs than those students who had occasional contact.

Students who had family member with disability have weak prejudice and discrimination towards all groups of PWDs than those students who had friend & classmate with PWDs. And students who had friend with disability have weak prejudice and discrimination than those students who had classmate relation with PWDs.

The study further indicates students who had unpleasant experience with PWDs have strong prejudice and discrimination than those who had no unpleasant experience. Similarly, students who had pleasant experience with PWDs have weak prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs than students who had no pleasant experience with PWDs.

Finally, the study reveals that, students who attend training on disability issues have weak prejudice and discrimination than students who do not attend.

6.2 Recommendations

Based on the results obtained and the conclusions drawn from the study, the following recommendations are suggested:-

- Using both students feeling and behavior scale, it is found out that, students prejudice and discrimination towards most groups of PWDs were moderate but it does not mean that the students developed good knowledge about PWDs. It has also impact on the life situations of PWDs. Therefore, it should be tackled to the extent of students develop respectable knowledge and not to create adverse impact on the life of PWDs using strategies like developing awareness through different children & youth associations & school clubs to promote inclusion of PWDs.
- Based on the result found out, both prejudice and discrimination towards PWIDs were stronger than any other groups of PWDs. which means the restriction, social isolation and misperception towards PWIDs were strong. Therefore, it would be very helpful if the concerned bodies like government & NGOs working on disability to work strongly on the training & rehabilitating PWIDs besides creating awareness.
- A result indicates students who had daily contact with PWDs are less prejudiced and less discriminate PWDs. Which means if more opportunities are given to people to increase the participation of PWDs in different aspects, prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs becomes lesser. Therefore, obstacles should be confronted to the extent that PWDs & PWODs construct healthy contact & ensure full participation of PWDs.
- Few students who attended on awareness creation programs have less prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs than who had not. This indicates, even though the training does not eliminate student's wrong attitudes, it modifies their attitude. Therefore, attitude creation trainings and programs aimed at removing &/or at least reducing misbehaviors should be designed & address the society.

- All people with disabilities also need to struggle for their right, advance their participation in different aspect and take part in creating awareness in their community.

REFERENCES

- Alan, S. (1998). *Caring for people with Disabilities*. USA.
- Almaz Tamene (2011). *Attitudes of Ethiopian college students toward people with visible disabilities: thesis. University of Iowa*
- Andreas, Z., Beate, K., Andreas H. (2011). *Intolerance, Prejudice and Discrimination: A European Report*.
- Anne, M. M. C. (2007). *This Ability: An International Legal Analysis of Disability Discrimination*. England
- Bernanrd, E., W, JR. & Mary, E., K. (2010). *The psychology of prejudice & discrimination*. 2nd Ed. USA
- Carloyn, L. V. & Nancy M. C. (2004). *Psychology of Disability*. 2nd Ed USA
- Colin, B. & Geof, M. (2006). *Independent Futures: Creating used- led Disability Services in a Disabling society*. Britain
- Crystal, M. (2009). *Prejudice*. USA
- Devenney Michael J. V. (2003). *The Social Representations of Disability: Fears, dissertation Fantasies and Facts Clare College*.
- Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia(1994). *Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Fred Lesserre (2012). *The Construct of Discrimination*. USA.

Harold, D. F. (2002). *Peer Prejudice and Discrimination: The Origins of Prejudice*. 2nd Ed, USA.

Julie, S. (2001). *Disability, Society, and the Individual*. USA

Lipsky, D. and Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and school reform*. Transforming America's classrooms. USA. Baltimore Paul. H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Mark, P. (2001). *Disability and Life Course Global Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press. USA.

Miguel, A. C. & Katherine, S. N. (2010). *Discrimination in an Unequal World*. Oxford University Press, Inc.

Mittler, P. and *et al.* (1993). *World year book of Education*. Special Needs Education. London: Kogan page.

Radda Barner (1994). *The Right to Education of Children at Risk*. Policy document for Radda Barnen's International programme.

Richard, C. H., Sharon M., H. & Kelly, R. (2007). *Prejudice in the World*. Vol 1, USA.

Ron, D. & Daniel, H.J. W. (2008) *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Susan Wendell (1996). *The Rejected Body: The Social Construction of Disability*. New York: Routledge.

Tirusew, T. (2005). *Disability in Ethiopia: Issues, Insights and Implications*.

AAU printing press, Ethiopia

The Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (1994).

Todd, D. N. (2009). *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination*.

USA.

Tooley, M. (1983). *Abortion and Infanticide*. New York, Oxford University

Press.

UNESCO (2000). *Dakar Framework for Action*.

United Nation (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*.

United Nations (1994). *Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for People with Disability*.

United Nations (2003/4). *Human Rights and Disabled Persons: Report on prejudices and discrimination against disabled persons: areas, form and scope*.

United Nations (1948). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.

United Nations (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*.

United Nations (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*.

United Nations (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*.

the scores given by the two groups of students towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$.

Generally this indicates that, there was strong prejudice & discrimination by those students who were without contact with PWDs. however prejudice & discrimination was weak by those students who were with contact with PWDs.

Like the above comparisons there was hierarchy of prejudice towards PWDs. This was strong prejudice towards PWIDs, moderately strong prejudice towards PVPDs & PWVDs and weak prejudice towards PWHDs. Furthermore it indicated that, it's difficult to conclude that having contact with PWDs reduce prejudice towards PWDs in general. Which means having contact with PWDs did not a guarantee for less prejudice towards PWDs. For example, even if there was a contact with PWDs, there was high prejudice towards PWIDs. This might be due to the type & duration of contact that the students had, the perceived cause of disability & other causes. In this regard, Yuker (as cited in Julie, 2001) states that, contact between majority and minority groups did not decrease prejudice, rather it may increase prejudice unless the contact is based on equal social status, willingness & having same goals. In general the prejudice and discrimination were less by students who had contact with PWDs than those who did not have. Regard this, Amsel and Fichten (as cited in Almaz, 2011) describes that "contact is a key variable in order to reduce negative attitude towards PWDs" p.108.

5.7 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and extent of contact with PWDs

As it is indicated above in table 4.5.5, there were a mean difference between students who had daily contact with PWDs and students who had occasional contact with PWDs on prejudice towards various types of PWDs. The

statistical significance differences were seen between the score given by two groups of students towards all groups of PWDs.

Concerning discrimination table 4.8.6 indicates that, the score given by students who were in daily contact with PWDs were below the median towards all four types of PWDs except the score towards PWIDs. All scores given by students who were in occasional contact with PWDs was below the median except the score towards PWIDs. There was also statistical significant difference between scores given by two groups of students towards PWPDs & PWHDs at $\alpha = .02$ & $\alpha = .001$ respectively.

In general, there was weak prejudice & discrimination by students who had daily contact with PWDs than who had occasional contact across the four types of PWDs; but there were also difference on prejudice between the four types of PWDs with in the same extent of contact. As a result, those who had daily contact with PWDs were had weak prejudice towards the three types of PWDs & highly prejudice PWIDs. The same was true for students who had occasional contact with PWDs; there was greater degree of prejudice towards PWIDs than the rest. This indicates, the differences on prejudice were not only based on the extent of contact rather it may also based on the type of disability, healthy contact with PWDs, sharing of experiences & developing familiarity, having common sense or other factors. For this reason, there was solely less prejudice & discrimination towards PWHDs & greater prejudice & discrimination towards PWIDs among each extent of contact with PWDs.

5.8 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and type of relation with PWDs

As it is indicated in table 4.5.6, there was a comparison between the scores given for prejudice towards each group PWDs based on the students different type of relation with PWDs. Therefore, the mean score given by students who had different type of relation with PWDs (family, friend & classmate) towards PWPDs was below the median except those students who

had classmate relation with PWDs, and it was statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$ level. Therefore, there was strong prejudice towards PWDs by students who had classmate relation with PWDs and weak prejudice by students who had friend & family relation with PWDs. Again differences seen between these two groups of students; prejudice emerges from those students who had family member with disability very weak than those who had friends with disability.

The mean score towards PWDs were below the median across the three types of student's relationship with PWDs (family, friend & classmate) therefore, prejudice were not strong. But there was high statistically significant difference at $\alpha = .00$. This means, Even though all mean scores were below the median there was difference between the prejudice level as the student's relation with PWDs varies. Therefore, the appeared prejudice were very weak by students who had family, weak by students who had friends & moderately weak by students who had classmates with disability.

The same was true for PWVDs, all the mean scores towards PWVDs were below the median regardless of the types of relation that the students had and it was statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$ level. Therefore, prejudice towards PWVDs was also not strong and there was a difference among the three types of relation on prejudice like the prejudice towards PWDs.

Whereas, the mean scores towards PWIDs were above the median except the score by students who had family relationship with PWDs. Therefore, prejudices directed to PWIDs were strong as regards to student's relationship (friend & classmate) with PWDs. The statistical significance difference among the scores given by the students with different three relation with PWDs were at $\alpha = .00$ level.

Generally, the mean score for each type of PWDs were with the inclination of more prejudice towards all four types of disability by those who

had classmate relationship with PWDs, then those who had friend and family relation with PWDs follows.

In table 4.8.7, the comparison goes to discrimination towards the four types of PWDs as student's types of relations with PWDs. Discrimination towards PWPDs & PWHDs was below the mean by all students who had family, friend & classmates with disability. There was also a high statistical significant difference between the scores given by three groups of students towards PWPDs & PWHDs with same level at $\alpha = .00$. In both case (PWPDs & PWHDs), all scores are below the median; but there was level of discrimination. When discrimination describes in ascending order; discrimination emerges from those who had family member then from those who had friend and those who had classmates with disability. This order was within the range of weak discrimination because all the scores are below the median.

In the case of PWVDs, the score given by students who had classmates with disability were equal to the median (6) and the scores by students who had family and friend with disability were below the median. The scores were highly statistically significant at $\alpha = .00$ level. Here also classifications of discrimination based on the mean score. Therefore, discrimination from those students who had family member was very weak, those who had friend with disability were weak and those students who had classmates with disability moderately discriminate PWVDs. The same was true for the score given for PWIDs. Those students who had classmate with disability score were 8 (above the median) whereas; other scores were below the median and like other comparison there was high statistically significant difference at $\alpha = .00$. Hierarchy of discrimination towards PWIDs was strong discrimination by students who had classmates with disability and weak discrimination by those students who had family & friends with disability.

In general, this can be also an indication that people with different kinds of disability strong prejudice & discriminate by the students who had no family

relation or friendship with PWDs and it could be, students may not have good & close friendship with PWDs, limited contact with PWDs or other. But in both prejudice & discrimination comparisons PWDs receive weak prejudice and discrimination by any group of students than other types of PWDs. Moreover, research done by Ladd, Munson and Miller (as cited in Harold, 2002), stated that, most PWDs are socially interactive if they once built relation.

5.9 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and unpleasant experience with PWDs

As it was indicated in table 4.5.7, for all four types PWDs the mean score of students who had unpleasant experience with PWDs were greater than the mean score of students who had no unpleasant experience with PWDs. Therefore, there was mean difference among each groups of PWDs based up on unpleasant experience, statistically significant difference has been seen between students who had unpleasant & no unpleasant experience with PWDs towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$. This indicates that, students prejudice towards PWDs has substantially influenced by the student's unpleasant experience with PWDs.

Also table 4.8.8 indicates that, there were higher mean score on discrimination scale for each disability types by students who had unpleasant experience with PWDs than those who had no unpleasant experience with PWDs. Unlike prejudice, statistical significance difference on discrimination was seen between those students who had unpleasant & no unpleasant experience with PWDs towards PWDs & PWIDs at $\alpha = .00$ & $\alpha = .001$ respectively. The result also indicates that, discrimination towards PWDs has noticeably influenced by the students having or not having unpleasant experience with PWDs.

In general, prejudice & discrimination has been strong by those students who had unpleasant experience with PWDs than those students who had no unpleasant experience. This indicates, there were influences of their prior

unpleasant relation with PWDs on their attitude or perceptions towards all PWDs.

But also similarities occur between both group of students on the level of prejudice & discrimination towards four groups of PWDs. Therefore, there was strong prejudice & discrimination towards PWIDs then, PWPDs, PWVDs & less prejudice & discrimination towards PWHDs. This might emerge from; the students rooted stereotyping attitude towards different types of PWDs like generalizing that PWDs are emotional and aggressive rather than their prior unpleasant experience with PWDs. Yuker (as cited in Almaz, 2011) stressed that the nature and type contact that the person have with PWDs is most influential variable to the attitude towards PWDs.

5.10 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and pleasant experience with PWDs

As indicated in table 4.8.9, the mean score towards PWPDs, PWHDs & PWVDs, on prejudice scale were less than the median by students who had pleasant relation with PWDs. Therefore, prejudice by students who had pleasant experience with PWDs. However, the mean scores for PWPDs, PWVDs & PWIDs were above the median and the score for PWHDs (56.61) were below the median by those students who had no pleasant experience with PWDs. Here, prejudice by students who had no pleasant experience with PWDs was weak towards PWHDs and strong towards three groups of PWDs. The statistical significance difference occurs between students who had and had no pleasant experience with PWDs towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$ except towards PWHDs. This indicates having pleasant experience with PWDs has strong influence on the prejudice towards PWHDs, PWVDs & PWIDs.

Table 4.8.9 indicates that, the mean score on discrimination scale was below the median for all groups of PWDs by students who had pleasant experience with PWDs & the score given by students had no pleasant experience with PWDs were above the median towards PWPDs & PWIDs. There

were also high statistical significant difference between the score of students who had and who had no any pleasant experience with PWDs on discrimination towards PWPDs at $\alpha = .00$ level and towards PWHDs at $\alpha = .02$ & PWIDs at $\alpha = .05$ level. Therefore, student's pleasant experience with PWDs determines the level of discrimination towards PWDs.

5.11 Prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs and training on PWDs

Among the students there are students who had attended disability issue training and those who did not have. Prejudice as well as discrimination comparison was made to see the impact of disability issue training on students prejudice & discrimination towards each type of PWDs. As it is presented on table 4.5.9, prejudice towards groups of PWDs by those students who get disability issue training was weak than those who did not get. The mean score between two groups of students also significantly different at $\alpha = .00$. This communicates, even though there was no significant difference between the scores of the two groups of students towards the three groups of PWDs, training modify students attitude towards all groups PWDs.

Regarding discrimination, table 4.8.10 indicates that, discrimination was weak towards all groups of PWDs by students who get training on PWDs with low mean scores from the median. While, the score given by students who had not taken training was strong discrimination towards PWPDs & PWIDs and weak discrimination towards PWHDs & PWVDs. And the statistical significant difference emerges between students who had & had not taken training about PWDs towards all groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$ level.

There was an opposite result towards PWIDs on prejudice and discrimination; which was less prejudice & strong discrimination by the students who does not take training. This could be due to some other outside influences towards student's action against PWIDs than what they really act. For instance, friend and family pressure; students may worry about losing their relation and affection with their friends as well as families through acting

positively with PWIDs. Also sometime having information and take it in to practice are very different things. There for even though students got information they may not take it in to practical state. In this regard, Harold (2002) stated that, it is frequently happens that discrimination not always based on prejudice rather it may coerce by some other group like parent/neighbor. Also Anne (2007) states that many prejudicial behaviors are picked up at a young age by children imitating their elders' way of thinking and speaking, with no malice intended on the child's part.

In general, prejudice and discrimination emerges from those students who doesn't attend training were strong and it becomes weak by the students who taken training. This result clearly indicates that awareness creation training modify students prejudiced attitude and discriminatory behavior. The necessity of training also described by Anne (2007) information should be prepared and disseminated to improve and that will avoid reinforcing traditional stereotypes and prejudices by the public towards PWDs.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The objective of this study was to examine the nature and differences of prejudice and discrimination by students without disability towards various types of PWDs. survey research design were used, in which multistage cluster sampling techniques were employed to select 2 classroom (cluster) samples from grade 11 & 6 classroom samples from grade 12. Tool development passed through stages of item generation and item selection and professionals from the Department of Special Needs Education, Department of Psychology and Department of Sign Language commented the instrument based on some criteria like clarity of the items, meaning and equivalence of the Amharic and English version.

Before collecting the necessary data from the samples, letter of cooperation was taken from the Department of Special Needs Education and lists of sample frame from Yekatit 12 preparatory school. Then by using simple lottery way, samples were drawn on simple random technique. Using a computer program (, the collected data were analyzed and for further analysis, Pearson correlation, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-test computations were used.

The findings of the study were presented under different table variables in chapter four. For example on prejudice towards PWDs scale, the mean score of prejudice by students towards PVPDs & PVPDs were around the median. Whereas, the mean score given for PVPDs were below the median. But the mean score given for PVPDs was above the median. Therefore, prejudice towards PVPDs & PVPDs was weak and it was very weak towards PVPDs. Strong prejudice by the samples was towards PVPDs. Moreover, high statistical significant mean score differences are found out in each comparisons of groups of PWDs at $\alpha = .00$.

Regarding prejudice and discrimination towards various groups of PWDs based on samples sex, all the groups PWDs deserve mean score by male students which is greater than the female students. As a result, male students were highly prejudiced all groups of PWDs than female students. There was also significant difference the mean score given by female and male students on prejudice against all groups of PWDs. There was also a high statistically significant difference in discrimination of male & female students towards all groups of PWDs.

High negative correlation was found out between the age of samples and prejudice as well as discrimination across all groups of PWDs.

There are a mean difference in the prejudice & discrimination between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards all groups of PWDs. The mean score by grade 11 students was greater than the score given by grade 12 students. Although significant difference on prejudice & discrimination was seen between grade 11 & grade 12 students towards PWDs.

Students prejudice and discrimination mean score towards all groups of PWDs shown different due to contact with PWDs. Statistical significant difference on prejudice due to contact has shown on the score towards all groups of PWDs. On discrimination score also statistical significant difference has shown towards all groups PWDs.

The findings that prejudice and discrimination among students who had daily contact with PWDs points out that they held mild prejudice and discrimination than students with occasional contact with PWDs. The statistical significant difference appears between the two groups of students on the score of prejudice towards all groups of PWDs. On the discrimination score the statistical significant difference appears between the two groups of students towards PWPDs & PWHDs.

The finding revealed that prejudice and discrimination towards all groups of PWDs by students who had classmate relation with PWDs is strong than the students who had friend with disabilities. The least prejudice and discrimination score is given by students who had family with disability. Furthermore, the score given by the three groups of students is significant on both prejudice & discrimination towards all groups of PWDs.

The finding also shows that the impact of unpleasant experience with PWDs on prejudices & discrimination. The finding of the study pointed out that pleasant experience with PWDs has effects on both prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs.

Finally, the result shows that training on the issue of PWDs results change in the students prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs.

6.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussion above, the following conclusions are drawn. By looking on the mean score given for compared groups, it is possible to conclude that, nature of prejudice towards all groups of PWDs was similar which was in medium magnitude. While nature of discrimination towards PWPDs & PWIDs was moderate and towards PWHDs & PWVDs was mild. Therefore, it is possible to conclude nature of prejudice towards the groups of PWDs were similar and there was difference in the nature of discrimination among groups of PWDs.

As per the findings of the study, there is difference in both prejudice and discrimination among the different groups of PWDs. The hierarchy of prejudice & discrimination in its descending order as; towards PWIDs then towards PWPDs, PWVDs follows & PWHDs were the least group.

The study also revealed that, male students prejudice and discrimination is strong than female students. Similarly grade 11 students had strong prejudice and discrimination towards all groups of PWDs than grade 12 students. The study also reveals, the increment in age decreases both prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs.

The study also discloses, students who had no contact with PWDs has strong prejudice and discrimination against PWDs that those students who had contact with PWDs. The extent of contact also affects prejudice and discrimination. Students who had daily contact have weak prejudice and discrimination towards all groups of PWDs than those students who had occasional contact.

Students who had family member with disability have weak prejudice and discrimination towards all groups of PWDs than those students who had friend & classmate with PWDs. And students who had friend with disability have weak prejudice and discrimination than those students who had classmate relation with PWDs.

The study further indicates students who had unpleasant experience with PWDs have strong prejudice and discrimination than those who had no unpleasant experience. Similarly, students who had pleasant experience with PWDs have weak prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs than students who had no pleasant experience with PWDs.

Finally, the study reveals that, students who attend training on disability issues have weak prejudice and discrimination than students who do not attend.

6.2 Recommendations

Based on the results obtained and the conclusions drawn from the study, the following recommendations are suggested:-

- Using both students feeling and behavior scale, it is found out that, students prejudice and discrimination towards most groups of PWDs were moderate but it does not mean that the students developed good knowledge about PWDs. It has also impact on the life situations of PWDs. Therefore, it should be tackled to the extent of students develop respectable knowledge and not to create adverse impact on the life of PWDs using strategies like developing awareness through different children & youth associations & school clubs to promote inclusion of PWDs.
- Based on the result found out, both prejudice and discrimination towards PWIDs were stronger than any other groups of PWDs. which means the restriction, social isolation and misperception towards PWIDs were strong. Therefore, it would be very helpful if the concerned bodies like government & NGOs working on disability to work strongly on the training & rehabilitating PWIDs besides creating awareness.
- A result indicates students who had daily contact with PWDs are less prejudiced and less discriminate PWDs. Which means if more opportunities are given to people to increase the participation of PWDs in different aspects, prejudice and discrimination towards PWDs becomes lesser. Therefore, obstacles should be confronted to the extent that PWDs & PWODs construct healthy contact & ensure full participation of PWDs.
- Few students who attended on awareness creation programs have less prejudice & discrimination towards PWDs than who had not. This indicates, even though the training does not eliminate student's wrong attitudes, it modifies their attitude. Therefore, attitude creation trainings and programs aimed at removing &/or at least reducing misbehaviors should be designed & address the society.

- All people with disabilities also need to struggle for their right, advance their participation in different aspect and take part in creating awareness in their community.

REFERENCES

- Alan, S. (1998). *Caring for people with Disabilities*. USA.
- Almaz Tamene (2011). *Attitudes of Ethiopian college students toward people with visible disabilities: thesis*. University of Iowa
- Andreas, Z., Beate, K., Andreas H. (2011). *Intolerance, Prejudice and Discrimination: A European Report*.
- Anne, M. M. C. (2007). *This Ability: An International Legal Analysis of Disability Discrimination*. England
- Bernanrd, E., W, JR. & Mary, E., K. (2010). *The psychology of prejudice & discrimination*. 2nd Ed. USA
- Carloyn, L. V. & Nancy M. C. (2004). *Psychology of Disability*. 2nd Ed USA
- Colin, B. & Geof, M. (2006). *Independent Futures: Creating used- led Disability Services in a Disabling society*. Britain
- Crystal, M. (2009). *Prejudice*. USA
- Devenney Michael J. V. (2003). *The Social Representations of Disability: Fears, dissertation Fantasies and Facts* Clare College.
- Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia(1994). *Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Fred Lesserre (2012). *The Construct of Discrimination*. USA.

Harold, D. F. (2002). *Peer Prejudice and Discrimination: The Origins of Prejudice*. 2nd Ed, USA.

Julie, S. (2001). *Disability, Society, and the Individual*. USA

Lipsky, D. and Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and school reform*. Transforming America's classrooms. USA. Baltimore Paul. H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Mark, P. (2001). *Disability and Life Course Global Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press. USA.

Miguel, A. C. & Katherine, S. N. (2010). *Discrimination in an Unequal World*. Oxford University Press, Inc.

Mittler, P. and *et al.* (1993). *World year book of Education*. Special Needs Education. London: Kogan page.

Radda Barner (1994). *The Right to Education of Children at Risk*. Policy document for Radda Barnen's International programme.

Richard, C. H., Sharon M., H. & Kelly, R. (2007). *Prejudice in the World*. Vol 1, USA.

Ron, D. & Daniel, H.J. W. (2008) *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Susan Wendell (1996). *The Rejected Body: The Social Construction of Disability*. New York: Routledge.

Tirusew, T. (2005). *Disability in Ethiopia: Issues, Insights and Implications*.

AAU printing press, Ethiopia

The Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (1994).

Todd, D. N. (2009). *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination*.

USA.

Tooley, M. (1983). *Abortion and Infanticide*. New York, Oxford University

Press.

UNESCO (2000). *Dakar Framework for Action*.

United Nation (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*.

United Nations (1994). *Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities
for People with Disability*.

United Nations (2003/4). *Human Rights and Disabled Persons: Report on
prejudices and discrimination against disabled persons: areas, form and
scope*.

United Nations (1948). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.

United Nations (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*.

United Nations (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*.

United Nations (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on
Special Needs Education*.

