

Please reference:

Daruwalla, P., and Darcy, S. (2005), Public Sympathy: Private Antipathy: Personal and Societal Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3) p549-570

PERSONAL AND SOCIETAL ATTITUDES TO DISABILITY

Pheroza Daruwalla

University of Western Sydney, Australia

Simon Darcy

University of Technology Sydney, Australia

Simon.Darcy@uts.edu.au

CONTACT PERSON

Dr. Pheroza Daruwalla

Tourism and Hospitality Management

University of Western Sydney

Locked Bag 1797

Penrith South DC, NSW 1797

Australia

Email <p.daruwalla@uws.edu.au>

Abstract: The research addresses theoretical and conceptual frameworks dealing with the formation and change of attitudes, cognitive dissonance, positive and negative prejudice, the concept of “spread”, overt and covert attitudes and their formation, and the nexus between attitudes and behavior to disability. Two attitude scales, the Interaction with Disabled Persons and the Scale of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons are reviewed. Results of two studies are presented. Major findings are that it is easier to change societal attitudes than personal attitudes. Additionally, the use of contact with a person with a disability was more efficacious in changing attitudes than only information provision. Implications for the practice of hospitality and tourism management service provision are discussed.

Keywords: disability, service provision, attitudes

Pheroza Daruwalla is Senior Lecturer in tourism and hospitality management at the University of Western Sydney (Penrith South DC, NSW 1797, Australia. Email <p.daruwalla@uws.edu.au>). Her research interests are in attitudes to people with disabilities and the educational praxis of hospitality and tourism. **Simon Darcy** has a broad interest in leisure and tourism participation patterns, public policy, environmental planning, and universal design.

INTRODUCTION

In research on attitudes of the general public towards people with disabilities, Barker, Wright, Myerson and Gonick (1953) concluded that the public verbalizes favorable attitudes towards people with disabilities but actually possesses deeper un verbalized feelings which are frequently rejecting (Daruwalla 1999:61).

The purpose of this paper is to explore the role, nature and impact of disability awareness training in the industry. Central to this examination are the differences in personal and societal attitudes and in examining these attitudes, it is important to understand the genesis of attitudes and their formation as well as important constructs related to attitudes towards people with disabilities. It is evident that the service providers in the tourism industry are given very little education and training concerning legislation, access provision and service related to people with disabilities (Darcy 2000; McKercher, Packer, Yau and Lam 2003; Miller and Kirk 2002; O' Neill and Knight 2000). Additionally, literature dealing with attitudes towards people with disabilities is scarce. A survey of the subject index in the Annals of Tourism Research (Long 1998) revealed only one study (Smith 1987) addressing this issue.

The hospitality, tourism, leisure, and recreation literature represents disability in very distinctive ways. The leisure and recreation literature focuses on constraints to inclusive provision (Bedini and Henderson 1994; Bedini and McCann 1992; Luken 1993; Muloin and Clarke 1993) while the hospitality and tourism literature reviews issues from an employment perspective (Alexander 1994; Kohl and Greenlaw 1992; Romeo 1990, 1992; Woods and Kavanaugh 1992). Economic

issues of hiring and easing staff shortages are examined by authors such as Dietl (1988); Lattuca and Scarpati (1989); Schapire and Berger (1984); Smith (1992) and Stokes (1990).

In Australia, Darcy (2000, 1998), Darcy and Daruwalla (1999), Daruwalla (1999) and O'Neill and Knight (2000) address the issue of attitudes, education and awareness as part of the experience. Murray and Sproats (1990), Darcy (1998, 2002, 2002a) and Darcy and Daruwalla (1999) examine the demand side perceptions and supply side perceptions of operators are limited to Darcy (2000) who completed a scoping study of operators in the accommodation sector and O' Neill and Knight's (2000) study of operators to ascertain their understanding of the needs of tourists with a disability. Attempts to measure attitudes and attitude change in the industry (supply side) have been limited. This paper reports on research to redress this gap in the literature.

ATTITUDE FORMATION AND CHANGE

Attitudes are generally thought to be part of the socialization process. Authors such as Chubon (1992:303) broadly classify attitude formation into four major categories, behavioral, consistency, information integration and function theory. Each of these four categories is briefly discussed to contextualize the discussion on the data gathered from the Interaction with Disabled Persons Scale (IDP) and Scale of Attitudes towards Disabled Persons (SADP) scales in the study.

Horne (1985) explains behavioral theories as being construed as a response to environmental stimuli. Incentive is a further factor to consider in the forming and changing of attitudes towards a referent object. Triandis (1971) and Gergen and Gergen (1986) suggest that communication

practices play an important role in behavioral change theories. These communication practices then have a vital function in the development of change programs.

Consistency theories refer to the need for persons to maintain balance or consistency in interpersonal relations and cognitions thorough their beliefs, feelings and actions. The concept of “cognitive dissonance” relates to the incongruities and the psychological discomfort experienced by non disabled persons, who attempt to avoid this “inconsistency” by either reducing their interactions or avoiding situations with people with disabilities (Gething 1986; Nicoll 1988). Siller (1964) referred to this phenomenon as that of “strain in social interaction”. Age old practices and consequent worldviews of institutionalization, segregation from mainstream society and the societal exposure of charity recipients has further reinforced cognitive dissonance aspects in non disabled persons. The Lewinian model of change proposed that such dissonance could be modified through the reduction of the discomfort or by introducing a “driving force” (Hickson 1995:49-50). Driving forces include the presentation of information aimed at modifying or changing presently held positions. These may include equal status contact with a person with a disability as part of an attitude change/modification intervention.

Information integration theory deals with the concept that a person’s attitudes are a reflection of their knowledge and belief about an object and that it is possible to change these beliefs through the introduction of new information. Thus, information integration is the cornerstone of attitude change programs providing salient and contemporary information. For example, the introduction of information aimed at changing people’s perceptions from a medical model to a social model (Oliver 1990, 1996) contributes significantly to the contemporary understanding of disability.

Function or functionalist theory is subdivided into four categories based on the purpose served. The knowledge function allows a person a frame of reference for evaluating attitudes toward referent objects. These frames of reference serve to help individuals understand the world and events (Antonak and Livneh 1988:12). The social adjustment function allows a person to identify with, or gain the approval of, important reference groups. It is intrinsically related to the earning of rewards and the minimization of penalties by conforming with and completing sanctioned tasks and behaviors (Katz 1960). The value expressive function allows an individual to give expression to their central values and self concept or to facilitate value expressions. They achieve self satisfaction through the combined function of asserting their own self and assimilating the values and attitudes of their group (Antonak and Livneh 1988). The ego defensive function allows individuals to reflect or externalize unresolved inner personal problems (Voyatzakis 1994). Antonak and Livneh (1988) suggest a fifth function that of “reinforcers”. These trigger certain behaviors, whether positive or negative, dependent on the perspective held.

Yuker (1977) and Gellman (1960) have indicated that attitudes are learned. The attribution of positive and negative prejudice is learned and often these attributions have little bearing on the disability itself. Thus, in the case of positive prejudice, people are lionized as being selfless, brave and so on. In the case of negative prejudice, they may be perceived as helpless, dependent, ungrateful, selfish, freakish, evil, deranged, tragic, depressed or special (Hume 1995). Wright (1980, 1983) termed this a form of prejudice “spread”. These stereotypical views of disability also include the assumption that one disability includes the characteristics of other impairment groups. An example of this would be a service provider who, assuming that a wheelchair user is unable to communicate, does not address this person directly but talks to the companion instead.

Lack of information, knowledge and fear that are generally experienced by wider society, all contribute towards negative attitudes.

Wrightsmann and Brigham's (1973) observation that attitudes may change in order for a person to function more effectively in their environment is an important consideration in the introduction of disability awareness programs for industry service providers. This in turn may be extrapolated to persons who take on particular attitudes in order to be "consistent" with their peers, to fit into certain environments or simply to avoid attracting sanctions by going against prevailing ideas and trends. This idea also leads to the importance of the changing personal attitudes of service personnel as a means of reflecting prevailing societal beliefs.

At their most basic level, personal attitudes may be described as beliefs and opinions held by an individual about a referent object, for instance, voting, disability or multiculturalism. Societal attitudes, on the other hand, refer to prevailing beliefs espoused by and influenced by governments, cultural orientation, historical background or other prevailing conditions. Societal attitudes tend to be more remote and do not necessarily have congruence with personal attitudes. This very remoteness allows for differences between the two. The differences may also be understood in terms of distancing, with greater accountability demanded in personal rather than societal attitudes. Overt political correctness has also influenced societal perspectives, so rhetorical and abstract notions, particularly as measured by scales, are influenced by media exposure or other educative campaigns. However, these campaigns often fail to change the deeply held and internalized belief systems of individuals. Media portrayals tend to lionize or demonize, positive prejudice being applied to Paralympic athletes and other exceptional "Superhero" examples, at the same time as, people who are mentally ill are being demonized.

The media also play a significant role in attitude formation by stereotyping of disability and disability issues (Adams 1998; Chynoweth 2000; Gilbert, MacCauley and Smale 1997).

Sources of negative bias towards people with disabilities include sociological perspectives. The most common of these is the “labeling or deviance theory”. Goffman (1961) and Rosenhahn (1973) describe the “non humanization” and stigmatization particularly of those with a mental illness. The construction of what is “normal” or “abnormal” contributes to this stigmatization and stereotyping and is a function of socialization processes. The move away from constructing disability through this medical model worldview to a social model perspective is an important refinement of perspective.

Conceptualizations of “normalcy” are the basis of the medical model (Oliver 1990). Disability, impairment and handicap are underlying assumptions of an “objective scientific” construct of the normal. As such, these concepts are supposed to be objectively measurable. However, Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999), Chadwick (1994) and Linton (1998) challenge these notions of scientific normalcy. In contrast, the social model views disability as the product of social structures and places it firmly on the social, economic and political agendas. The oppression, exclusion and segregation of people with impairments from participation in mainstream activities are not a result of the person’s impairment but a function of the *disabling* social environments and prevailing “hostile social attitudes” (Barnes 1996:43). These hostile social views represent it as a personal tragedy of the individual and the impaired body (Oliver 1996; Shakespeare 1994). This medical model worldview in western society also implies a normative value structure that is challenged by the social model. The social model views it not as “other” but as part of human diversity. As Charlton (1998) argues, disability is part of the continuum of humanity, as

evidenced by the 500 million people with disabilities living today. Statistical data collection of western governments shows that between 10 to 19 percent of their populations identify as having a disability.

As suggested by Alexander (1994), the industry holds the same negative attitudes and stereotypes as the rest of society. However, as Alexander discovered, managers of destination marketing organizations became very astute at providing politically correct responses about employing people with disabilities while their behavior and practices remained unchanged. This reaction echoes the behavior and practices to be found in wider social policy formation and evaluation which reflects the policy makers' view that it is a personal tragedy of the individual. This has led to an orientation of charity over civil rights, professional hegemony over user power, individual rehabilitation over collective needs and segregation over inclusion (Priestly 1998). The social model has been applied to understand and construct debate and experiences of tourists with disabilities discussed at some length by Darcy (2002a:62-63). His research includes the call to identify socially constructed constraints and formulate strategies to mitigate the resulting negative tourism experiences.

The Attitude-Behavior Nexus

“Behavior is a mirror in which everyone shows his (sic) image” (Goethe quoted in Ajzen 1988:1). In examining the attitude behavior consistency approach, Oskamp (1977:226-227) defines behavior as “overt responses”. The two key concepts of “situational thresholds and pseudo inconsistency” were used to define and explain the connection (or lack thereof) between attitudes and behavior.

Ajzen (1988) refers to the differences in probability levels of occurrence between a person's verbal attitude statements and overt behaviors as "situational thresholds". This discrepancy may involve such factors as: the instability of attitudes and intentions over time; competing attitudes, motives and values; and the inadequacy of the attitude holder who may lack the intellectual, verbal or social skills to recognize that their attitudes and behavior do not match (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975). Other factors that cause this discrepancy relate to lack of "volitional control", where the individual is unable to exercise the behavior voluntarily because of external or other limitations and the possibility that they may have no suitable alternatives available. A further discrepancy may be engendered by the need for "proper" behavior. This is particularly salient for the study reported in this paper where verbal/written attitudes measured by a paper pencil instrument (scale) may not necessarily translate into appropriate behaviors when confronted by the referent "object". Additionally, the fear of sanctions or repercussions may cause inconsistencies in the attitudes espoused and the behaviors exhibited.

The second concept of "pseudo inconsistency" between behaviors and attitudes is magnified when race and disability are raised. Due to the notions of "proper" behavior, persons might be constrained in face to face interactions. Their underlying attitudes however, might be quite different when measured in a questionnaire. The converse may be equally true, when attitudes measured by a paper and pencil instrument are shown to be quite positive but overt behaviors may be less than positive. Bogardus (1933) and Thurstone and Chave (1929) address the issues of overt-covert expressions or opinions. Bogardus believed that opinions represented logical, rational and conscious aspects of beliefs while attitudes did not. Thurstone, on the other hand, postulated that written and oral opinions are overt expressions and attitudes were more likely to be inferred and covert in nature. For example, a non disabled person who replied in the

affirmative when asked face-to-face (overt) whether people with disabilities should have children but who marked “strongly disagree” on a written scale when anonymity was guaranteed.

Scales and Issues of Measurement of Attitudes

A number of scales exist to measure attitudes towards disability. These scales measure attitudes that are impairment specific, (Attitude to Blindness Scale, A Scale of Knowledge and Attitudes Toward Epilepsy and People with Epilepsy) and general, (Interaction with Disabled Persons Scale, Attitude Towards Disabled Persons Scale, and Disability Factors Scale). In the studies described, two scales were used to measure personal and societal attitudes. Both instruments have been widely tested and the literature attests to their psychometric soundness (Antonak and Livneh, 1988; Gething 1994a; Gething, Wheeler, Cote, Furnham, Hudek-Knezevic, Kumpf, McKee, Rola and Sellick 1997). Factors considered in selecting the scales included dimensionality (uni or multi where more than one dimension of attitude is measured), focus (societal or personal), social desirability bias and potential for faking, disability type (general or specific named), reliability and validity criteria, concept clustering, forced response, length of scale and additional information regarding the presence of test banks and the origins of the instrument. Psychometric soundness, applicability of the scales to industry contexts and the use of two reliable scales was infinitely preferable to a one shot model (self developed scale) and more likely to yield data that could be generalized and compared with other vocational groups such as nurses, rehabilitation professionals and retail employees.

The first scale was the Interaction with Disabled Persons (IDP) scale (Gething 1994a). It is an instrument comprising 20 items that are rated on a six point scale ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. There is no mid point or neutral option. “The scale was devised for Australian

conditions to measure discomfort in social interaction which is posited to reflect reactions associated with non accepting or negative attitudes towards people with disabilities” (Gething 1991:12). The scale measures attitudes at a personal level and is based on the assumption that negative attitudes are reflections of the subjects’ lack of association with the object and that this lack of information or strangeness engenders feelings of uncertainty and anxiety (Gething 1993). It is these feelings of cognitive dissonance, referred to earlier, that are measured by the scale. A pro forma accompanies the scale to gather socio demographic information on gender, age, education level, occupational status and prior level of contact and knowledge of people with disabilities. While it was developed and primarily tested in Australia, the scale has been translated into four languages and tested in nine different countries. It has also been tested as part of a battery of research scales designed to assess attitudes towards people with disabilities.

The second scale used was the Scale of Attitudes towards Disabled Persons (SADP) (Antonak 1981). It consists of a summated rating scale with 24 items. Respondents rate each item on a six point scale ranging from *I disagree very much* (-3) to *I agree very much* (+3). No mid point or neutral response is provided and the scale is designed to measure attitudes to disability as a group and at a societal level. The score ranges from 0 to 144 with a higher score indicating a more positive attitude. Three factors were delineated in assessing the reliability of the instrument and these broadly related to human rights, behavioral misconceptions and societal perceptions of pessimism/hopelessness as aspects related to disability. The measures of validity of the scale measure attitude domains have been broadly classified as: civil and legal rights; equity and equality; and destructive stereotypes of personality and social characteristics (Antonak and Livneh 1988:161).

Research Design

Two samples of convenience (Jennings 2001) and captive groups (Veal 1997) were used. The initial sample had 175 respondents drawn from University (120) and Technical and Further Education (TAFE) (55), with data collected in September 1996. The second sample was a government tourism organization where disability awareness training was being implemented as part of Australian legislative procedures to comply with disability legislation under the *Australian Disability Discrimination Act 1992*. This second study consisted of 176 respondents who were drawn from a state-based tourism organization (137) and from government employees (39) involved in industry provision. Data was collected between June to November 2002. In both studies, attitudes were measured prior to and post the training. For the initial sample a follow up measurement was done after one month.

The initial study of 175 respondents comprised a mixture of hospitality and tourism students enrolled in a diploma program at vocational institutes and first-year and second year university degree in urban New South Wales, Australia. The primary differences between the education imparted between the two institutions are the vocational and technical emphasis provided by technical institutes as opposed to a more management focused, less hands-on experience offered by the university sector.

For the initial sample, 33% were male and 67% female. The predominant age group (49%) of respondents was 20-29 years followed by 16-19 years (45%). Respondents (52%) identified themselves as having contact with a person with a disability less than once in three months. Surprisingly, 20% of the sample identified themselves as having weekly contact with a people with disabilities. In terms of educational qualifications, 79% of the sample identified as having

achieved Year 12 qualifications, which was unsurprising given that most students proceed to TAFE or university post Year 12. A majority of the respondents (54%) were involved in food and beverage provision, 3% in front office, 14% in a customer service role and 28% were full-time students.

The study aimed to measure the most efficacious means of changing attitudes towards people with disabilities. The study used an experimental design, with a control group and two groups where the intervention variables were manipulated. One group received only lecture and video intervention while the other group received lecture, video, role-play and contact with people with disabilities as an intervention. The respondents were surveyed three times, first prior to any intervention taking place, second immediately post the intervention and finally, in a follow up one month after the interventions. The results were then collated to measure differences *between* (i.e. based on the intervention method, control, lecture and video or lecture, video, role play and contact) and *within* (pre, post or follow up measurement) groups on both scales. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to measure the relationship of the demographic variables.

The results showed that differences were detected not only in terms of levels of significance but also in trends of mean scores (not statistically significant). A number of hypotheses were tested. These included whether attitudes could be altered through a disability attitude intervention program. The efficacy of using contact and two way communication (lecture, video, role play and contact) as compared to one way communication (lecture and video only) and comparisons between attitudes of different cohorts of students were studied. Coding was done to ensure matched pairs/triples of the surveys could be identified. Thus, it was possible to measure an individual's scores through pre, post and follow up testing.

The second study of 176 employees consisted of 118 respondents drawn from a large state based tourism organization and 19 trainees from the same organization. Of the respondents 39 were government employees involved in tourism provision in a regional area. Demographic variables were completed by only 101 of the sample and data revealed that 29% were female and 72% were male. Results revealed that 30% of the sample had less than once in three monthly contact with a person with a disability and 23% had weekly contact. Age demographics revealed 32% of the sample fell in the age range of 30-39 years, followed by 31% aged 20-29, 24% aged 40-49 and 13% were 50-59 years. Educational demographics indicated 43% of the sample were graduates and 22% were postgraduates while 24% had Year 12 qualifications.

The second study of tourism organizations was designed to implement the best practice identified by the results of the first study. All groups received the Interaction with Disabled Persons scale in a pre and post measurement. The intervention consisted of a disability awareness training program that included lecture, video, role play and contact with people with disabilities. The confidentiality and anonymity provisions of the research did not allow for matched pairs and individual scores to be tracked. Further, while the organization was supportive of the research, it stipulated a two hour time limit to the training and would only approve the use of the Australian IDP scale.

Results indicated that this second group had significant change in attitude after the training, with women being more affected than men. Analysis of the data also revealed that the trainee group experienced the least significant changes in attitudes post the training. This might have been due to the small sample size or alternatively might represent a general resistance to personal attitude

changes. Compared to other vocational groups such as judicial system employees, nurses, rehabilitation professionals and so on, industry employees had more negative attitudes prior to training. Their post training scores, however, were more positive and comparable to other vocational groups.

Detailed findings of the studies are beyond the scope of this paper, however the following synopsis presents the major findings, concentrating further on the differences between personal and societal attitudes.

Study Results

Results from both studies indicated that it was possible to change attitudes of industry staff and students through an intervention program. An analysis of the data revealed that this change tended to be more efficacious and longer lasting when subjects were exposed to a controlled form of contact with a person with a disability, giving them the opportunity to increase their knowledge about persons living with a disability. Additional findings from the initial study concluded that it was subjects who were both better educated (i.e. second year students) and had greater exposure to working in the industry (TAFE and second year university students) who tended to have longer lasting attitude change. First year students, while more impressionable and reactive to the initial attitude awareness, tended to have short lived attitude change as measured by the one month follow up. This would suggest that repeated exposure and practical knowledge would enhance the levels of knowledge and the attitude and behaviors of service personnel. In terms of demographic significance to attitudes, an analysis of the data revealed no differences between male and female attitudes of students.

The differences between societal and personal attitudes measured by the two scales form the primary focus of the discussion in the following section. In the initial study of 175 students from the industry, it was hypothesized that significant differences would emerge between personal and societal attitudes. The results indicated that significant differences occurred at the $p < .05$, $p < .01$ and $p < .001$ between, within and in the ANOVA on scales. Tables 1 and 2 show the differences in pre, post and follow up surveys for the initial sample on the scale scores. The tables show an administration (Admin) column that identifies the intervention to each sample group (Cont = Control; LV = Lecture and Video; LVRC = Lecture, Video, Role play and Contact) the pre, post and follow up survey scores, and the significant difference scores within the groups (Sig.Diff. within). The other columns represent each sample group (TAFE 1, 2 and 3; Univ 1, 2 and 3) and the significant difference scores between the TAFE and University sample groups (Sig.Diff. between TAFE; Sig.Diff. between Univ). The significant difference scores are presented or non significance (n.s.) noted. The tables also illustrate the changes between and within groups. Lower scores on the IDP scale represent positive attitudes. The SADP scale is the reverse, with lower scores representing negative attitudes.

Table 1. Heans and Standard Deviations using the IDP scale

Admin	TAFE 1	TAFE 2	TAFE 3	Sig.Diff. Between TAFE	Univ 1	Univ 2	Univ 3	Sig. Diff Between Univ
Intervention	Control	LV	LVRC		Control	LV	LVRC	
Pre	71.94 (8.64)	69.24 (9.97)	70.17 (8.09)	n.s.	71.38 (8.26)	73.00 (8.69)	68.96 (8.14)	LV&LVRC t=2.23 p>.05 (.029)
Post	0	66.10 (9.12)	63.33 (11.73)	n.s.	0	72.65 (9.75)	69.07 (9.69)	n.s.
Follow up	72.19 (8.27)	64.48 (8.07)	63.67 (10.85)	LV&Cont t=-2.85 p<.01 (.007) LVRC& Cont t=-2.55 p<.02 (.016)	71.94 (8.75)	72.22 (10.63)	66.46 (9.97)	LV&LVRC t=2.59 p=.01 LVRC&Cont t=2.56 p=.01
Sig. Diff Within	n.s.	Pre&Post t=2.42 p<.05 (.025) Pre&Fol t=2.57 p<.02 (.018) n.s. Post&Fol	Pre&Post t=3.14 p<.01 (.006) Pre&Fol t=3.10 p<.01 (.007) n.s. Post&Fol		n.s.	n.s.	Post&Fol t=2.35 p<.05 (.023) n.s. Pre&Post Pre&Fol	

Table 2 – Means and Standard Deviations using the SADP scale

Admin	TAFE 1	TAFE 2	TAFE 3	Univ 1	Univ 2	Univ 3	Sig. Diff
Intervention	Control	LV	LVRC	Control	LV	LVRC	
Pre	98.3 (14.6)	99.4 (17.0)	106.9 (11.6)	100.7 (13.4)	100.5 (14.0)	103.0 (14.0)	F=.946 df 5,164 p>.05
Post	0	113.2 (14.3)	120.0 (11.7)	0	115.1 (14.8)	115.9 (12.7)	F=.872 df 3,117 p>.05
Follow	108.6 (13.5)	111.1 (17.0)	120.8 (12.2)	108.1 (12.5)	113.8 (12.5)	111.7 (14.5)	F=2.29 df 5,161 p=.05
Sig. Diff within groups	Pre&Fol t=2.47 df 15 p<.05	Pre&Post t=5.752 df17 p<.001	Pre&Post t=5.962 df 17 p<.001	Pre&Post t=3.163 df 30 p<.001	Pre&Post t=8.849 df 37 p<.001	Pre&Post t=9.093 df 41 p<.001	
Paired Tests		Pre&Fol t=5.041 df 19 p<.001	Pre&Fol t=5.229 df 17 p<.001		Pre&Fol t=6.921 df 35 p<.001	Pre&Fol t=2.780 df 42 p<.01	
						Post&Fol t=3.487 df 40 P=.001	

An examination of the frequency of significance levels (that is, $p<.001$, $p<.01$ and $p<.05$) revealed that the societal scale had many more highly significant scores as compared to the personal data scale. Table 3 represents these results by comparing the numbers of items on the scales. Results indicated that the IDP scale showed changes in personal attitudes in terms of within (**3** at $p<.05$, **3** at $p<.01$ and **zero** at $p<.001$) administrations (that is, pre, post and follow up). Equally significantly, differences were also observed between groups (**3** at $p<.05$, **4** at $p<.01$ and **1** at $p<.001$) in terms of the intervention. Further, in terms of the ANOVA of demographic variables the results indicated that prior contact with people with disabilities, the method of the intervention and whether the respondent was a first year or second year student were all significant.

Table 3: Frequency of significance on the IDP and SADP scales

Level of significance	Within	Between	ANOVA
.05 IDP	3 e.g LV TAFE, Pre and Post, t = 2.42 p<.05 (.025)	3	2 Prior contact with a person with a disability
.05 SADP	2	0	0
.01 IDP	3	4 e.g LV and Control TAFE Follow up, t= -2.85 p<.01 (.007)	2 Use of intervention Prior contact with a person with a disability
.01 SADP	3	0	1 Whether first or second year university student
.001 IDP	0	1	5 e.g Intervention, TAFE and University, Post, f= 24.91 p<.001
.001 SADP	15	0	0

On the other hand, the results from the SADP measurement demonstrated that changes in attitude were at highly significant ($p < .001$) levels within administrations of the instrument (pre, post and follow up). However, differences between groups (Control, LV and LVRC) and ANOVA of demographic variables, while not being statistically significant, demonstrated significant trend differences in mean scores. Statistically significant differences occurred in terms of whether the respondents were first year or second year students. TAFE and second year university students had less positive attitudes than did first year students immediately after the interventions.

The IDP scale has been administered to thousands of Australians and the establishment of a data bank allows for comparisons between different administrations of the instrument. Results comparing attitudes of tourism related personnel from the second study with other occupational groups in Australia such as health and rehabilitation personnel indicated that tourism employees tended to have less positive attitudes. The attitudes of the second study group tended to be comparable to university students. Implications for these less positive attitudes are discussed more fully later in the paper, when considering the impact they have on the provision of services to people with disabilities by the tourism industry. Table 4 illustrates differences in mean scores

between tourism and other occupational groups (adapted from Cameron, Darcy and Daruwalla 2002). Table 4 also presents the mean scores on the IDP scale between pre and post testing of the sample, showing the shift to more positive attitudes post the intervening training.

Table 4 - Comparisons with other Australian groups

Sample	Sample Size	Mean	SD
Tourism Employees			
Pre	118	74.3	11.1
Post	109	69.8	11.0
Tourism Trainees			
Pre	19	75.0	14.4
Post	25	71.2	9.2
H&T Govt Employees			
Pre	39	73.6	10.9
Post	39	67.0	10.3
Comparative Data			
General population	4180	64.1	12.2
Members of judicial system	59	67.5	12.2
Government employees	541	63.0	12.5
High School students	181	69.3	11.3
University education students	118	72.8	10.8
University nursing students (Year 1)	272	67.3	10.1
University nursing students (Year 2)	104	65.5	9.8
University nursing students (Year 3)	136	63.3	10.4
Registered nurses	372	62.3	10.3
Enrolled nurses	376	60.0	11.0
Physical therapists	123	58.6	9.7
Medical therapists	171	61.1	10.2
Rehabilitation professionals	351	58.8	12.3
Members of a disability agency	63	60.8	12.8
H&T Students	175	69.2	11.0

Significant differences between the two scales should not have been surprising, given the different foci of the scales (personal versus societal) and Gething's (1994a) commentary regarding the non significant relationship between the two scales. Researchers such as Eberly, Eberly and Wright (1981); Rickman (1993); Semmel and Dickson (1966); Snyder, Kleck, Strenta and Mentzer (1979), and Stovall and Sedlacek (1983) give credence to the notion that it is much easier to make an impact on societal attitudes when contrasted to personal values and attitudes where individuals are likely to feel more threatened by contact with people with disabilities. Rickman noted that:

data from studies investigating interaction behavior showed that, whenever possible college students have avoided contact attitudes were generally more favorable

for relatively distant or transient situations than for more permanent situations (1993:58).

While results from the analysis of both instruments indicated changes in attitudes, some significant disparities arose. These disparities were that personal attitudes tended to be more affected by the type of intervention and immediately after the intervention. Thus, respondents who met a person with a disability tended to have more significant changes in personal attitude than those who had no contact. Societal attitudes as measured by the SADP, while affected at much more significant levels ($p < .001$), tended to be independent of the type of intervention received. Thus, in the initial study, respondents showed significant change in societal attitudes, regardless of the intervention employed, whether lecture and video or lecture, video, role play and contact. This would imply that societal attitudes improve regardless of the type of intervention used, whereas for personal attitudes to improve, it is important to incorporate personal contact. Thus, in the second study of industry employees, two out of three facilitators in the component using direct contact were persons with a disability. Data resulting from this intervention and measured by the IDP scale indicates that, while there was some change in attitude, it was not as significant as the change in SADP scores in the initial study.

In the one month follow up conducted after the initial study, the data revealed that while personal attitudes were affected immediately after the intervention, attitudes reverted to more negative levels in the intervening one month period (see Table 1 Follow up scores). Societal attitude change however, tended to persist at more positive levels in the one month intervening period (see Table 2 Follow up scores). The implications of this for education are that constant reinforcement and refreshers are needed if attitude change is to become internalized and

persistent. On the job interaction with people with disabilities would further affect attitude and managers could reinforce training outcomes by incorporating disability customer service in routine management practices.

There are three possible reasons for the incongruity in results in the initial study: The first involves the simultaneous positioning of the instrument as both were handed out to respondents together. However, respondents were encouraged to complete the IDP before the SADP. This positioning might in itself have had an “edumetric” (Gething 1994b:246) effect wherein the IDP scale tended to make respondents more sensitive to the issue of attitudes towards people with disabilities. It might equally be suggested that completing the IDP had a “contamination effect” (Gething 1994:13) and this highlights the need to change the order of the administration of the instruments in future studies, to test whether there is any impact of the positioning of the instruments. Thus, more positive attitudes in the societal scale pretest scores even by those in the control group might be explained by this edumetric effect, caused by first completing the personal scale.

The second issue is the wording of items on the instruments. Gething (1991a) suggests that the wording of items may tend to polarize views and this may affect responses. The wording on the SADP may be interpreted as being both provocative and challenging whereas the IDP tends to state items more mildly. Reactions by respondents to societal items were quite forceful in certain instances. For example, item 22 which states, “Disabled people indulge in bizarre and deviant sexual behavior”. This item elicited written responses such as “Not my business”, “How should I know about this”, and “I can’ t comment”.

The third issue is the origin of each instrument: respondents queried terminology, wording and meaning of statements on the SADP. This querying, however, did not occur for items on the Australian developed IDP and linguistic interpretation difficulties were not presented to a primarily Australian audience. The SADP is American in origin and used both terminology and contextual references that were unfamiliar to a primarily Australian audience. This finding is important as it shows that even in Western nations, where there are many cultural similarities, there are still cultural differences involving language use and approaches to disability.

Implications for Management

The implications for tourism management drawn from these results include the likelihood that societal attitudes will change and remain more positive, regardless of the type of intervention (education, training, disability awareness program). However, for personal attitudes to change and become more positive, an intervention program that uses role play and contact with people with disabilities will be more effective. It may be argued that in an industry context, the attitude change needs to be more personal. This assertion is based on some specific characteristics of the tourism industry, namely the intangibility of personal service provision, the heterogeneity of services and the inseparability of the production and consumption of many services (Shames and Glover 1989; Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry 1990). Thus the “one on one” nature of services and the unpredictability (situational, locational or people specific) of the service encounter, point to the need for operators to have positive personal attitudes to maximize the satisfaction of the service encounter. Further, the service encounter is not “a relatively distant or transient situation” (Rickman 1993:58) that allows for good societal attitudes but poor personal attitudes. This then raises the issue of how to improve attitudes, using contact as a major influencer.

A note of caution needs to be added in relation to the use of contact as an intervention strategy. The use of contact as an intervention method in changing attitudes has its genesis in Allport's (1954) seminal work on contact theory. More specifically the use of equal status or higher status contact to change attitudes is emphasized by writers such as Cook (1962); Gething (1994); Hannah (1988); Leach (1990); Westwood, Vargo and Vargo (1981), and Wright (1988). Equal or higher status contact refers to the contact where the audience and the person with a disability are from a similar background. Examples would be tourism academics and students in an attitude change workshop facilitated by an academic or student with a disability. The focus of this contact also needs to be based on the person's abilities and the disabling environments that they encounter rather than the medical diagnoses of impairment. There is a need to place the contact in the context of a social model approach, rather than reinforce the curiosity of the non disabled about the person's "personal tragedy/individual heroism" as is so often espoused by the media. Positive experiences regarding the nature and perspective of disability are more likely to achieve positive attitude change and overcome "cognitive dissonance" in the non disabled. A peer with a disability facilitated the student respondents of the initial study. Persons with a range of disabilities (mobility, sensory and intellectual) were incorporated into the survey design. For the respondents drawn from tourism organizations, the research design incorporated facilitators (with disabilities) who were industry and academic specialists in tourism.

The use of videos such as *The Year of the Patronizing Bastard* (Denton 1990), the trigger tape with some industry related contexts from the Disability Awareness Package (Gething 1994) and industry specific awareness packages (Western Australian Disability Services Commission 2000) also provide support for discussions. The role of stereotyping and stigmatization need attention when attitude change programs are considered. Participants need to be reminded that persons

with disabilities are a microcosm of the general population and individuals in their own right. Thus, the application of broad generalities is both dehumanizing and inappropriate. It is critical that, in developing program that uses contact, this contact is meaningful and relevant to the situation. Positive contact serves to reinforce where negative contact may result in stereotyping and avoidance.

In industry contexts, it is essential that both business enterprises and educational institutes that offer tourism and hospitality programs put disability awareness education firmly on the agenda. Organizations may do this through a variety of ways, including mandatory modules on disability awareness in both orientation and performance appraisal programs. Educational institutes need to address these issues as a subject, or by lectures within generic subjects, including topics of market segmentation and human rights obligations under international and national frameworks.

The delivery of disability awareness programs needs to be carefully considered, including the delivery of relevant and industry specific information. The human rights and legislative implications of the discriminatory nature of poor attitudes in a business context need to be highlighted. These same frameworks identify the need for education to form the basis of social change and promote the use of people from the community to provide the contact and act as facilitators. Well structured programs focusing on ability and employing appropriate material could also be used to form part of a worldwide accreditation system that to some extent standardizes the service a person can expect from enterprises within the tourism industry.

Other recommendations for industry and educational institutions interested in implementing disability awareness education would be the modification of the demographic instrument to

collect information about ethnicity. This information would greatly enhance the provision of diversity training to people of different cultural backgrounds. As Miles (2000) argues, there are different conceptualizations of disability from western and eastern perspectives and from developed and developing world perspectives. A cross-cultural/cross-countries study would add to the information on how different cultures perceive and respond to disability and people with disabilities in the industry. A further recommendation would be the testing of the instruments in an industry setting amongst service providers.

Apart from the human rights and social justice issues that surround negative attitudes and behavior, management of industry enterprises needs to be cognizant that discriminatory practice can result in legal proceedings. Discriminatory practices have resulted in lawsuits in the USA (Andorka 1999; Peniston 1996; Salomon 1996; Seal 1994; Worcester 2000), UK (Goodall 2002) and Australia (Darcy 2002). The lawsuits highlighted in these studies document a multitude of industry practices that ignore basic customer service provision and deny people their citizenship rights. From an industry perspective, the effects go beyond the scope of monetary restitution required of the providers resulting in poor publicity, loss of goodwill and loss of business.

The economic implications of legal proceedings and the under servicing of the group impact on the industry. People with disabilities have friends, family and business associates similar to non disabled customers. The multiplier effect of inadequate access to premises and services extends not only to the person with a disability but also to those who accompany them when they partake of these services (Darcy 2003; Harris Interactive Market Research 2002). Management that claims, “we don’t have people with disabilities using our premises/services” is not only excluding a significant proportion of the population but also a great number of other patrons,

such as families with small children and the seniors market, who require similar services. The practice of universal design (Aslaksen, Bergh, Bringa, and Heggem 1998) and disability awareness training for staff, offer the potential of securing a loyal and growing market.

CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the role, nature and impact of disability awareness training in the industry. It has shown that disability awareness training can be a valuable resource in forming and changing the personal attitudes of non disabled persons towards people with disabilities. While previous studies have identified the need for disability awareness training, the tourism industry has not been forthcoming in developing access and service provisions to meet the needs of this group. Human rights legislation in many western countries has had the salutary effect of preventing service providers from overtly discriminating. However, the industry as a whole has been reluctant to embrace the concepts of universal design (for access) and disability awareness training, while at the same time it claims to be informed (Darcy 2002; Goodall 2002; O'Neill and Knight 2000).

Operators and service providers need to be moved from the mindset of just wanting to meet their legislated human rights obligations to exemplary service provision. As they do when focusing on any market segment, service providers need to internalize a more holistic embrace of attitudinal modification to service the tourism experience. The service and the experience would then be lifted from the banal to the truly memorable. This internalization of positive attitude by industry service personnel would influence both personal and societal attitudes towards people with disabilities and help in the creation of a more civil society.

REFERENCES

Adams, P.

2000 High Hurdles for Able-Bodied. *The Weekend Australian* October 21:31.

Ajzen, I.

1988 *Attitudes, Personality and Behaviour*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Alexander, R.

1994 *Attitudes Towards the Disabled in Destination Marketing Organizations*.

PhD dissertation. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Allport, G.

1954 *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading: Addison Wesley.

Andorka, F.

1999 Bass Settles Disputes over ADA Compliance. *Hotel and Motel Management*

214(2):1, 30.

Antonak, R.

1981 Development and Psychometric Analysis of the Scale of Attitudes Toward

Disabled Persons. *The Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*. 13(2):22-29.

Antonak, R., and H. Livneh

1988 *The Measurement of Attitudes Toward People with Disabilities, Methods,*

Psychometrics and Scales. Springfield: Charles Thomas Publisher.

Aslaksen, F., S. Bergh, O. Bringa, and E. Heggem

1997 *Universal Design: Planning and Design for All*. Oslo: The Norwegian State Council
on Disability.

ABS

1998 Catalogue No. 4430.0: *Disability, Ageing and Carers, Australia*. Summary of

- Findings. Canberra, Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Barker, R., B. Wright, L. Myerson, and M. Gonick
1953 Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of
Physique and Disability. New York: Social Sciences Research Council.
- Barnes, C.
1996 Theories of Disability and the Origins of the Oppression of Disabled People in
Western Society. In Disability and Society: Emerging Issues and Insights. L. Barton,
ed. pp., 43-60. New York: Longman.
- Barnes, C., G. Mercer, and T. Shakespeare
1999 Culture, Leisure and the Media. In Exploring Disability: A Sociological
Introduction. C. Barnes, G. Mercer, and T. Shakespeare, eds., pp., 182-210. Malden:
Polity Press.
- Bedini, L., and K. Henderson
1994 Women with Disabilities and the Challenge to Leisure Service Providers. Journal of
Parks and Recreation Administration 12(1):17-23.
- Bedini, L., and C. McCann
1992 Tearing Down the Shameful Walls of Exclusion. Parks and Recreation 27(4):
40-44.
- Bogardus, E.
1933 A Social Distance Scale. Sociology and Social Research 9: 299-308.
- Cameron, B., S. Darcy, and P. Daruwalla
2002 Disability Awareness Training Resources for Government Tourism Organisations.
Kew: Easy Access Australia Pty Ltd.
- Chadwick, A.

1994 For Disabled People the Body is the Principal Site of Oppression, Both in Form and What is Done to it? Australian Disability Review 4:36-44.

Charlton, J.

1998 Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Chubon, R.

1992 Attitudes Toward Disability: Addressing Fundamentals of Attitude Theory and Research in Rehabilitation Education. Rehabilitation Education. 6: 301-312.

Chynoweth, C.

2000 Wheel Power. The Daily Telegraph April 1:36.

Cook, S.

1962 The Systematic Analysis of Socially Significant Events: A Strategy for Social Research. Journal of Social Issues 18:66-84.

Darcy, S.

1998 Anxiety to Access: The Tourism Patterns and Experiences of New South Wales People with a Disability. Sydney: Tourism New South Wales.

2000 Tourism Industry Perspectives of Providing Facilities and Services for People with Disabilities: A Scoping Study of the Accommodation Sector. Sydney, Australia: NSW Dept. of Ageing and Disability.

2002 People with Disabilities and Tourism in Australia: A Human Rights Analysis, *In* the conference proceedings of Tourism and Well Being - 2nd Tourism Industry and Education Symposium, E. Arola, J. Karkkainen, and M. Siitari eds., pp. 137-166. Jyvaskyla, Finland, 16-18 May.

2002a Marginalised Participation: Physical Disability, High Support Needs and Tourism.

Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management 9(1):61-72.

2003 Disabling Journeys: The Tourism Patterns of People with Impairments in Australia, *In* the conference proceedings of Riding the Wave of Tourism and Hospitality Research, R. W. Braithwaite and R. L. Braithwaite eds., CDROM. CAUTHE Southern Cross University, Lismore.

Darcy, S., and P. Daruwalla

1999 The Trouble with Travel: People with Disabilities and Tourism, *Social Alternatives* 18 (1):41-46.

Daruwalla, P.

1999 Attitudes, Disability and the Hospitality and Tourism Industry. PhD dissertation. University of Newcastle, Australia.

Denton, A.

1990 The Year of the Patronising Bastard [videorecording]. Australian Broadcasting Corporation: Sydney.

Dietl, D.

1988 The Game Plan Works for Marriott. *Worklife* 1(2):30-32.

Eberly, C., B. Eberly, and K. Wright

1981 Mental Health Professionals Attitudes Toward Physically Handicapped Groups in Attributionally Ambiguous and Non-Ambiguous Situations. *Counseling Psychology* 28:276-278.

Fishbein, M., and I. Ajzen

1975 Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research. Reading: Addison Wesley.

Gellman, W.

1960 Attitudes Toward Rehabilitation of the Disabled. *Journal of Occupational Therapy* 14: 188-190.

Gergen, K., and M. Gergen

1986 *Social Psychology* (2nd ed.) New York: Springer-Verlag.

Gething, L.

1986 International Year of Disabled Persons: Attitudes and Integration. *Rehabilitation Literature* 47:34, 66-72.

1991 *Interaction with Disabled Persons Scale: Manual and Kit*. University of Sydney, Sydney.

1991a Generality vs Specificity of Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities. *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 64:55-64.

1993 Attitudes Toward People with Disabilities of Physiotherapists and Members of the General Population. *Australian Physiotherapy* 39:291-296.

1994 *Disability Awareness Package* (2nd ed.) University of Sydney: Community Disability and Ageing Program.

1994a The Interaction with Disabled Persons Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Behaviour* 9:23-32.

1994b The Disability Awareness Package for Training Rehabilitation and Service Delivery Professionals. *Rehabilitation Education* 7:241-251.

Gething, L., B. Wheeler, J. Cote, A. Furnham, M. Hudek-Knezevic, M. Kumpf, K. McKee, J.

Rola, and K. Sellick

1997 An International Validation of the Interaction with Disabled Persons Scale. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research* 20:149-158.

Gilbert, A., M. MacCauley, and B. Smale

- 1997 Newspaper Portrayal of Persons with Disabilities over a Decade. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal* 31(2):108-120.
- Goffman, E.
- 1961 *Asylums*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goggin, G., and C. Newell
- 2001 Crippling Paralympics? Media, Disability and Olympism. *Media International Australia* 97:71-83.
- Goodall, B.
- 2002 Disability Discrimination Legislation and Tourism: The Case of the United Kingdom. *In* the conference proceedings of Tourism and Well Being - 2nd Tourism Industry and Education Symposium, E. Arola, J. Karkkainen, and M. Siitari eds. Jyvaskyla, Finland, 16-18 May.
- Hannah, M.
- 1988 Teacher Attitudes Toward Children with Disabilities: An Ecological Analysis. *In* Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities, H.E. Yuker, ed. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- HarrisInteractive Market Research.
- 2003 Research among Adults with Disabilities - Travel and Hospitality. January. Chicago: Open Doors Organization.
- Hickson, F.
- 1995 Attitude Formation and Change Toward People with Disabilities. PhD dissertation. University of Sydney.
- Horne, M.
- 1985 Attitudes Toward Handicapped Students: Professional, Peer and Parent Reactions. Hillsdale, New Jersey : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hume, J.

1995 Media Guidelines. Sydney: Disability Council of NSW.

Jennings, G.

2001 Tourism Research. Australia: John Wiley and Sons.

Katz, I.

1960 The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 24:163-205.

Kohl, J.P., and P.S. Greenlaw

1992 The ADA Part II: Implications for Managers. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 33(1):33-39.

Lattuca, F., and S. Scarpati.

1989 Training the Handicapped as a Resource for the Foodservice Industry. *Hospitality and Education Research Journal* 13(1):37-44.

Leach, R.

1990 The Effect of Contact on Attitudes Toward Individuals with Disabilities, PhD dissertation. Florida State University.

Linton, S.

1998 *Claiming Disability: Knowledge and Identity*. New York: New York University Press

Luken, K.

1993 Reintegration Through Recreation. *Parks and Recreation* 28(4):52-57.

McKercher, B., T. Packer, M. Yau, and P. Lam

2003, Travel Agents as Facilitators or Inhibitors of Travel: Perceptions of People with Disabilities. *Tourism Management* 24:465-474.

Miles, M.

2000, Disability on a Different Model: Glimpses of an Asian Heritage. *Disability &*

Society 15:603-618.

Miller, G., and E. Kirk

2002, The Disability Discrimination Act: Time for the Stick? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 10(1), 82-88.

Muloin, S. and F. Clarke

1993 Barriers to Recreation Participation: Challenges and Alternatives in Australian and New Zealand Association of Leisure Studies Proceedings, A. Boag, C. Lamond, and E. Sun, eds. pp. 163-170. Brisbane: Australia

Murray, M., and J. Sproats

1990 The Disabled Traveller: Tourism and Disability in Australia. *Journal of Tourism Studies* 1(1), 9-14.

Nicoll, N.

1988 Teaching about Disabilities: Does it Change Attitudes Towards Disabled People? *The Special Education Journal* 1:17-24.

Oliver, M.

1990 *The Politics of Disablement*, Basingstoke: Houndsmills Macmillan

1996 *Understanding Disability: From Theory to Practice*, Basingstoke: Houndsmills Macmillan.

O'Neill, M., and J. Ali Knight

2000 Disability Tourism Dollars in Western Australia Hotels. *FUI Hospitality Review* 18(2):72-88

Oskamp, S.

1977 *Attitudes and Opinions*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Peniston, L. C.

1996 Hotel Accessibility and Accommodations for People with Disabilities. *Parks and Recreation* 31(12): 24-29.

Priestly, M.

1998 Constructions and Creations: Idealism Materialism and Disability Theory. *Disability & Society* 13(1):75-94.

Rickman, J.

1993 The Efficacy of EPSE 200 as a Strategy for the Positive Modification of Attitudes Toward Persons with Disabilities in Undergraduate Non-Education Majors. Doctor of Education dissertation. Northern Illinois University.

Romeo, P.

1990 ADA Imposes New Duties on Operators. *Nation's Restaurant News* 26(4):1,4.

1992 Foodservice Fights to Revive AIDS Clause. *Nation's Restaurant News* 24:1-2.

Rosenhahn, D.

1973 *Science* 179 4070, pp. 250-258. NY: Association for the Advancement of Science.

Salomon, A.

1996 Days Inn Sued Over Alleged ADA Non-Compliance. *Hotel and Motel Management* 211(4): 1, 23.

Schapiro, J., and F. Berger

1984 Responsibilities and Benefits in Hiring the Handicapped. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 24(4):58-67.

Seal, K.

1994 Feds Cracking Down on ADA Compliance. *Hotel and Motel Management* 209(17):1, 5.

Semmel, M., and S. Dickson

1966 Connotative Reactions of College Students to Disability Labels. *Exceptional Children*
32:443-450.

Shakespeare, T.

1994 Cultural Representation of Disabled People - Dustbins for Disavowal. *Disability & Society*
9:283-299.

Shames, G., and W. Glover

1989 *World Class Service*, Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Siller, J.

1964 Personality Determinants of Reactions to the Physically Disabled. *American
Foundation for the Blind Research Bulletin* 7:37-52.

Smith, J.

1992 A Study of Handicapped Employment in the Hospitality Industry. *Hospitality and
Tourism Educator* 4(3):16-25.

Smith, R.

1987 Leisure of Disabled Tourists: Barriers to Participation. *Annals of Tourism Research*
14:376-389.

Snyder, M., R. Kleck, A. Strenta, and S. Mentzer

1979 Avoidance of the Hands: An Attributional Ambiguity Analysis. *Journal of Personality and
Social Psychology* 37:2297-2306.

Stokes, S.

1990 Restaurant Supervisors: Don't Discount the Disabled. *The Cornell Hotel and
Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 30(4):14-17.

Stovall, C., and W. Sedlacek

1983 Attitudes of Male and Female University Students towards Students with Different

Physical Disabilities. *Journal of College Student Personnel* 22:325-330.

Thurstone, L., and E. Chave

1929 *The Measurement of Attitude: A Psychophysical Method and Some Experiments*

with a Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward the Church. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Triandis, H.

1971 *Attitude and Attitude Change*. John Wiley and Sons Inc. USA.

Veal, A.

1997 *Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism: A Practical Guide* (2nd ed.)

London: Longman

Voyatzakis, M.

1994 *Attitudes of Undergraduate University Students Toward People with Physical Disabilities*. MA dissertation. McGill University, Montreal.

Western Australian Disability Services Commission.

2000 *You Can Make a Difference to Customer Service for People with Disabilities [Kit]:*

Hospitality, Tourism, Retail and Entertainment Industries. Western Australian Disability Services Commission: West Perth: Western Australia.

Westwood M., J. Vargo, and F. Vargo

1981 *Methods for promoting attitude change toward and among physically disabled persons*. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling* 12:220-225.

Woods, R., and R. Kavanaugh

1992 *Here Comes the ADA - Are You Ready (Part I)*. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 33(1):24-32.

Worcester, B.

2000 Day Inns Settles; Helps Simplify ADA. *Hotel and Motel Management*, 215(1):1,78

Wright, B.

1980 Developing a Constructive View of Life with a Disability. *Rehabilitation Literature* 41:274-279.

1983 *Physical Disability- A Psychosocial Approach*. NY: Harper and Row.

1988 Attitudes and the Fundamental Negative Bias: Conditions and Corrections In *Attitudes Towards Persons with Disabilities*, H. E. Yuker ed. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Wrightsman, L., and J. Brigham

1973 *Contemporary Issues in Social Psychology*, California: Brookes Cole Publishing Company.

Yuker, H.

1977 Attitudes of the General Public Toward Handicapped Individuals. Albertson, NY Awareness Papers, Human Resources Center. Vol. 1.

Zeithaml, V., A. Parasuraman, and L. Berry

1990 *Delivering Quality Service: Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Submitted 15 March 2002. Resubmitted 3 February 2004. Resubmitted 22 July 2004.

Resubmitted 10 September 2004. Accepted 09 October 2004. Refereed anonymously.