ATTITUDES TOWARD DISABLED PEOPLE IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF
WORK DATING AND MARRIAGE:

RELIGIOSITY, RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION, CONSERVATISM AND
AMBIVALENT SEXISM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MELEK MERT KASTNER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

JUNE 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Science

_____

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Canan Sümer
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Özlem Bozo Özen   (METU, PSY)   _____

Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan   (METU, PSY)   _____

Prof. Dr. Yeşim Yasak   (Karatekin Uni., PSK)   _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Melek Mert Kastner

Signature　　　 :

ABSTRACT

ATTITUDES TOWARD DISABLED PEOPLE IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF DATING, MARRIAGE AND WORK: RELIGIOSITY, RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION, CONSERVATISM AND AMBIVALENT SEXISM

Mert Kastner, Melek

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan

June 2019, 118 pages

The main objective of this study was to examine the relationship between religiosity, religious orientation, conservatism and ambivalent sexism with attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating, marriage and work. Moreover, the relationship between gender, age, education, income and contact with disabled people in social contexts of dating, marriage and work was investigated in this study. The data was collected from 626 participants in the age of 18 to 40. The results of the study revealed that gender differences were significant only on one variable; Attitude toward disabled people in work. Moreover, for attitudes toward disabled people in dating, while on the one hand age, conservatism and ambivalent sexism were significant predictors; education, income, religiosity and religious orientation were not significant. Furtermore, in the cntext of marriage just age and ambivalent sexism were significant predictors. Only ambivalent sexism, conservatism and religious orientation are significant predictors in attitude toward disabled people in work. Finally, it has been found that having a disabled family member or close friend significantly effected attitude toward disabled people in the context of work but not for dating and marriage. On the other hand, people who have more contact with a disabled person in daily life showed more positive results on attitudes toward disabled

people in the context of dating. The study findings, strengts and limitations of the study were discussed.

ÖZ

ROMANTİK İLİŞKİ, EVLENME VE İŞ YAŞAMI BAĞLAMINDA
ENGELLİLERE YÖNELİK TUTUMLAR: DİNDARLIK, DİNİ YÖNELİM,
MUHAFAZAKARLIK VE ÇELİŞİK DUYGULU CİNSİYETÇİLİK

Mert Kastner, Melek

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan

Haziran 2019, 118 Sayfa

Bu çalışmanın ana amacı dindarlık, dini yönelim, muhafazakarlık ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ile romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamında engellilere karşı tutumlar arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir. Ayrıca bu çalışmada cinsiyet, yaş, eğitim, gelir düzeyi ve engelli birey ile temas ile romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamında engellilere karşı tutumlar arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir. Bu çalışmaya 626 kişi katılmıştır. Yapılan analizler sonucunda, kadın ve erkeklerin engellilere karşı tutumlar konusunda anlamlı olarak sadece iş yaşamı ortamında farklılaştığı görülmüştür. Bununla birlikte, romantik ilişki ortamında yaş, muhafazakarlık ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin romantik ilişkilerde engellilere karşı tutumlar ile anlamlı şekilde ilişkili olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Ancak, eğitim, gelir seviyesi, dindarlık ve dini yönelimin romantik ilişkilerde engellilere karşı tutumlar ile anlamlı şekilde ilişkili olduğu bulunamamıştır. Engellilere karşı tutumların evlenme bağlamında incelenmesinde sadece yaş ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ile anlamlı bir ilişki içinde olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. İş ortamı bağlamında engellilere yönelik tutumların ise çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, muhafazakarlık ve dini yönelim ile anlamlı ilişkide olduğu ancak diğer değişkenler ile anlamlı ilişki içerisinde olmadığı bulunmuştur. Son olarak, engelli bir aile üyesine veya yakın arkadaşa sahip olmanın, sadece iş bağlamında engelli insanlara yönelik tutumları açısından anlamlı

olduğu bulundu. Engelli birey ile günlük hayatta temas içinde olma sıklığının ise sadece romantik ilişki bağlamında engelli bireylere yönelik tutumları açısından anlamlı olduğu bulundu. Araştırmanın sonuçları, güçlü ve çalışmanın sınırlılıkları tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Engellilik, Dindarlık, Dini Yönelim, Muhafazakarlık, Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik

For a fair world

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Not blindness, but the attitude of the seeing to the blind is the hardest burden to bear"

Helen Miller

In today's world, people are striving for to be perfect. To be perfect means beautiful, clever, young, healthy and able, have a good job position and a fit body. That perfectionism idea is emphasized by social media channels, televisions, magazines and advertisements. Those channels claim that the perfect people are everywhere and they form the largest part of the society. They get all the attention from the opposite sex, are wealthy, handle all the problems of life and do not suffer from any illness or disability (Seligman, 1994). But what about us, are we really that perfect?

People believe that the perfect ones are everywhere. However; this is just a wrong perception. Perfectionism is not something human kind has. We have our own limits and could not go beyond them. Somebody has body stains is allergic to something or something more serious. Our body has some impairments. Impairments of our body affect us in different ways and make us disabled. It's difficult to define ourselves as disabled just because of some impairment. In the other side, people believe that disability is just a minority issue. However, actually disabled people are the hugest minority group of the world with over than 1 billion people (World Health Report, 2011; Shakespeare, 2017).

Disability is primarily a personal experience. At the same time, except its individual level of effect, disability also influences the world as a global experience. Due to its individual and structural effects, academics from different countries and fields work on disability (Drake, 1999; Barnes, Oliver, & Barton, 2002). However, that interest

towards disability does not have a long history. Until 1960's disabled people's existence in the society was not socially accepted and they did not have the right of education or being employed (Rimmerman, 2013; `The Murder of the Handicapped´, n.d., para. 3). After the politicization of disability in 1960's and 1970's, especially people who worked in the field of politics and social policies started to work on disability rights both in national and international levels (Barnes, Oliver, & Barton, 2002). Many regulations and laws have been released to improve the realization of disability in the eye of society. With all those efforts on conceptualization of disability and the rights of disabled people, disabled people are seen as a minority groups like bisexuals and blacks (Scotch, 2001; Roulstone, Thomas, & Watson, 2012; Moore, & Slee, 2012; Rimmerman, 2013).

Over than 1 billion people in the world who are disabled people now face with prejudice, oppression and negative attitudes, although from 1960's there is increased interest toward disabled people. Disabled people experience social exclusion during different parts of their life in very serious ways (Park, Faulkner, & Schaller, 2003; White, Gordon, & Jackson, 2006; Rimmerman, 2013). For example, according to World Health Organization's data (2011), today less than half of the disabled people (44%) have a job, half of the population of disabled people cannot afford their healthcare payments and more than 90% of disabled children in the developing countries could not continue their school education. The negative attitudes they face, social exclusion and oppression toward disabled people are the result of the social attitudes of non-disabled people (Anthonak, & Livneh, 2000). That means, society's general attitude toward disabled people create either social inclusion if the society has positive attitudes toward disabled people or social exclusion, oppression and negative attitudes if the society has negative attitudes toward them (Vilchinsky, & Findler, 2004). Disabled people face with many obstacles in society such as that could not reach their life goals and could not satisfy their roles in society. Being aware of the relationship between disabled and non-disabled people in the context of negative attitudes could help us to get to know the underlying mechanisms between those two groups. In addition to this, if those underlying mechanisms are learned, new

intervention programmes could be created to reduce the negative attitudes toward disabled people (Cample, & Oliver, 1996, Anthonak, & Livneh, 2000). In literature, there are many researches which have been conducted by academics to understand the negative attitudes of different non-disabled groups toward disabled people in many social contexts (Brodwin, & Orange, 2002; Chan, Livneh, Pruett, Wang, & Zheng, 2009). As the non-disabled group, health professionals (Hunt, & Hunt, 2000; Tervo, & Palmer, 2004), students from different grades' (Au, & Man, 2006) and employees' (Hernandez, Keys, & Balcazar, 2000) attitudes toward disabled people were searched from academicians from different countries. Besides, non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the educational and vocational areas has been analysed many times (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Sharma, Forlin, & Loreman, 2008). Although there is a huge literature corpus about attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of those two domains, there is a big gap for the attitudes toward disabled people in the personal and social life domains (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Miller, Chen, Glovergraf, & Kranz, 2009). The corpus about attitudes towards disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage is a subfield of the research area dealing with the society's attitude towards disabled people on the personal and social level. While it has been stated before that the attitude towards disabled people is negative, neither have the reasons for that been researched nor have possible solutions in the context of dating and marriage been presented (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002).

In this current study the main focus is non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people. This study was conducted to analyse the factors which affect Turkish non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in three life domains: dating, marriage and work life. Especially, the effect of traditional gender role beliefs, religiosity, and religious orientation, general conservatism levels of people on their attitudes toward disabled people in the context of work, date and marriage are investigated. Moreover, the relationship between gender, age, education and income, and the attitudes toward disabled people in the context of work, date and marriage are searched.

For this reason, in this chapter, first the history of disability will be explained. As the second part, the models which are used in disability studies will be introduced with their differences. In the third part the current findings of non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the vocational area will be reviewed. In the next session, non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage will be introduced with the recent findings of related literature Later, Erikson's developmental stages and especially young adulthood stage will be presented with its connections with current study. After that, Allport's intergroup contact theory will be explained with its relationship with disabled people as the target group. Finally, the present study with the hypotheses of this master thesis will be briefly explained.

1.1. History of Disability

Before the modern Homo sapiens, both monkey and apes, and not evolved humans had physically damaged participants in their societies. For example, it was common to see many physical injuries in the body of an adult male Neanderthal. To gather their food, they should often use their arm, legs and teeth. Because of common usage of some body parts, they were severely injured many times (Berkson, 1993; Braddock, & Parish, 2001).

In Ancient Greek and Rome, many people suffered from different illnesses and impairments due to undeveloped healthcare centres, wars, scarcity, diseases exacerbating after pregnancy and malnutrition. Thus, it was easy to get any kind of disability either in the mother's tomb or after birth. Accordingly, it can be said that prevalence of disability was common in that time. Moreover, disabled people in that country were also seen as 'funny toys' to play. They were always take part of the social activities to make people happy (Garland, 1995; Rimmerman, 2013; `The Murder of the Handicapped´, n.d., para. 3).

During the Medieval Ages, there was still the big impact of malnutrition, wars and infectious diseases on the huge number of disabled people. Although there was not the statistical data about the population of disabled people in the medieval time, it can be said that disability can be seen in the society as a common fact (Jankauskas, & Urbanavicius, 1998). There were two different views in the society toward disabled people. According to first view, disabled people have supernatural powers. Especially mental and intellectual disabilities, deafness and epilepsy left a huge impression on the non-disabled peers. Woman who has psychotic issues were called witches and a person who has epilepsy had the Devil inside their body in the eyes of medieval society (Braddock, & Parish, 2001; Rimmerman, 2013; `The Murder of the Handicapped´, n.d., para. 3). Then to cure those people from the devil, executions had started in different Catholic cities. Woman called witches and other disabled people burned in the big fires visible to all members of society. Still it's not clear that how many disabled people were executed like this (Winzer, 1993). On the other side, disability was part of the normal life. Nearly in all families, there was at least one disabled person. In the nature of life, people were trying to look for some cures for disabled people. Especially religious leaders gathered the disabled people and tried to cure them in hospices. For example, intellectually disabled people from Turkey were in a hospice which had been organized by Bishop Nicholas (Kroll, 1973; Roseens, 1979).

In the age of Enlightenment and Reason, society's view toward disabled people had changed from the view of family care to hospitalization. That means, during the medieval time disability had been seen as a family-based issue, not a general issue of society. Due to this understanding, family members were hold responsible for the disabled person. However, in Renaissance it has been stated by the new laws and rules of society that if a person did not take care him/herself properly and need help from others, society itself should provide the help. According to those laws and rules, hospitalization places for disabled people put into service such as Bethel and St. Luke's Mental Hospitals in Norwich (Suzuki, 1991; Braddock, & Parish, 2001). During that time, there were schools for deaf people to learn sign language in the

Ottoman Era. In those schools deaf people were taught sign language by other deaf people. Between 16th to 18th centuries, sign language was popular in Ottoman Empire and used by Sultans too. Those schools in Ottoman Empire were the first examples to show that disabled people can obtain education in a school system (Miles, 2000).

Industrial Revolution and the transformation from villages to big cities especially in the 19th century showed that there was a need for disabled people's education. They should be educated to be productive workers rather than just to be a consumer in the society (Braddock, & Parish, 2001). Because of this idea, firstly schools for disabled people had been opened. The first schools for disabled people were for blind and deaf people in Europe and America. Later, schools for physical, intellectual and mental disabilities put into service (Roberts, 1986; Roberts, 1989). Secondly, high rate of migration and societal changes caused problems in the society. To protect the societal order, solutions must be found for deviant members who are disabled. Thus, big facilities were built to segregate disabled people from the society. Those hospitals were far away from the city centres, facilities offering a place to stay for many and closed penal facilities (Grob, 1990; Mora, 1992). The disabled people who stayed in those facilities were most of times more than their capacity. Some of the facilities had the double amount of patients. Those facilities did provide any therapeutic help; instead the main aim was the segregation of as many disabled people as possible (Scull, 1991). People at those places lived in terrific circumstances such as sexual or physical abuse or physical violence toward them such as hitting them with sticks or leave them without food and clean water (Grob, 1990).

Later close to end of the 19th century and during the first half of 20th century, people were influenced by the idea of Darwinism and had the desire to create the perfect offspring. That means, intellectual disability was seen as 'incurable disease' and created big danger for the continuation of human kind. To protect the human kind from that disease, the idea of eugenics was born. Intellectually disabled people were segregated from society and send to big institutions. Marrying with or getting a child from a disabled person was strictly forbidden by the governments. The archival

documents showed that disabled people were killed or exposed to unethical and inhumane experiments during that time period (Hirsch, 1995; Brown, 1997; Braddock, & Parish, 2001; Rimmerman, 2013; `The Murder of the Handicapped´, n.d., para. 3). The eugenic idea reached its extremity in Nazi Germany in the time era of 1939- 1945. 300,000 to 400,000 intellectually disabled and 200.000-275.000 physically disabled people were killed according to Nazi Germany's segregation laws (Wolfensberger, 1981).

The biggest slaughter of disabled people occurred during World War II (Aysoy, 2004). This cruelty toward disabled people got the attention of people who were part of the war as soldiers and civilians. People have started to gather and establish international organizations to protect the rights of disabled people in the second half of the 20th century (Braddock, & Parish, 2001). Society's moral responsibilities for disabled people after World War II and the improvements in medicine (such as foundations of antipsychotics in 1950's and community treatment approaches) politicized the disability issue and society's attention turn to that topic (Barnes, 2012). Until end of 1960's in UK, disabled people were either in residential care or in the streets as homeless and faced with severe poverty. There was no kind of financial aid for disabled people to pay their living expenses. The severe poverty was inevitable for disabled people if they did not choose overcrowded health institutions to stay. Due to the lack of financial aid for them, Berit Moore and Megan de Boison cofounded the Disablements Income Group (DIG) (Barnes, 2016). Establishment of DIG arouses the attention of activists about disability. Ken Davis, Paul Hunt and Vic Finkelstein were the some of them. After some time, those experts started to disagree with the DIG's narrow-minded focus on financial aspect neglecting other aspects of the needs of disabled people. Thus, they created the Disability Alliance (DA) to gather many disabilityorganizations for far-reaching income for disabled people. Later, Davis, Hunt and Finkelstein and some other disability activists created the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS) in 1974 (UPIAS 1976). The establishment of UPIAS and the efforts of people who support the union, disability started to gain importance by society and academicians. The publications

of disability activists created the questions in the mind of people about the general perspective toward the issue. Academician especially social scientists tried to understand the topic in new and different ways. Those perspectives shaped a new model in the field of disability which is fundamentally different from whatever had existed before (Barnes, Oliver, & Barton, 2002; Barnes, 2012; Barnes, 2016).

In this part, the general history of disability has been explained. In the history overview, the story of disability started with the life of Neanderthals and closed with the UPIAS' new approach of how to perceive disability. In the next part, firstly the first approach to disability which is in the Medical Model will be explained. Later, the new approach of UPIAS to disability, the Social Model, will be introduced with its effects on academic interest to disability as a social and political issue.

1.2. Models of Disability

In history, the first model to define disability is the medical model. According to the model, disability has been seen as a personal tragedy (Morris, 1991). That means, disability is a 'problem' and the only one who needs to be concerned is the disabled person. For example, if a worker in a wheelchair could not go to his working area due to the stairs in the building, the reason of this problem is the wheelchair, not the stairs or a missing elevator. Besides, the model also argues that it does not matter whether disabled people suffer pain because of that impairment or difference. Those impairments and differences should be fixed or changed by medical means (Berghs, Atkin, Graham, Hatton, & Thomas, 2016; Retrief, & Letsosa, 2018). The model also argues that society does not have any effect on the definition of the disability. The effect of society is exaggerated and politicized (Williams, 1999; Thomas, 2004; Atabey, 2011). However, the influence of society on the definition of disability started to be questioned later 1970's in UK (Shakespeare, 2005; Retrief, & Letsosa, 2018). The scholars and the activists of disability came together and established UPIAS in 1974. UPIAS is the most influential organization in the history of disability about the social thinking of disability (Barnes, 2016). UPIAS (1976) argues that like

bisexuality, gender issues or ethnic minorities, disability issue is a complex form of social oppression. According to the medical model, disability is the result of the impairment. However, based on UPIAS' new view, disability should be regarded as both a political and social issue. Moreover, that view makes a clear distinction between biological and social aspects of disability. According to UPIAS definition, impairment is 'lacking part or all of a limb, or having a defective limb or mechanism of the body' and disability is:

> The disadvantage of restriction of activity caused by a contemporary social organisation which takes no or little account of people who have physical impairments and thus excludes them from participation in the mainstream of social activities (UPIAS 1976, p.14).

That definition of disability had been accepted and used by many other organizations dealing with disability such as British Council of Organisations of Disabled People (BCODP) and Disabled People's International (DPI) (Campell, & Oliver, 1996). Moreover, the new definition of disability increased the attention of people who participated in the Vietnam War and the university students in USA toward issue of disability. They came together and formed organizations such as Independent Living Movement (ILM) and Centres for Independent Living (CIL). Those organizations also worked on the judicial changes in US (Barnes, 2016).

The academic interest toward disability issue was limited until 1970's. Before 1970's, the general approach of academics toward disability was more traditional and based on medical model (Morris, 1991; Barnes, 2016). For example, to be called a normal person one should be healthy. However, being sick or impaired was the reason of being called abnormal and those people were the social deviants for the academics of 1950's (Barnes, & Mercer, 2010). However, the academicians of the 1960s did studies on social construction of disability rather than the studies of the previous academics which investigated the medical structure of disability (e.g. Goffman 1968, Szasz, 1971). Especially with the manifestation of UPIAS (1976), disability turned to be a popular topic among the social scientists from different countries (Barnes, Oliver, & Barton, 2002; Barnes, 2016). Studies of disability were generally based on

sociology and try to understand the society's bias toward disabled people (Finkelstein, 1997). Mike Oliver who is a disabled activist and lecturer used the 'social model of disability' in his writing (1981).

The social model of disability argues that our impairments are not the main reason to define us as disabled. Society itself is disabling. That means the main reason of why we are disabled is the society (Oliver, 1996). Society reacts toward disabled people as an oppressing majority. It creates social barriers and social oppression like exclusion from employment, blocks the access to the environment and failing to reach educational opportunities (Bury, 2000; Finkelstein, 2001; Shakespeare, & Watson, 2001; Thomas, 2004). Although, there are some societal and political developments for an able-world, disabled people still earn less money compared to their non-disabled co-workers. Besides, a disabled person should pay more money for transportation, personal assistance and heating (Burchardt, 2004). Moreover, 56% of the disabled people in the world do not have a job, many of them face with poverty and half of them could not afford their own health-care payments (Burchardt, 2004; World Health Organization, 2011). In our country, 36% of Turkish disabled people is illiterate while the ratio of illiteracy is just 12 % for non-disabled people, 50% of the disabled population faces with severe poverty while it's just less than 25 %for non-disabled people and 48% of physical and mental disabled people and 64% of people who suffer chronic illnesses do not have any kind of social insurance (Öztürk, 2011).

The traditional approach to disability, the Medical Model, and the Social Model has been presented with their own differences for approaching the issue of disability. Moreover, it has been explained to define what kind of changes happened in society and academic research in the topic of disability with the presentation of the Social Model. In the next chapter, the general research ideas after 1970's about attitudes toward disabled people will be briefly explained.

1.3. Attitudes toward Disabled People

In the academic field, there are many studies about attitudes toward disabled people (Anthonak & Livneh, 2000). Especially in psychology, the researcher aims to search the attitudes toward disabled is to improve the opportunities of disabled people in social life such as education, employment, civil rights and equality to create social and psychological environments which are open and friendly or at least neutral for disabled people (Dunn, 2015). If the origins, reasons and the factors which affect non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people search and understand, it is possible to find the ways to promote positive interactions between non-disabled people and disabled people (Yuker, 1965; Siller, 1984). Furthermore, it has been found that the attitudes toward disabled people are both a complex and a multifaceted issue (Yuker, 1988). The studies which attempt to understand those attitudes have been conducted all over the world with many of the social domains. The conclusion of all the studies insisted that the attitudes toward disabled people are negative (Smart, 2001; Brodwin & Orange, 2002; Chan, Livneh, Pruett, Wang, & Zheng, 2009; Esmail, Darry, Walter, & Knupp, 2009; Vilchinsky, Findler, & Werner, 2010). To create social inclusion for disabled people, it is important to understand which factors affect the attitudes of non-disabled people toward disabled people. The extensive research has been conducted to understand which individual characteristics and the other factors related to non-disabled people increase or decrease the likelihood of negative attitudes toward disabled people (English, 1977).

The first factor is religiosity. All Abrahamic religions Islam, Christianity or Judaism advise to accept the deviants and be tolerant of the others. However, the studies show that there is a positive relationship between the religiosity and having negative attitudes toward disabled people (Zertinsky-Shurka, 1988; Weisel & Zaidman, 2003). On the other hand, there are some studies conducted with Christian people found out that more religious Christians has more positive attitudes toward disabled people compare to non-religious Christians (McQuilkin, 1990; Erin, Rudin, & Njoroge, 1991).

As the second factor, religious orientation plays an important role in attitudes toward disabled people. Religion orientation is a motivational construct. It explains that why people look for religion and spirituality in their daily life (Ginkel, 2011). Religiosity is an individual and social behaviour. It affects both the person's character and also the shape of culture and the social structure of society (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). On the other side, religious orientation has different forms in different societies. Those differences are even higher within the nations than between nations. For instance, according to the report of Pew Research Center 98% of Turkish population is Muslim; however, the religious truths of this society is not same for all of them (Özdemir, 2013). Religious orientation of a person influences the attitudes toward disabled people. The findings of the studies demonstrate that people who have high scores in religious orientation show more negative attitudes toward disabled people (Allport & Ross, 1967; Donahue, 1985).

Conservatism is a construct which shapes social behaviours of person and the identity of nations. Conservatism and religion are the concepts which are related and represented by traditionalism, religiousness, normative patterning and conformity to society's expectations and norms (Schwarz, 1994; Roccas, 2005; Van Hiel, & Kossowska, 2007). Conservative people generally give more importance to conformity and tradition, and give less importance to universalism, and are rather close to new experiences (Duriez, & Van Hiel, 2002). Those people show higher scores in dogmatism and more negative attitudes toward minorities such as disabled people (Backstörm, & Björklund, 2007; Brandes, & Crowson, 2009).

The demographic factors were also extensively researched on attitudes toward disabled people. As the demographics, gender of the participant has been shown to be an important factor in many studies of attitudes toward disabled people (English, 1977; Tervo, Azuma, Palmer, & Redinius, 2002). It has been found that women have more positive attitudes toward disabled people and show more acceptance compared to men. However, in some studies there was no relation between the sex of participant and the attitudes toward disabled people (Parasuram, 2006).

The research about the relationship between age and attitudes toward disabled people was searched extensively (English, 1977; Tervo, Azuma, Palmer, & Redinius, 2002). The findings of the existing literature show that there is significant negative relationship between age and attitudes toward disabled people. The studies revealed that younger people has more positive attitudes toward disabled people compare to old ones (Siller, 1963; Tait & Purdie, 2000). However, the correlations between the age and attitudes were around .20 which is a lower correlation. The findings of the study of Parasuram (2006) showed that younger (20-30 years old) and older (50-60 years) adults hold more positive attitudes toward disabled people compare to middle age adults (40-50 years old).

The effect of educational level of people on the attitudes toward disabled people was also studied. The findings of the studies revealed people with higher level of education hold more positive attitudes toward disabled people compare to people who has lower educational level. Moreover, the findings also added than people who have degrees from university or higher degrees show more positive attitudes compare to primary, middle or high school graduated people (Au, & Man, 2006; Parasuram, 2006).

As the last demographic variables, income and socio-economic status have inconsistent findings related to attitudes toward disabled people. According to findings of one study, low income people have more positive attitudes toward disabled people compare with high income groups (Greenbaum & Wang, 1965). On the other side, there are the studies found out that higher income groups were more accepting of people with disabled people (Farber, 1968; Parasuram, 2006). The factors affect non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people often in the four life zones: Education, social interactions, public access to services and facilities and vocational area. The existing literature for those life zones is bigger than other life zone (OEC, 2010). The general attitudes toward disabled people in those four life zones have been discussed extensively such different perspectives. However, there are some life zones for disabled people which have not been studied

well. The main social domain is dating and marriage (Shakespeare, 2000). That means, the existing literature of non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people includes few studies which have been conducted just in Western countries such as the USA or Australia, although the studies look for the attitudes in employment, education or public access to services areas conducted nearly all of the countries, religions and languages (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; OEC, 2010; Goreczny, Bender, Caruso, & Feinstein, 2011; Aycan, 2015; Mamatoğlu, Dökmen, & Yıldırım, 2015).

In this part, the attitudes toward disabled people have been briefly explained. Moreover, the scope of this research is based on non-disabled people's attitudinal differences in vocational area - more specifically work with a disabled person, date and marry with them. In the next two chapters, firstly the attitudes toward disabled people in vocational area and secondly attitudes toward disabled people in dating and marriage life zones will be discussed.

1.3.1. Attitudes toward Disabled People in Vocational Area

In today's world employment is a main topic to be socially included and have sufficient financial sources to afford food, shelter and main life resources. Moreover, studies indicated that employed people are more satisfied with their life and their well being scores are higher than the unemployed ones. Those statements are valid for both disabled and non-disabled people (Priebe, Warner, Hubschmid, & Eckle, 1998; Mansour, 2009). Being employed has also another importance for disabled a person that is to be independent. Disability includes some important facets which are medical, economic and social problems. A disabled person with the help of his family could be cared, taken to school and rehabilitation facilities. However, like all people a disabled person needs to find a job to have enough income to be independent and socialize with others. To lead an independent life and to see themselves as the part of society, being employed is one of the main topics for disabled people (Akardere, 2005). However, in today's world in over 1 billion people in the world are disabled

and in Turkey 12% of population disabled, just 1% of them are employed. Moreover, those employed people have job below their actual qualification and they earn less money compared to their non-disabled co-workers at equivalent works (Bricout, & Bentley, 2000, Aycan, 2015).

The literature classifies the reasons of disability employment into 3 main groups. Those are; 1)Factors related to disabled person such as type and the quality of disability, educational level or self-esteem, 2) Institutional factors such as quality of job, attitudes of employers and employees toward disabled worker or structural features of working area, 3) Societal factors such as societal attitudes, opportunities for education and job positions or laws and regulations about disabled people's employment (Fungham, & Thompson, 1994).

In the hiring process, the type of the disability plays an important role. Employers prefer to hire some disability groups over others. For example, literature findings suggest that physically disabled people (16%) have the highest employment rate compare to other types. However, intellectualy and developmentally disabled people has the lowest employment rate (61%) (Nota, Santili, Ginevra, & Soresi, 2014). Employers argue that the physically disabled people's workability rate is higher than intellectually and developmentally disabled people (Bordieri, Drehmer, & Taylor, 1997). Another factor related to hiring decisions is the personal factor. Disabled people who have a higher educational degree and more work experience have a higher chance to be hired. Moreover, employers have more positive attitudes toward disabled people who are determined, strong-minded, independent, hardworking and resilient (Adelman, & Vogel, 1993; Tracey, 1995; Conyers, Koch, & Szymanski, 1998).

Institutional factors are the main reason for high unemployment rate for disabled people. Although a disabled person has a high educational level and good qualities for the job, the negative attitudes of employers affect the employment decision to a great extent. Employers state that due to the instability of economy and the needs of

15

marketing the main aim of the firms and the employers is high productivity. Moreover, the general view of employers toward disabled workers is that they are unqualified, unproductive and incompatible with the work place. Due to negative stigmatization of disabled worker in the eye of employers the employment rate of disabled people is low (Diksa, & Rogers, 1996; Sunoo, 2001; Baybora, 2006). The attitude studies which has been done with employers reported that employer's attitudes toward disabled workers are comparably positive when they were asked in the global perspective. On the other hand, when the questions targeted more specific attitudes (e.g. express willingness to hire them) toward disabled people as the employee then the employers were more reluctant to hire them. Also, employers showed more negative attitudes toward disabled workers in the employment processes compared to non-disabled workers (Priebe, Warner, Hubschmid, & Eckle, 1998; Hernandez, Keys, & Balcazar, 2000). The second main reason of disabled people's unemployment as the institutional factor is the attitudes of employees toward disabled co-workers. In the view of employee, they prefer to have less disabled workers, believe that disabled people have less knowledge and skills for the job and argue that their customers do not feel comfortable and want to work with a disabled person (Bricout, & Bentley, 2000; Priebe, Warner, Hubschmid, & Eckle, 1998; Woodley, & Metzger, 2012).

Literature suggest that the personal characteristics of employers and employees have effect on their attitudes toward disabled employment. For example, employers and employees who haven't had prior contact with disabled people in their life have more negative attitudes toward working with a disabled person. Moreover, it has been suggested that people who are more religious, conservative, accept societal norms more, and have lower educational level have more negative attitudes toward disabled co-workers (Hood, 1973; Cesare, Tannenbaum, & Dalessio, 1990; Rimmerman, 1998).

As the last factor, societal factors are important for disabled people's employment process. If a disabled person does not have the opportunity to prepare themselves for

16

a job position, it is possible to see high unemployment rates for disabled people. That means societal factors are 1) having educational opportunities to be qualified, 2) getting support from family and society to be independent rather than live just with economical support from family or 3) government, having regulations in laws for employment in laws for employment for a disabled person (Callahan, & Garner, 1997; Aycan, 2015). However, in our country disabled people have on avarage lower educational degrees and 36% of them are illiterate. The degrees for getting to know a branch of industry-economic-activity for disabled people are really rare. Even many cities does not offer them. Poverty is a common issue for disabled people and their economic situation has been called 'social disaster' in Turkey (Tufan, & Arun, 2002; Öztürk, 2011). Studies also indicate that disabled people work in unqualified and lower status jobs although they are more qualified and have better education and experiences in Turkey (Kayacı, 2007; Yılmaz, 2007). Moreover, although just 15% of disabled people whose health report says they cannot work, the employment chance of a disabled person in Turkey is low (Tufan, & Arun, 2002). The findings of the studies show that disabled people face with negative attitudes, prejudices and discrimination in the vocational area in Turkey.

In this part, the factors which affect the unemployment rate of disabled people has been discussed. The findings demonstrate that disabled people face with severe social exclusion in vocational development. In the next part, the current findings about the attitudes of non-disabled people in romantic relationship (dating) and marriage will be discussed.

1.3.2. Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating and Marriage

In 1940's while John Bowlby was working on the reasons why juvenile thieves face with difficulties while creating social bonds, he decided to examine their family histories. He found out that many of them were living in dysfunctional families due to loss of mother and due to having been passed from one foster family to another. His work on this topic created one of the most prominent theories of psychology and

has deeply affected the society, child care policy, history of psychology and psychiatry. That is the Attachment Theory (Gillath, Karantzas, & Fraley, 2016). The main aim of the theory is to explain the nature of child's relationship with his main care giver and the effect of that bond on the child's life time experiences (Fraley, 2002). If a child separated from his main care giver, the child shows reactions such as crying, clinging or madly searching just to find the care giver and get the proximity with her. Bowlby argues that the behaviours which child shows after the separation from the caregiver are the adaptive responses. He stated that human babies are not capable of feeding and caring by themselves. They need an adult to care and feed them to survive. From the evolutionary perspective, human babies who have a caregiver and could maintain that relationship survive longer compared to the ones who could not. Natural selection has created the attachment behavioural system which is an important concept of the theory to regulate proximity to main care giver. Bowlby defines attachment behavioural system as like this; the attachment behavioural system of the baby looks for whether the main care giver is nearby, close and attainable or the opposite. If the caregiver can be described as being near, close and attainable, the child feels loved, secure and confident. Thus, the child could enjoy the life, explore the world and be sociable. However, if the care giver is not close or accessible, the child starts to feel separation, distress and anxiety. The child starts to show crying, clinging and searching behaviours until the caregiver finds it. If the separation from the caregiver is prolonged, the child experiences despair and depression (Gillath, Karantzas, & Fraley, 2016; Fraley, 2018). Although the studies of Bowlby generally focus on the child's relationship with his main care giver, in his book Bowlby insisted that attachment is an important human experience 'from the cradle to the grave' (1979, p. 129). Based on his words, research has been started on adults. Hazan and Shaver's first study on the topic in 1987 works on understanding the nature of adult love and loneliness (Hazan, & Shaver, 1987; Fraley, & Shaver, 2000). The research findings showed many similarities between the relationship between the baby and its caregiver and the adult romantic relationship; (1) the attachment behavioural system, which allows an emotional bond between the baby and care giver, affects the creation of emotional bond between adult partners, (2) they feel safe and secure when the other one is close, (3) they prefer close and intimate

bodily contacts with the other one, (4) they like to know more about each other, (5) they use baby talk while talking with each other, (6) they spend most of the time with each other. Thus, it has been shown that adult romantic relationship is a manifestation of attachment theory (Hazan, & Shaver, 1987; Fraley, & Shaver, 2000; Fraley, 2018).

Adult romantic relationships range between dating to marriage. Those relationships have a large effect on person's mental and physical health, working life and sexuality. There plenty of literature about the effect of marriage and dating on a person's life. The studies were conducted with teenagers, adults and older people from different countries and cultures (Russell, & Consolacion, 2010). Research findings show that married people's wellbeing level is higher than the ones who have never married, were divorced, separated or widowed (Waite, 1995; Dush, & Amato, 2005). Moreover, it also has been reported that although people who are in a relationship have a lower wellbeing than married people, their wellbeing scores are higher than the ones who do not have a romantic partner (Horwitz, & White, 1998; Brown, 2000). Besides, people in a relationship feel happier and socially supported. Those feelings affect the low rates of depression, anxiety, morbidity and mortality (Robles, Slatcher, Trombello, & McGinn, 2014). Likewise, the study on long term adult romantic relationship on physical health reported that there is a beneficial change in the functioning of hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenocortical axis has an effect on the cortisol hormone production of people who are in a romantic relationship (Selcuk, & Ong, 2013). In short, based on the strong and consistent results of many different studies, people who are in a romantic relationship have better psychological and physiological health conditions compared to unpartnered ones (Braithwaite, Delevi, & Fincham, 2010).

After the first book of Bowlby's on attachment theory, studies have started to deal with the infant-caregiver relationship and continued with adult romantic relationship. The studies insisted that having a romantic partner has many positive effects on a person's mental and physical health (Braithwaite, Delevi, & Fincham, 2010; Robles, Slatcher, Trombello, & McGinn, 2014). Moreover, it has also been mentioned by

scientists that humans naturally look for somebody to have sustainable belongingness. That need is common for all humans from different cultures, religions and countries. In short, indeed belonging is significant to a meaningful life (Baumeister, & Leary, 1995; Lambert, et al, 2013). Although literature supports all the sentences written until now, adult romantic relationship of disabled people is still a taboo for the academic areas (Chan, Livneh, Pruett, Wang, & Zheng, 2009).

The existing literature of non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people includes more about employment, education, civil rights and equality but studies about the personal and social domains are not that numerous (Chan, Livneh, Pruett, Wang, & Zheng, 2009). The findings of existing literature about attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage are consistent. However, the studies on dating and marriage has been conducted within a few cultures like US-American, Western European and South Asian such as Thailand, Singapore or Hong Kong people and the generalizability of the findings to all cultures and societies are in question (Fichten, & Amsel, 1986; Goldstein, &Johnson, 1997; Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Karalleou, 2003; Hergenrather, & Rhodes, 2007; Chan, Livneh, Pruett, Wang, & Zheng, 2009; Miller, Chan, Glover- Graf, & Kranz, 2009; Marini, Wang, Etzbach, & Castillo, 2012). The literature argues that disabled people are seen as childish, undemanding and having no sex (asexual, third gender) by non-disabled people due to this they are not perceived as possible romantic partners (Ray, & West, 1984; Fichten, Amsel, 1986). Moreover, society has some myths about disabled people's sexuality due to those unreal beliefs non-disabled people do not prefer to date or marry with a disabled person. For example, disabled people have a lack of sexual desire, they are not capable of having intercourse, they do not have social skills and mental judgements to behave appropriately in sexually intimate situation or it is not possible that a non-disabled person can perceive a disabled people as a romantic partner. If that is the case, it means something is wrong with the non-disabled partner (Miller, Chan, Glover- Graf, & Kranz, 2009). Lastly, studies point out that people explicitly argue that they have positive attitudes to date and marry with disabled people; however, implicit studies have shown that people generally

have negative attitudes toward disabled people in those domains. This shows that people provide answers according to what is expected to be socially desired (Man, Rojahn, Chrosniak, & Sanford, 2006).

In the limited literature about non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage, some factors' effects on those attitudes have been studies. As the first factor, the effect of gender of non-disabled people has been studied. It has been found that female non-disabled people hold more positive attitudes toward disabled people. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that the gender of disabled people also influences non-disabled people's attitudes. That means, the attitudes toward disabled person is more negative in the context of dating and marriage if the disabled person is female (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Vilchinsky, Findler, 2004). However, in another study conducted with American and Egyptian college students it was found out that Egyptian male students hold more positive attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of marriage than female non-disabled college students (Hamdy, Auter, Humphrey, & Attia, 2011). This study's findings differ from what the other studies reported, thus it can be concluded that the effect of target's group gender has contradictory results for the attitudes toward disabled people in dating and marriage contexts.

The type and the severity of the disability are the factors which have an effect on the attitudes of non-disabled people in those contexts. For example, the findings revealed that there is a negative relationship between the severity of disability and the attitudes toward disabled people in dating and marriage contexts. Moreover, it has been shown that non-disabled people prefer to date or marry with some type of disabled groups such as visually or physically disabled people more than the others such as mentally disabled or psychiatric disabled people (Miller, Chan, Glover- Graf, & Kranz, 2009).

Another common factor which influences the non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in dating and marriage is the prior contact with a disabled person. In other words, studies demonstrated that non-disabled people who had had a contact

with a disabled person in their daily life show more positive attitudes toward disabled people in the given context compared to those without any prior daily contact with a disabled people. Moreover, non-disabled people who had a relationship such as friendship reported that they could date or marry with a disabled person more than the ones who never had a relationship with a disabled person (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Marini, Wang, Etzbach, & Castillo, 2012).

Studies conducted about non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage do not cover all the cultures or societies from all around the world. However, the existing studies about Americans, Taiwanese people, Hong Kong people, Singaporeans and Egyptians demonstrated that there is a significant difference between the countries. American people hold more positive attitudes toward disabled people in dating and marriage compare to Taiwanese, Hong Kong and Singaporean people (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002). Besides, in one study conducted with American and Egyptian college students it was found that Egyptian students have more negative attitudes toward disabled people (Hamdy, Auter, Humphrey, & Attia, 2011). Culture has a significant effect on non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage. The reasons for this attitudinal difference have been described as cultural beliefs, westernization and lack of knowledge about disability (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002).

The existing literature for attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage is limited to few studies. Due to this, some of the variables' effects on those attitudes have not been studies. The effect of religion on the non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people has been examined just a few studies. It has been found that religion of the target group does not have significant effects on attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage (Strohmer, Grand, & Purcell, 1984). However, in this study the religion of students has been identified with the question 'What is your religion?' There was no

kind of scale to measure the religiosity level of people and the effect of it on the attitude scale.

In all cultures, there are differing gender role expectations from males and females. In traditional societies those expectations differ to a larger extend and are of higher importance of individual. Gender roles are under the influence of such as history, religion, culture, economy and ethnic. Traditionally men are expected to be strong, independent, dominant, active, aggressive, macho, insensitive, competent, ambitious, employed and a bread winner. On the other hand, females are expected to be nurturing, sensitive, attractive, emotional, ambitious, independent, incompetent, weak, physically attractive and take the responsibility for all domestic chores such as cooking, cleaning and washing clothes (Thomas, & Thomas, 2002; Nario - Redmond, 2010). The effect of disability on traditional gender roles is huge. That is, disability affects the person's chance to carry out traditional gender roles. In societies, disabled people are regarded as asexual, eternally childish and without sexual desires. Thus, disabled people are perceived as unable to fulfil traditional male or female gender roles (Björnsdottir, & Traustadottir, 2010). For example, a female wheelchair user who needs somebody as physical assistance for self-care is perceived not to match traditional roles of a female such as beauty, independence and handling domestic chores. Studies show that the unmatched traditional roles for disabled male and female causes low marriage rate for disabled people (Thomas, & Thomas, 2002). Moreover, there is a growing literature about disability and gender to understand traditional gender role ideas and disability. However, those studies generally search for what are the traditional gender roles and how disabled people are seen based on those roles (Thomas, & Thomas, 2002; Björnsdottir, & Traustadottir, 2010; Nario-Redmond, 2010). There is a gap in the literature about the effect of traditional gender role beliefs of non-disabled people on their attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage.

The chapter begins with a general overview of Attachment Theory and continues with the importance of adult attachment. Then it has been mentioned that having a

romantic partner is also an important issue for disabled people. However, non-disabled people generally have negative attitudes for having a disabled romantic partner. The factors affect those attitudes for non-disabled people have been argued while referring to the related research findings. In the next chapter, Erikson's psychosocial developmental stages will be explained. Besides, the sixth stage of theory which is Intimacy vs. Isolation will be discussed because of its relation to dating and marriage topics.

1.4. Erikson's Developmental Stages

Erik Erikson, an American developmental psychologist and psychoanalyst, is famous for his work on the psychoanalytic theory of psychosocial development of humans from infancy to late adulthood. His theory explains the development of people in a life span approach within the contexts of family, culture and society. The theory includes eight stages from infancy to late adulthood that every healthy human being will experience (Markstrom, & Kalmanir, 2001; Dunkel, & Harbke, 2017). During those stages, individual experience conflicts between the psychosocial needs and the needs of society. As the result of those crises, individual experiences psychosocial crises while passing through eight stages. The crises during different stages have both positive and negative consequences for the personality development. To have a healthy personality and the acquisition of basic virtues such as hope, love or wisdom, each individual should complete all eight stages successfully. The basic virtues are important strengths for individual's character to solve the subsequent crises of ego. For example, an individual enters the young adulthood stage (intimacy vs. isolation) with more identity than role confusion, that individual will carry the virtue of love to the rest of the stages (Erikson, 1963; McLeod, 2013).

The theory was firstly published in 1950 in the article 'Eight Ages of Man' and some improvements made by Erikson over time (Markstrom, & Kalmanir, 2001). During the last fifty years, the theory has been used to gain insights in to the human development and it turned to be the basis for many research ideas. The effect of the

theory on research has increased over time and societal changes. That means, the concepts of ego identity and generativity, for example, are still the important concepts with the technological changes in the world and rapid increase in contact between people from different cultures and countries. In many countries, the appearance of positive psychology and increasing attention to age contribute to more interest to the topic of generativity. Thus, although Erikson's stages of psychosocial development had been introduced more than fifty years ago, the theory is still an important resource for research (Dunkel, & Harbke, 2017).

During young adulthood in the age between 18 to 40, intimacy which is the sixth psychosocial stage of Erikson occurs in the individual's life. The core idea of this stage is make and sustain intimate relationships and commitments with others (except from family members) such as dating or marriage (Erikson, 1963). A healthy young adult who has an established identity is ready and has less fear of being close to another person. However, if the individual is afraid of risking the own identity through the sharing of true intimacy, the individual faces with isolation. Isolation creates unwillingness and anxiety for the person to create intimate relationships and have children (Erikson, 1964). In other words, when this stage has been successfully completed, the individual is capable of creating comfortable relationships with commitment, safety and care. However, the unsuccessful completion of this stage causes isolation, loneliness and depression. Finally, the successful completion of this stage will bring the virtue of Love characterized by mutual and reciprocal commitments between partners (Markstrom, & Kalmanir, 2001; Dunkel, & Harbke, 2017).

Erikson's psychosocial developmental stages have been discussed in this chapter. The sixth stage of that theory occurs in the age of between 18 to 40 years. The psychological crisis of this stage is Intimacy vs. Isolation for young adults. While facing with the negotiation between psychological needs and the conflicting needs of family, society and culture, people try to reach the virtue of Love in this stage. The next chapter will explain The Intergroup Contact Theory of Allport. Moreover, the

relationship between the Intergroup Contact Theory and attitudes toward disabled people will be represented.

1.5. The Intergroup Contact Theory

In 1954 Social Psychologist Gordon W. Allport published his book The Nature of Prejudice. In the 16th chapter, he explained the intergroup contact theory which later would be the most influential statement of the book. Allport frames that under optimal conditions, contact between the minority and majority group reduce the intergroup prejudice. To reduce the intergroup prejudice, Allport stated that four key features of the contact should exist: equal status between the groups in the situation; common goals, intergroup cooperation, and the support of authorities, law, or custom (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew, & Troop, 2006).

From 1954 to today, researchers from all over the world from different fields have been affected by Allport's intergroup contact theory. Psychologists tried to understand how and why the contact between the groups reduces the intergroup prejudice (Pettigrew, & Troop, 2008). Allport (1954) postulated a set of hypotheses about the effects of intergroup contact. Firstly, with gaining knowledge about the outgroup the prejudice towards it is reduced (Stephan, & Stephan, 1985). Secondly, the intergroup contact enables the individuals to feel less fear and anxiety when interacting with the outgroup. That leads to a less negative evaluation of the outgroup (Stephan, & Finlay, 1999). Thirdly, the intergroup contact leads to more empathy between the individuals of those different groups. Over the years only weak evidence has been found for the first hypothesis. On the other hand, for the second and third the evidence is striking (Pettigrew, & Troop, 2008).

The formulation of intergroup contact theory arose the attention of many researchers from the 1954. There is an extensive research database about this theory. The theory has been used to understand the relationships between different groups, situations and societies from all over the world. Although in the beginning of the research the focus

groups were different racial and ethnic groups, with time further target groups have been added such as elderly people, disabled people, victims of AIDS or LGBTQ people. Much of the evidence stems from such as surveys, field studies or laboratory experiments (Pettigrew, 1997; Pettigrew, & Troop, 2006; Pettigrew, & Troop, 2008). The studies which disabled people were the target group in showed that the attitudes of non-disabled people toward disabled people are negative when there is no contact. However, when there is occasional contact between the groups, the attitudes turn to be more positive way (Desforgers et al, 1991; Anderson et al, 1997; Maras et al., 2000; Cameron et al, 2006; McManus et al, 2011). The intergroup contact theory has been used to search for the effects of contact on the negative attitudes toward disabled people in many life zones. For instance, there is a significant positive effect of contact with disabled people on non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the context of work, dating and marriage (Rimmerman, 1998; Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Sheridan, & Scior, 2013). As the last point, the biggest meta-analytic study of the theory, which has used 515 studies, showed that although the theory had been originally developed for racial and ethnic groups, the theory works equally well for disabled people (Pettigrew, & Troop, 2006).

1.6. Aims of the Study

Based on exiting literature, the present study aims to investigate non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social contexts of dating, marriage and work. Also, as religion, religious orientation, traditional gender role beliefs and conservatism are important variables, they will be taken into account. In other words, it will be examined that whether religion, religious orientation, traditional gender role beliefs and conservatism are the predictors on non-disabled people's actions of dating, marriage and work with a disabled person. Besides, it will be examined whether gender, age, education and income are the possible predictors of attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of work, date and marriage. Lastly, the effect of having contact with a disabled person will create a difference in the attitudes

of non-disabled people in the social contexts of dating, marriage and work. More specifically, the research questions and related hypotheses as follows;

Research Question 1: *Are the gender, age, income and educational level significant predictors of attitudes toward disabled people in the social contexts of work, date and marriage?*

Hypothesis 1: Basing on the literature that investigated attitudes toward disabled people (e.g., English, 1977; Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Tervo, Azuma, Palmer, & Redinius, 2002), it is expected that men and women will significantly differ in their attitudes. Specifically, women are expected to endorse more supportive attitudes toward disabled people in the social contexts of work, date and marriage than men.

Hypothesis 2: Age, education level and income level as demographic variables which were revealed to be significant predictors of attitudes toward disabled people (e.g., Tervo, Azuma, Palmer, & Redinius, 2002; Au, & Man, 2006; Parasuram, 2006), are expected to have predictive power on favourable attitudes toward disabled people in work, date and marriage contexts.

Research Question 2: Are religiosity, religious orientation, conservatism and ambivalent sexism significant predictors of attitudes toward disabled people in work, date and marriage contexts?

Hypothesis 3: Basing on the literature that investigated attitudes toward disabled people (e.g., Zertinsky-Shurka, 1988; & Weisel & Zaidman, 2003), high levels of religiosity, religious orientation, conservatism and ambivalent sexism are expected to predict more negative attitudes toward disabled in the social contexts of dating, marriage and work.

Research Question 3: Is the contact with a disabled person significant predictor of attitudes toward disabled people in work, date and marriage contexts?

Hypothesis 4: Consistent with Allport's Intergroup Contact Theory in which contact between the groups reduces the intergroup prejudices (e.g., Pettigrew, & Troop, 2008) and the existed literature on attitudes toward disabled people (e.g., Rimmerman, 1998; Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Sheridan, & Scior,

2013), people who have contact with a disabled people is expected to predict more favourable attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of work, date and marriage.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1. Participants

A total sample of the study consisted of 626 people. There were 432 females (69%), 134 males (31 %). The age ranged from 18 to 40 (M=24.98, SD=4.53). In the sample, 522 people (83.4%) were single, 97 of them (15.5%) were married and 3 of them (0.5%) were divorced. 527 people (82.6%) reported that they do not have any disabled family member. Moreover, 426 people (68.1%) reported that they have any close friend who is disabled.

Table 1 shows the socio - demographic characteristics of the participants such as gender, age, educational status, marital status, income level, whether they have a disabled family member or a disabled close friends and frequency level of being in contact with a disabled people in daily life.

2.2. Instruments

Participants filled out 6 measurement items in addition to the demographic information form to test the hypotheses of the research. Those measures were Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Social Context of Dating and Marriage Scale (Mert Kastner, 2016), developed by the author for this study, Attitudes toward Disabled Employment (Aycan, 2005), Religious Orientation Scale (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Shaver, 2013), General Conservatism Scale (Yıldırım, 2007), Religiosity Scale (Peterson & Seligman, 2004) and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The consent form was a mandatory field for all participants before they could start to fill out the survey booklet (see Appendix A).

2.2.1. Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Social Context of Dating and Marriage Scale (RİEB-EYTÖ)

The Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Social Context of Dating and Marriage Scale (RİEB-EYTÖ) was developed by the author of the thesis as a part of another research. It is an anonymous, pen and paper style attitude instrument. This scale measures the nondisabled people's attitude toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage. The questionnaire was designed to measure the attitudes of nondisabled people towards disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage. Although there were some English measurement tools which aims to measure non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating or marriage, the items of the scales were not specific to the Turkish culture or Muslim ideas of dating and marriage. Moreover, there was no measurement tool which measured the non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating or marriage in Turkish literature. Due to, the lack of measurement tools in Turkish literature and the need for Turkish culture and Muslim religion specific items, RİEB- EYT was developed by the author of the thesis.

The scale consists of 31 items with one factor-solution questionnaire. The measurement tool is a 4-point Likert-type scale (1= Totally Agree, 2= Agree, 3= Disagree, 4= Totally Disagree). The score range for this scale lies between 31 and 124. People who obtain a high score on the scale are said to have a positive attitude toward disabled people in the social context of dating and marriage. However, people who get lower scores on the scale show that their attitude toward disabled people in that construct is negative.

The Cronbach's alpha level for the internal consistency of the scale was .92. Besides, the scale's split half reliability was .86. To examine the convergent validity of RİEB-EYT, The Measurement for Attitudes toward People with Disabilities (ATPD) (Yuker, Block, & Younng, 1966) was used. The analysis of the convergent validity was done via checking the correlation patterns between the factor solution of RİEB-

EYT and ATPD. The correlation pattern between these variables were significant ($\alpha=$ .6, $p<$ .001) (see Appendix B and C).

2.2.2. Attitudes Toward Disability Employment

Aycan developed the Attitudes toward Disability Employment to measure attitudes toward disabled people's employment in Turkey (2005). Although in the literature there are many measurement tools which are developed to measure attitudes toward disabled people's employment, those were not culture-specific. Due to that lack of literature that scale has been developed by author as a culture specific measurement tool. The Attitudes toward Disability Employment includes 40 items with one factor structure. The scale is a 5-point Likert-Type scale with responses from 1 (Totally Disagree) to 5 (Totally Agree). The Cronbach's Alpha score of the scale is .89. The highest score in the scale implies that positive attitudes toward disabled people's employment (see Appendix D).

2.2.3. Religious Orientation Scale

The religious Orientation Scale was developed by Sakallı-Uğurlu and Shaver (2013) to measure the type of participants' religious orientation. In the formation process of the scale, researchers added some items from different religious orientation scales (Allport & Ross, 1967; Öner-Özkan, 2007) and also created new items which are specific to Turkish culture. Religious Orientation Scale includes 19 items. Besides, it is a 7-point Likert scale in which responses range from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree). The scale has 4 sub-scales which are Quest Religious Orientation, Fundamentalist Religious Orientation, Intrinsic Religious Orientation and Extrinsic Religious Orientation sub-scales. Cronbach's Alpha scores of subscales for American Christian sample were .74 for the Quest Religious Orientation sub-scale, .73 for the Fundamentalist Religious Orientation sub-scale, .88 for the Intrinsic Religious Orientation sub-scale and .73 for the Extrinsic Religious Orientation sub-scales. In Turkish sample, Cronbach's Alpha scores of sub-scales were .76 for the Quest

Religious Orientation sub-scale, .73 for the Fundamentalist Religious Orientation sub-scale, .84 for the Intrinsic Religious Orientation sub-scale and .70 for the Extrinsic Religious Orientation sub-scale (see Appendix E).

2.2.4. General Conservatism Scale

The General Conservatism Scale was developed by Yıldırım to measure conservative attitude of people in Turkey (2007). The researcher tried to find characteristics and dimensions of conservatism of Turkish people. The General Conservatism Scale consists of 13 items, with two sub-scales: Conservation of Values and Resistance to Change. Moreover, it is a 7-point Likert scale with responses from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree). Higher scores in the scale show that participant has more conservative attitudes and is resistant to change. Cronbach's Alpha score of the General Conservatism Scale was .71 and for sub-scales it was .71 for both Conservation of Values and Resistance to Change (Özdemir, 2013) (see Appendix F).

2.2.5. Religiosity Scale

To measure participants' general religiosity, Peterson and Seligman's Religiosity Scale was used (2004). The scale includes 10 items such as 'I believe that everything happened in the world has a reason.' The religiosity Scale is a 7-point Likert scale in which responses range from 1 (totally disagree) to 7 (totally agree). The original scale was translated to Turkish by Demir and Kumkale (2013). Cronbach's Alpha score of Religiosity Scale was .90 in the translated version (Appendix G).

2.2.6. Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

Glick and Fiske (1996) developed the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory as a Likert Type measurement with 22 items. ASI includes two subscales which are benevolent and

hostile sexism subscales. Those subscales are positively correlated with aspects of sexist ideology. The Benevolent sexism subscale has three subscales: protective paternalism, complementary gender differentiation and heterosexual intimacy sub factors. However; the hostile sexism subscale has one factor structure with three categories: dominative paternalism, heterosexual hostility and competitive gender differentiation. Due to problems in the reversed coding of cross-cultural studies, all items were converted to one way. That means, higher scores in Ambivalent Sexism Inventory mean stronger ambivalent attitudes toward woman (Sakallı Uğurlu, 2002). Cronbach's Alpha scores of Ambivalent Sexism Inventory were between .83 to .92 for the whole scale. The Cronbach's Alpha scores of benevolent sexism subscale were .73 to .85, and for hostile sexism subscale it ranged from .80 to .92 (Glick & Fiske, 1997).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory was translated to Turkish with a cross-culture study (Glick et. al. 2000). Reliability and validity tests of Turkish version of ASI were performed by Sakallı Uğurlu (2002). The result of the study showed that translated version of ASI has two subscales which are hostile and benevolent sexism. Cronbach's Alpha score of ASI was .85 for whole scale, .78 for benevolent sexism subscale and .87 for hostile sexism subscale. The results indicate that the translated version of ASI is reliable for Turkish culture (see Appendix H).

2.2.7. Demographic Information Sheet

As the last part of the questionnaire booklet, participants got a detailed demographic information sheet. In that part, the participants' gender, age, level of their education, name of university and department, marital status, income, growth place, socio-economic status, disability status of participant were asked. In the last part of the demographics sheet, it was asked that whether there were any disabled family members/relatives/friends/known persons, and whether they was any disabled person the participant liked, had a romantic relationship with or has married (see Appendix I).

2.3. Procedure

Firstly, the ethical approval has been taken from METU Human Participants Ethical Committee. After getting the approval from the ethical committee, participants got the questionnaire booklet in a printed way or via Internet. To reach the participants of the study, a snowball technique was used. The survey pack was administered via Qualtrics Online Survey Software. As the mandatory part, all participants read and signed the consent form before starting to fill out the questionnaire booklet. In the booklet, participants were handed out the scales in the following order: Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Social Context of Dating and Marriage Scale, Attitudes toward Disability Employment, Religious Orientation Scale, General Conservatism Scale, Religiosity Scale, Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and Demographic Information Sheet. Lastly, a debriefing form was given to the participants to explain this study (see Appendix J). Completing the questionnaire took almost 15 minutes for participants.

Table 1.
Socio-demographic Characteristics of Sample (N= 626)

	Frequency	Percent	Mean
Gender			
Female	432	69	
Male	194	31	
Age	626		24.98
Educational Status			
Middle School Graduated	4	.6	
High School Graduated	41	6.5	
College Student	15	2.4	
College Graduated	11	1.8	
University Student	266	42.5	
University Graduated	169	27	
Master's Degree Student	61	9.7	

Table 1. (continued)

Master's Degree Graduated and higher	57	9.1
Marital Status		
Single	522	83.4
Married	97	15.5
Divorced	3	.5
Income Level		
Low	10	1.6
Middle Low	41	6.5
Middle	359	57.3
Middle High	202	32.3
High	12	1.9
Have a disabled family member		
Yes	104	16.6
No	517	82.6
Have a disabled close friend or known person		
Yes	184	29.4
No	426	68.1
Frequency level of being in contact with a disabled person		
Once in a day	15	2.4
More than once in a day	48	7.7
Once in a week	41	6.5
More than once in a week	46	7.3
Once in a month	142	22.7
More than once in a month	112	17.9
I have no contact with a disabled person	206	32.9

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1. Data Screening and Data Cleaning

The data has been gathered from 1165 participants via pen and paper and online surveys and was entered to SPSS version 23. Because 42 of the participants filled out the paper survey, this data was checked for conformity to the rules employed in the browser. For the analysis, the first inclusion criterion was the completing at least 90% of the survey. 515 participants completed less than 90% of the survey. Therefore, their responses were eliminated. The second inclusion criterion was the age of participants. For the study, only participants in the age of 18 to 40 were included. Due to this reason, three participants under 18 and eleven participants above 40 were eliminated. The third inclusion criterion was being non-disabled. There were five participants who indicated to have disabilities were eliminated. At the end of those three stages the numbers of participants decreased to 631. After converting the items containing the inverse item to the reverse points of the items, the items that have been left empty below 10% for each scale have been assigned the mean point value of the scale. After the total score was created for each scale and sub-dimension, the total scores created by using single-ended end-value analysis to determine whether the normal distribution was achieved were converted to z scores. In the case the absolute a score exceeded the value of 3.29 and a contradiction by the Mahalanobis distance with the multi-ended end value analysis was found, the data of five people were removed from the analysis. As a result of the normality test which was evaluated by examining the skewness and kurtosis values, parametric tests were used in the study because the skewness and kurtosis values were found to be between -1 and +1 for each scale and sub-dimension (Tabachnik, & Fidell, 2001).

In the following sections, first the correlations among study variables will be presented. After providing an overview of the data, results of Correlation, T-Test, Hierarchical Regression and MANOVA analyses regarding the research questions will be demonstrated.

3.2. Correlation Coefficients between the Measures of the Study

To reveal the relationship between the study variables, Pearson two-tailed correlation analysis has been conducted. All continuous variables of the study were included to the analysis. The results of Pearson two-tailed correlation analysis were shown in Table 5.

According to the results of Pearson two-tailed correlation analysis, total score of the Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Context of Dating was positively correlated with Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Context of Marriage ($r = .864$, $p < .01$) and Attitudes toward Disabled Employment ($r = .388$, $p < .01$). On the other side, Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Context of Dating was negatively correlated with Religiosity Scale ($r = -.182$, $p < .01$), Religious Orientation Scale ($r = -.084$, $p < .01$), and its sub-dimensions of Intrinsic Religious Orientation ($r = -.162$, $p < .01$) and Extrinsic Religious Orientation ($r = -.247$, $p < .01$); Conservatism Scale ($r = -.187$, $p < .01$) and its sub-dimensions of Conservation of Values ($r = -.094$, $p < .01$) and Resistance to Change ($r = -.247$, $p < .01$); and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale ($r = -.235$, $p < .01$) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism ($r = -.157$, $p < .01$) and Benevolent Sexism ($r = -.266$, $p < .01$). However, the total score of the Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Context of Dating was positively correlated with the Quest Religious Orientation sub-dimension ($r = .198$, $p < .01$).

The total score of the Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Context of Marriage was negatively correlated with Religiosity Scale ($r = -.122$, $p < .01$), Intrinsic Religious Orientation ($r = -.102$, $p < .01$) and Extrinsic Religious Orientation ($r = -.178$, $p < .01$);

Conservatism Scale (r= -.105, p< .01) and its sub-dimension of Resistance to Change (r= -.172, p< .01); and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale (r= -.188, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= -.138, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= -.200, p< .01). On the other side, total score of the Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Context of Marriage was positively correlated with the Quest Religious Orientation sub-dimension (r= .165, p< .01). In addition, total score of the Attitudes toward Disabled People in the Context of Marriage was not correlated with Religious Orientation and Conservation of Values sub-dimension.

Attitudes toward Disabled Employment was positively correlated with Religious Orientation Scale (r= .120, p< .01) and its sub-dimension of Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale (r= .087, p< .01), Quest Religious Orientation (r= .134, p< .01) and Conservation of Values sub-dimension (r= .099, p<.01). On the other side, Attitudes toward Disabled Employment was negatively correlated with Extrinsic Religious Orientation sub-dimension (r= -.082, p< .01), Resistance to Change sub-dimension (r= -.204, p< .01), Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale (r= -.350, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= -.370, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= -.258, p< .01). However, there was no correlation between Attitudes toward Disabled Employment and Religiosity, Conservatism and Conservation of Values sub-dimension.

Religious Orientation Scale was positively correlated with its sub-dimensions of Intrinsic Religious Orientation (r= .798, p< .01) and Extrinsic Religious Orientation (r= .584, p< .01) and Quest Religious Orientation Scale (r= .262, p< .01), Conservatism Scale (r= .332, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Conservation of Values (r= .392, p<.01) and Resistance to Change (r= .194, p< .01), Religiosity Scale (r= .574, p< .01), Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale (r= .159, p< .01)and its sub-dimension of Benevolent Sexism (r= .226, p< .01). However, Attitudes toward Disabled Employment and Hostile Sexism were not correlated with each other.

Intrinsic Religious Orientation sub-scale was positively correlated with Extrinsic Religious Orientation sub-dimension (r= .710, p< .01), Conservatism Scale (r= 619, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Conservation of Values (r= .616, p< .01) and Resistance to Change (r= .485, p< .01), Religiosity Scale (r= .863, p< .01), Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale (r= .380, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= .245, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= .439, p< .01). On the other side, Intrinsic Religious Orientation sub-scale was negatively correlated with Quest Religious Orientation Scale (r= -.310, p< .01), Extrinsic Religious Orientation sub-scale was positively correlated Conservatism Scale (r= 613, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Conservation of Values (r= .534, p< .01) and Resistance to Change (r= .562, p< .01), Religiosity Scale (r= .735, p< .01), Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale (r= .442, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= .305, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= .491, p< .01). On the other side, Extrinsic Religious Orientation sub-scale was negatively correlated with Quest Religious Orientation Scale (r= -.502, p< .01).

Quest Religious Orientation Scale was negatively correlated with Conservatism Scale (r= -.531, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Conservation of Values (r= -.394, p< .01) and Resistance to Change (r= -.562, p< .01), Religiosity Scale (r= -.508, p< .01), Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale (r= -.430, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= -.348, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= -.426, p< .01).

Conservatism was positively correlated with its sub dimensions of Conservation of Values (r= .902, p< .01) and Resistance to Change (r= .884, p< .01), Religiosity Scale (r= .720, p< .01), Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale (r= .519, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= .382, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= .551, p< .01).

Conservation of Values sub-dimension was positively correlated with Resistance to Change (r= .595, p< .01), Religiosity Scale (r= .671, p< .01), Ambivalent Sexism

Inventory Scale (r= .385, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= .272, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= .421, p< .01).

Resistance to Changewas positively correlated withReligiosity Scale (r= .613, p< .01), Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale (r= .548, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= .416, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= .569, p< .01).

Religiosity Scalewas positively correlated withAmbivalent Sexism Inventory Scale (r= .469, p< .01) and its sub-dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= .341, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= .504, p< .01).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory Scale was positively correlated with its sub dimensions of Hostile Sexism (r= .900, p< .01) and Benevolent Sexism (r= .895, p< .01).

Lastly, Hostile Sexism sub-dimension was positively correlated with Benevolent Sexism (r= .612, p< .01) (see Table 5).

3.3. Gender Differences

For the comparison of gender differences on continous variables (Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating Context, Attitudes toward Disabled People in Marriage Context and Attitudes toward Disabled Employment) independent-samples T test was used. The results revealed that gender differences were significant only on one variables; Attitudes toward Disabled Employment ($t(624) = 4.079, p < .05$). Attitudes toward Disabled Employment significantly more positive attitudes for females (M= 162.194, SD = 14.089) when compared to males (M= 156.954, SD = 16.355) (see Table 2).

3.4. Regression Analyses

Prior to performing a hierarchical multiple regression analysis, the relevant assumptions of hierarchical regression analysis were tested. First, the assumption of singularity was met, as the independent variables (religious orientation, religiosity, conservatism and ambivalent sexism) were not a combination of other independent variables. Second, residual plots and scatter plots indicated that the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were met As a result, a three stage hierarchical multiple regression was employed with attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating, marriage and work as the dependent variables in three separate analyses. Age, education level and income were entered at stage one of the regression to controlling them. Ambivalent sexism and conservatism were entered at stage two, and finally religious orientation and religiosity was entered at stage three.

The hierarchical multiple regression with attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating as the criterion variable revealed that only the first two steps were significant. In model 1, age, educational level and income contributed significantly to the model, $F (3, 622) = 5.054$, $p < .001$ and accounted for 2.4% of the variation in attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating. The analysis showed that age ($\beta = -.141$, $p < .001$) predicted the attitudes toward disabled people in the dating context; however, education and income did not predicted the dependent variable. In stage 2, ambivalent sexism and conservatism were entered. Conservatism and ambivalent sexism significantly contributed to the model, $F (2, 620) = 18.390$, $p < .001$ and accounted for 4.5% of the additional variation in attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating. Therefore, model 2 indicated that when age, educational level and income were controlled, people who have more ambivalent sexist ideas ($\beta = -.173$, $p < .001$) and have more scores on conservatism ($\beta = -.096$, $p < .05$) were prone to have more negative attitudes toward disabled people in dating context. Finally, religiosity and religious orientation were added into model, the variation coming from this variable was 0.2% and change in R^2 was not significant, $F (2, 618) = .498$, $p = .492$. To sum up, the results of model 3 indicated

that when religiosity and religious orientation added into equation they did not predict people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating (see Table 6).

The second hierarchical multiple regression was performed with attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of marriage as the criterion variables and the predictor variables were entered in the same ways as the former analyses. At stage one, age, educational level and income contributed significantly to the model, $F(3, 622) = 3.413$, $p < .05$ and accounted for 1.6% of the variation in attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of marriage. The analysis showed that age ($\beta = -.104$, $p < .001$) predicted the attitudes toward disabled people in the marriage context; however, educational level and income did not predicted the dependent variable. In stage 2, ambivalent sexism and conservatism were entered. Only ambivalent sexism significantly contributed to the model ($\beta = -.170$, $p < .001$) in attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of marriage. Finally, religiosity and religious orientation were added into model, the additional variation coming from this variable was 0.2% and change in R^2 was not significant, $F(2, 618) = .656$, $p = .519$. These results reveal that conservatism, religiosity and religious orientation did not have significant effect in attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of marriage. Nevertheless, ambivalent sexism is the only significant predictor of dependent variable (see Table 7).

With the same predictors entered in the same fashion with the previous models, attitudes toward disabled employment was the criterion variable for the last hierarchical multiple regression. At step one, age, educational level and income did not explain a sufficient variance in explaining the attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of work, $F(3, 622) = .389$, $p = .761$, $R^2 = .002$. In stage 2, ambivalent sexism and conservatism were entered. Conservatism and ambivalent sexism significantly contributed to the model, $F(2, 620) = 54.046$, $p < .001$ and accounted for 14.8% of the additional variation in attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of work. Therefore, model 2 indicated that when age, educational

level and income were controlled, people who have more ambivalent sexist ideas (β = -.447, $p < .001$) and have less scores on conservatism ($\beta = .168$, $p < .05$) were prone to have more negative attitudes toward disabled people in work context. Finally, religiosity and religious orientation were added into model, only religious orientation significantly contributed to the model ($\beta = .114$, $p < .001$) in attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of work. In the end, whole model showed that attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of work were predicted by conservatism, ambivalent sexism and religious orientation but not by religiosity (see Table 8).

3.5. The Effect of Contact with Disabled People on Dependent Variables

To define the effect of contact with disabled people on the attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating, marriage and work has been searched with three different questions in demographic sheet. The first question was 'Do you have a disabled people in your family?' While 104 of them said Yes, 517 of the participants reported that they do not have a disabled family member. For the comparison of existence of a disabled family member on continous variables (Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating Context, Attitudes toward Disabled People in Marriage Context and Attitudes toward Disabled Employment) independent-samples T test was used. The results revealed that existence of a disabled family member was significant only on one variables; Attitudes toward Disabled Employment ($t(619)$ = 2.883, $p < .05$). Attitudes toward Disabled Employment significantly more positive attitudes for people who have a disabled family member (M= 164.276, SD = 13.341) when compared to the ones who do not have a disabled family member (M= 160.046, SD = 15.085) (see Table 3).

The second question was 'Do you have a disabled close friend or known person?'. While 184 of them said Yes, 426 of the participants reported that they do not have a disabled close friend or known person. For the comparison of existence of a disabled close friend or known person on continous variables (Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating Context, Attitudes toward Disabled People in Marriage Context and

Attitudes toward Disabled Employment) independent-samples T test was used. The results revealed that existence of a disabled close friend or known person was significant only on one variables; Attitudes toward Disabled Employment ($t(608) =$ 2.219, $p < .05$). Attitudes toward Disabled Employment significantly more positive attitudes for people who have a disabled close friend or known person ($M= 162.780$, $SD = 14.399$) when compared to the ones who do not have a disabled close friend or known person ($M= 159.916$, $SD = 15.135$) (see Table 4).

The third question was 'How often do you have a contact with a disabled person in your daily life?'. The options for this question was like this; 1) I have no contact with a disabled person, 2) Once in a day, 3) More than once in a day, 4) Once in a week, 5) More than once in a week, 6) Once in a month, 7) More than once in a month. To test the mean differences between attitudes toward disabled people in dating context (ADD), attitudes toward disabled people in marriage context (ADM) and attitudes toward disabled people in work (ADE) context depending on frequency level of being contact with a disabled person in daily life, two-way MANOVA was used. A non-significant Box"s M value of 36.268 ($F(42, 30123.823) = .823$, $p = .771$) satisfied the normal distribution of the data.

A statistically significant MANOVA result was obtained for the main effect of the frequency level of being in contact with a disabled person with Roys Largest Root = .025, $F(7, 618) = 2.175$, $p < .05$ where partial $\eta 2 = .024$ indicated that the frequency level of being contact with a disabled person explained 2.4 % of the variance in the model.

When the tests of between subjects were examined for attitudes toward disabled people in dating, marriage and work contexts, the results revealed that the main effect of the frequency level of being contact with a disabled person ($F(7, 618) =$ 2.175, $p < .05$) had significant impact on dependent variables. Thus, ANOVAs were conducted for the frequency level of being contact with a disabled person as independent variable and attitudes toward disabled people in dating, marriage and

45

work contexts as dependent variables. Prior to conducting a series of analysis of variance (ANOVA), homogeneity of variance assumption was tested. Homogenity of variance assumption clearly satisfied with a non-significant result of Levene's F test ($p > .05$). After the homogeneity of variance assumption was met, the follow-up ANOVAs were conducted for the effect of frequency level of being contact with a disabled person.

The ANOVA results revealed that participants had only significantly different mean scores for dating in seven different frequency level of being contact with disabled people groups where people who have more contact with a disabled person in daily life showed on attitudes toward disabled people in dating context significantly more positive attitudes ($F(7, 626) = 2.050$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta2 = .023$). On the other side, participants did not have different mean scores for marriage and employment in frequency level of being contact with a disabled person groups.

Table 2.

Gender Differences on Dependent Variables

	Female		Male		t(624)
	N= 434		N= 192		
Variables	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
ADD	43.673	6.539	43.952	7.254	-.457
ADM	45.311	6.188	45.619	7.008	-.525
ADE	162.194	14.089	156.194	16.355	3.852*

Note: ADD: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating, ADM: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Marriage, ADE: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Work. * p< .001

Table 3.

Existence of a Disabled Family Member on Dependent Variables

Variables	Having a Disabled Family Member N= 104		Not Have a Disabled Family Member N= 517		t(619)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
ADD	44.044	6.847	43.779	6.663	.361
ADM	46.433	6.422	45.251	6.400	1.713
ADE	164.276	13.341	160.046	15.085	2.883*

Note: ADD: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating, ADM: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Marriage, ADE: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Work. * p< .05

Table 4.

Existence of a Disabled Close Friend or Known Person on Dependent Variables

Variables	Having a Disabled Close Friend or Known Person N= 184		Not Have a Disabled Close Friend or Known Person N= 426		t(608)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
ADD	44.286	7.101	43.572	6.557	1.165
ADM	45.874	6.655	45.216	6.339	1.138
ADE	162.780	14.399	159.916	15.135	2.219*

Note: ADD: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating, ADM: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Marriage, ADE: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Work. * p < .05

Table 5.
Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Measures of the Study

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. ADD	1																
2.ADM	.864**	1															
3. ADE	.388**	.427**	1														
4.RO	-.084*	-.034	.120**	1													
5. IRO	-.162**	-.102*	.087*	.798**	1												
6. ERO	-.247**	-.178**	-.082*	.584**	.710**	1											
7. QRO	.198**	.165**	.134**	.262**	-.310**	-.502**	1										
8. CO	-.187**	-.105**	-.052	.332**	.619**	.613**	-.531**	1									
9. CV	-.094*	-.022	.099*	.392**	.616**	.534**	-.394**	.902**	1								
10. RC	-.247**	-.172**	-.204**	.194**	.485**	.562**	-.562**	.884**	.595**	1							
11. RS	-.182**	-.122**	.005	.574**	.863**	.735**	-.508**	.720**	.671**	.613**	1						
12. ASI	-.235**	-.188**	-.350**	.159**	.380**	.442**	-.430**	.519**	.385**	.548**	.469**	1					
13. HS	-.157**	-.138**	-.370**	.062	.245**	.305**	-.348**	.382**	.272**	.416**	.341**	.900**	1				
14. BS	-.266**	-.200**	-.258**	.226**	.439**	.491**	-.426**	.551**	.421**	.569**	.504**	.895**	.612**	1			
15. AG	-.149**	-.116**	.007	.013	.096*	.067	-.119**	-.100*	.106**	.072	.116**	.129**	.081*	.153**	1		
16.EDC	-.041	-.034	-.006	.070	.030	.010	.064	-.026	-.023	-.023	-.010	.041	.034	.040	.095*	1	
17. INC	-.066	-.075	-.040	-.014	-.059	-.097*	.100*	-.136**	-.086*	-.159**	-.094**	-.037	-.016	-.051	.216**	.190**	1

Note: ADD: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating, ADM: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Marriage, ADE: Attitudes toward Disabled People in Work, RO: Religious Orientation, IRO: Intrinsic Religious Orientation Sub-Scale, ERO: Extrinsic Religious Orientation Sub-Scale, QRO: Quest Religious Orientation Sub-Scale, CO: Conservatism, CV: Conservatism of Values Sub- Scale, RC: Resistance to Change Sub-Scale, RS: Religiosity Scale, ASI: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, HS: Hostile Sexism, BS: Benevolent Sexism, AG: Age, EDC: Education, INC: Income, ** $p < .001$, * $p < .01$

48

Table 6.
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating

Variables	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	$SE\ B$	B	B	$SE\ B$	B	B	$SE\ B$	B
Age	-.209	.061	-.140	-.153	.060	-.102	-.150	.060	-.101
Educational Level	-.024	.045	-.022	-.017	.043	-.015	-.016	.044	-.015
Income	-.010	.013	-.033	-.019	.013	-.060	-.019	.013	-.060
Ambivalent Sexism				-.042	.011	-.173	-.040	.011	-.167
Conservatism				-.053	.025	-.096	-.033	.033	-.060
Religious Orientation							-.003	.021	-.006
Religiosity							-.020	.026	-.051
R^2		.024			.078			.080	
F for change in R^2		5.054**			18.390**			.492	

** p< .001

Table 7.
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Attitudes toward Disabled People in Marriage

Variables	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	$SE\ B$	β	B	$SE\ B$	β	B	$SE\ B$	β
Age	-.148	.058	-.104	-.110	.058	-.077	-.105	.058	-.074
Educational Level	-.016	.043	-.015	-.009	.042	-.008	-.011	.042	-.010
Income	-.014	.012	-.049	-.019	.012	-.065	-.020	.012	-.066
Ambivalent Sexism				-.039	.011	-.170	-.037	.011	-.160
Conservatism				-.010	.025	-.018	.011	.032	.022
Religious Orientation							.012	.020	.029
Religiosity							-.029	.026	-.077
R^2	.016			.048			.050		
F for change in R^2	3.431**			10.334**			.656		

** $p < .001$

50

Table 8.
Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Attitudes toward Disabled People in Work

Variables	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	B	$SE\ B$	β	B	$SE\ B$	β	B	$SE\ B$	β
Age	.053	.136	.016	.187	.127	.057	.188	.126	.057
Educational Level	.003	.100	.001	.052	.093	.021	.030	.092	.012
Income	-.030	.028	-.044	-.034	.027	-.050	-.036	.026	-.052
Ambivalent Sexism				-.240	.023	-.447	-.246	.024	-.457
Conservatism				.206	.054	.168	.081	.069	.066
Religious Orientation							.110	.044	.114
Religiosity							.084	.056	.095
R^2	.002			.150			.173		
F for change in R^2	.389			54.046**			8.602**		

** $p < .001$

51

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to examine the effects of individual differences related to religiosity, religious orientation, conservatism, ambivalent sexism and socio-demographic variables like gender, age, education and income on non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of work, date and marriage. Moreover, the relationship between being in a contact with a disabled person and the attitudes toward disabled people in continous variables are also examined. In this section, first, the main findings of the present study are discussed with its relation to literature and hypotheses mentioned in the first chapter. Then, major contributions of the current study are mentioned. Finally, strengthens and limitations of current study are discussed together with suggestions for future research.

4.1. General Evaluation of Current Study's Findings

4.1.1. Gender Differences

The current study firstly hypothesized that there will be gender difference in non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of work, date and marriage. For the comparison of gender differences on continous variables (Attitudes toward Disabled People in Dating Context, Attitudes toward Disabled People in Marriage Context and Attitudes toward Disabled Employment) independent-samples T test was used. The results revealed that gender differences were significant only on one variables; Attitudes toward Disabled Employment. In other words, female hold more positive attitudes toward disabled people in work context compare to men. However, there was no significant gender difference in attitudes toward disabled people in date and marriage.

The findings of the study was different then the expectations of Hypothesis 1. The existing literature argues that female has more positive attitudes toward disabled people in the context of work (Hood, 1973; Cesare, Tannenbaum, & Dalessio, 1990; Rimmerman, 1998). Moreover, the effect of target's group gender has contradictory results for the attitudes toward disabled people in dating and marriage contexts (Vilchinsky, & Findler, 2004; Hamdy, Auter, Humphrey, & Attia, 2011). One group of studies argue that female has more positive attitudes toward disabled people in date and marriage context compare to male; however, the other group of studies found out the vice versa. Thus, it can be concluded that based on the insignificant findings of the study and the contradictory findings of literature, the effect of gender in the attitudes of non-disabled people in date and marriage contexts depends on the characteristics of sample such as cultural or societal differences.

4.1.2. Predictive Powers of Age, Education and Income

In the current study, it was hypothesized that age, education and income will have predictor powers on non-disabled people's attitudes toward work, date and marriage (Hypothesis 2). To test the possible predictor factors of those variables on dependent variables, separated hierarchical regressions were conducted for attitudes toward disabled people in work, date and marriage contexts.

According to results, age has the predictor value for attitudes toward disabled people in dating context. Specifically, younger people reported more positive attitudes to date with a disabled people compared to older people. That finding supports the literature that when people get older, they show more negative attitudes toward disabled people in dating context (Marini, Wang, Etzbach, & Castillo, 2012). However; education and income did not show significant results for attitudes toward disabled people in dating context as predictors. Non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people on dating are not a popular and frequently subject in social sciences due to this there is a limited literature about it. In the existing literature education and income were the variables which searched rarely compare to age and

gender. The findings of limited literature argue that level of education is a significant predictor in attitudes toward disabled people in intimate relationships (Karellou, 2003). In the same study it has been reported that there was no significant predictor value of income in continous variable. Since there is contradictory findings about education level and income, we can talk about other possible variables affect the results such as the characteristics of sample and culture.

For the attitudes toward disabled people in marriage context, the findings showed that age was significant predictor. In other words, older people hold more negative attitudes toward disabled people in marriage context compare to younger people. The literature about general attitudes toward disabled people and also intimate relationships specified findings supported the results of current study (Siller, 1963; Tait & Purdie, 2000; Marini, Wang, Etzbach, & Castillo, 2012). Like in dating context, education level and income was not revealed to be significant predictors. The literature about the general attitudes toward disabled people found that people with higher level of education hold more positive attitudes toward disabled people compare to people who has lower educational level (Au, & Man, 2006; Parasuram, 2006). However, the findings of attitudes toward disabled people in intimate relationships revealed that while education had significant predictor for the continous variable, income were not a significant predictor (Karellou, 2003).

Lastly, the findings of current study revealed that age, education and income were not the significant predictors in the attitudes toward disabled people in work context. The findings of literature demonstrated that older people in work life hold more positive attitudes toward disabled people (Gade, & Toutges, 1983; Akardere, 2005). Moreover, it had been found that people who have higher educational level and income reported more positive attitudes toward disabled in work context (Tobias, 1989; Özmen, 1996; Akardere, 2005). Thus, the findings of the study did not support the existing literature.

4.1.3. Predictive Powers of Religiosity, Religious Orientation, Conservatism and Ambivalent Sexism on Dependent Variables

As the Hypothesis 3, in the first chapter it was mentioned that religiosity, religious orientation, conservatism and ambivalent sexism will be the negative predictors of attitudes toward disabled people in the social contexts of work, date and marriage. To examine that hypothesis, hierarchical regression analysis has been conducted while age, education and income were controlled. In this part, the findings of hierarchical regressions will be explained separately based on different dependent variables.

4.1.3.1. Predictive Powers of Religiosity, Religious Orientation, Conservatism and Ambivalent Sexism on Dating

As expected, Ambivalent Sexism and Conservatism were revealed to unique contributions in predicting non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in dating. Specifically, ambivalent sexism and conservatism were the negative predictors of continous variable. That is, people who define themselves as conservative and hold more traditional gender role ideas showed more negative attitudes toward disabled people in dating. In existing literature, it had been found that more conservative people hold more negative attitudes toward disabled people (Backstörm, & Björklund, 2007; Brandes, & Crowson, 2009). Due to lack of interest for the non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in intimate relationships, there was not enough literature to compare the significant predictor effect of ambivalent sexism on attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of dating.

Religiosity and religious orientation were not the significant factors on non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in dating. The limited literature which looks for the effect of religion on the attitudes toward disabled people in dating context found out that religion of the target group does not have significant effects on attitudes toward disabled people in dating (Strohmer, Grand, & Purcell, 1984).

However, there was any study which specifically looks for the effect of religious orientation on non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in dating context. On the other side, the studies which revealed the possible effect of religious orientation in general attitudes toward disabled people reported the negative significant predictor power of religious orientation (Allport & Ross, 1967; & Donahue, 1985).

4.1.3.2. Predictive Powers of Religiosity, Religious Orientation, Conservatism and Ambivalent Sexism on Marriage

The findings of second hierarchical regression analysis, in which age, education and income were controlled, demonstrated that ambivalent sexism significantly (in negative direction) contributed to the model in attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of marriage. That means, people who had more traditional gender roles show more negative attitudes toward disabled people in marriage. In literature, the qualitative studies demonstrated that disability affects the person's chance to carry out traditional gender roles. In societies, disabled people are regarded as asexual, eternally childish and without sexual desires. Thus, disabled people are perceived as unable to fulfil traditional male or female gender roles (Björnsdottir, & Traustadottir, 2010). Therefore, this study supported the findings of qualitative research.

It has been reported by many research that religiosity, religious orientation and conservatism are the significant negative predictors on attitudes toward disabled people (Strohmer, Grand, & Purcell, 1984; Donahue, 1985; Backstörm, & Björklund, 2007). However, the current study findings revealed that religiosity, religious orientation and conservatism were not the significant predictors on in attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of marriage.

4.1.3.3. Predictive Powers of Religiosity, Religious Orientation, Conservatism and Ambivalent Sexism on Work

To examine the predictive powers of religiosity, religious orientation, conservatism and ambivalent sexism on attitudes toward disabled people in work context, hierarchical regression analysis was conducted while age, education and income were controlled. The findings of hierarchical regression analysis revealed that while conservatism was a significant positive predictor, ambivalent sexism was significant negative predictor on dependent variable. That means, people who are more conservative and hold less ambivalent sexism reported more positive attitudes toward disabled people in work context. The literature argues that conservatism and attitudes toward disabled people in work context has negative relationship. In other words, more conservative people reported more negative attitudes toward disabled people (Hood, 1973; Cesare, Tannenbaum, & Dalessio, 1990; Rimmerman, 1998). However, a contradictory result had been found in the current study. On the other side, the negative predictor factor of ambivalent sexism has been reported by researchers (Björnsdottir, & Traustadottir, 2010).

Contrary to the hypothesis 3 and the findings of existing literature that religiosity was a significant predictor on attitudes toward disabled people on work context (Hood, 1973; Cesare, Tannenbaum, & Dalessio, 1990; Rimmerman, 1998); in this study it has been found that religiosity had no significant predictor on attitudes toward disabled people on work.

Finally, religious orientation had significant predictor value on attitudes toward disabled people on work context. More specifically, it has been found that people who defined themselves more religiously oriented showed more positive attitudes toward disabled people on work context. However, the findings of the existing literature revealed that there was a negative significant predictor value of religious orientation on attitudes toward disabled people on work (Hood, 1973; Cesare, Tannenbaum, & Dalessio, 1990; Rimmerman, 1998).

4.1.4. Predictive Power of Contact on Dependent Variables

As the last hypothesis (Hypothesis 4), it has been mentioned that people who have contact with a disabled people will predict more favourable attitudes toward disabled people in the social context of work, date and marriage. To test that hypothesis, three different questions were asked to participants in demographic information sheet. As the first question, it was asked to them that whether they have any disabled family member. According to their answer, independent sample T test were used to. The results revealed that existence of a disabled family member was significant only on one variables; Attitudes toward disabled people in work. More specifically, Attitudes toward disabled people in work context was significantly more positive attitudes for people who have a disabled family member when compared to the ones who do not have a disabled family member. However, the findings were not significant for attitudes toward disabled people in dating and marriage contexts.

As the second question, it was asked to participants that whether they have any disabled close friend or known person. The findings of same analysis showed that existence of a disabled friend or known person was significant only on attitudes toward disabled people in work context but not for dating and marriage. Lastly, participants reported their frequency level of being contact with a disabled person in daily life. MANOVA analysis was used to test the difference. It had been found out that the participants had only significantly different mean scores for dating in seven different frequency level of being contact with disabled people groups where people who have more contact with a disabled person in daily life showed on attitudes toward disabled people in dating context significantly more positive results.

According to Allport's Intergroup Contact Theory, it has been framed that under optimal conditions, contact between the minority and majority group reduce the intergroup prejudice (Pettigrew, 1998). The studies which disabled people were the target group in showed that the attitudes of non-disabled people toward disabled people are negative when there is no contact. However, when there is occasional contact between the groups, the attitudes turn to be more positive way (Desforgers et

58

al, 1991; Anderson et al, 1997; Maras et al., 2000; Cameron et al, 2006; McManus et al, 2011). Moreover, it has also been found that there is a significant positive effect of contact with disabled people on non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in the context of work, dating and marriage (Rimmerman, 1998; Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Sheridan, & Scior, 2013). However, in the current study the findings reported that having a disabled family member, close friend or known person predicts only the attitudes toward disabled people in work context not by dating and marriage contexts. Moreover, the frequency level of being in contact with a disabled people just predicted the attitudes toward disabled people in dating context not by marriage or work.

4.2. Contributions of the Present Study

This study contributes to the existing literature in many ways. First of all, attitudes toward disabled people in dating, marriage and work have been studied with its possible predictors in Turkish society –an unpopular and less frequently studied topic. This study showed the predictor powers of religiosity, religious orientation, conservatism and ambivalent sexism on attitudes toward disabled people in dating, marriage and work contexts while age, income and education were controlled. In general, partly the findings of this study supported the existing literature. For example, it has been found in this study that there was significant negative relationship between age, conservatism and ambivalent sexim, and attitude toward disabled people in the context of dating. Moreover, the negative significant relationship has been found between age and ambivalent sexism, and attitude toward disabled people in marriage context. The existing literature supports those findings. On the other hand, although existing literature argues that religiosity has a negative relationship with attitude toward disabled people in dating, marriage and work contexts; this study showed that there is no significant relationship between those variables. Different from prior literature, this study revealed that education level and income does not have a significant relationship with attitudes toward disabled people in dating, marriage and the context of work. The findings of study on the one hand

supported the existing literature; however, on the other hand some findings of this study showed the contradictions between nations and within the nation. As it has been mentioned in literature that attitude toward disabled people has a complex nature; more studies with different methods needs to be done in that regard in order to understand the underlying factors toward attitude toward disabled people in dating, marriage and work (Yuker, 1988).

Second, the findings of this study revealed that having a disabled family member, close friend or known person has a significant positive relationship only with attitude toward disabled people in the social context of work. This finding reveals a societal truth for us. That is, according to Turkish Labor Law, the employers employ fifty or more workers, with three percent disabled in private sector workplaces; 4 percent of disabled people in public workplaces are obliged to work in jobs suitable for their occupation, body, and spiritual status (Turkish Labor Law, 2003). Based on this law, in Turkish society non-disabled people must work with disabled co-workers. It is an obligatory situation for society. Thus, we know disabled people in the context of work and we have a more positive attitude there. However, on the other hand in the social contexts of dating and marriage, a person has the right to choose for a romantic relationship. With this right, a person could keep a distance from a disabled person. The findings of study supported this idea that when we have the option to choose, we do not want to see disabled people to be close. If we have been pushed by laws, we accept disabled people in our society.

Finally, this study showed that if we face with our negative attitude toward disabled people, we could change our society toward a fairer one. We should be braver to face ourselves and our negative attitude. The findings of this study revealed that if we turn familiar with disability and disabled people, we can get rid of the discrimination and negative attitude toward the world's biggest minority group, disabled people.

4.3. Limitations and Suggestions for the Future Studies

It is worth to mention about some limitations of this study. Firstly, the sample of the study includes double of females (69%, see Tablo 2.1) compare to male participants. Moreover, the sample consisted of highly educated, just 11.3 % of it has high school or lower degree, and mostly middle/upper socio-economic status people, only 8.1% of it lower than middle socio-economic class. That issue restricts the findings of the study in terms of generalization. Thus, the future studies conducted with more heterogeneous samples will increase our understandings about the topic.

As the other limitation, social desirability effect could be considered. Attitudes toward disabled people especially in dating and marriage contexts are hard to be explicitly mentioned especially for highly educated, middle/upper class people. Thus, the future studies with different methodologies such as qualitative ones can be conducted to increase the understanding of non-disabled people's attitudes toward disabled people in dating, marriage and work contexts.

Finally, to decrease negative attitudes toward disabled people in date, marriage and work contexts, more studies needs to be conducted by researchers from different academic fields. Without knowing the underlying mechanisms in the attitudes toward disabled people, it is not possible to break the borders between groups. It should always be in our minds that although disabled people cannot be seen in the streets, schools, shopping malls too often, actually there are here just some steps back in the apartments, houses and facilitations. They want to be in the part of daily life like all non-disabled people. They are working to get rid of our disabled societies for more equal rights in every aspect of life.

REFERENCES

Adelman, P. B., & Vogel, S. A. (1993). Issues in the employment of adults with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 16 (3)*, 219-232.

Akardere, S. S. (2005). *Işverenlerin Engelli çalışanlarına Yönelik Tutumları* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Marmara University.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 432-443.

Anderson, L., Schleien, S., McAvoy, L., Lais, G., & Seligman, D. (1997). Creating positive change through an integrated outdoor adventure program. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal,31 (4)*, 214-229.

Antonak, R. F., & Livneh, H. (2000). Measurement of attitudes toward persons with disabilities. *Disability and Rehabilitation, 22*, 211–224.

Atabey, C. M. (2011). *Disability salience as an indicator of loss anxiety: An alternative explanation for the fundamental fear of human beings* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Middle East Technical University, Turkey.

Au, K. W., & Man, D. W. K. (2006). Attitudes toward people with disabilities: a Comparison between health care professionals and students. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research, 29 (2)*, 155-160.

Aycan, Z. (2015). *Türkiye'de Engellilerin İş Hayatına Katılımını Engelleyen Bireysel, Kurumsal ve Toplumsal Faktörler* (Unpublished report). Koç University, Turkey.

Aysoy, M. (2004). *Avrupa Birligi Sürecinde Özürlüler Politikası*, İstanbul: Açı Kitaplar, pp. 1-20.

Bäckström, M., & Björklund, F. (2007). Structural modeling of generalized prejudice: Therole of socialdominance, authoritarianism, and empathy. *Journal of Individual Differences, 28*, 10–17.

Barnes, C. (2012). Understanding the social model of disability: Past, present and future in N. Watson, A. Roulstone, & C. Thomas (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook* of Disability *Studies*, NY: Routledge.

Barnes, C., Oliver, M., & Barton, L. (2002). Introduction. In C. Barnes, M. Oliver, & L. Barton (Eds.). *Disability Studies Today (pp. 1-18).* Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.

Barnes, C., & Mercer, G. (2010). Exploring Disability, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Palgrave.

Barnes, C. (2016, November). *History: Disability Activism and the Social Model of Disability.* Background notes for an informal presentation for the student Disability Action Society, University of Leeds, UK.

Baybora D. (2006). Çalışma hayatında özürlülere karşı ayrımcılık, *Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları Dergisi. 51,* 229-269.

Berghs, M., Atkin, K., Graham, H., Hatton, C., & Thomas, C. (2016). Implications for public health research of models and theories of disability: a scoping study and evidence synthesis. *Public Health Research, 4 (8).*

Berkson, G. (1974). Social Responses of Animals to Infants with Defects in M. Lewis and L. E. Rosenblum(Eds.) *The Effect of the Infant on Its Caregivers*, New York: John Wiley.

Björnsdóttir, K., & Traustadóttir, R. (2010). Stuck in the land of disability? The intersection of learning difficulties, class, gender and religion. *Disability & Society, 25*(1), 49-62.

Bordieri, J. E., Drehmer, D. E., & Taylor, D. W. (1997). Work life for employees with disabilities: Recommendations for promotion. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 40 (3),* 181-191.

Bowlby, J. (1979). *The making and breaking of affectional bonds*. New York: Routledge, Taylor &Francis Group.

Braaddock, D. L., & Parish, S. L. (2001). An Institutional History of Disability , in: G. L. Albrecht, K. Seelman & M. Bury (Eds*) Handbook of disability studies* (1st edn). London: Sage Publications.

Braithwaite, S. R., Delevi, R., & Fincham, F. D. (2010). Romantic relationships and the physical and mental health of college students. *Personal relationships*, *17*(1), 1-12.

Brandes, J. A., & Crowson, H. M. (2009). Predicting dispositions toward inclusion of students with disabilities: The role of conservative ideology and discomfort with disability. *Social Psychology of Education*, *12*(2), 271-289.

Bricout, J. C., & Bentley, K. J. (2000). Disability status and perceptions of employability by employers. *Social Work Research*, *24*(2), 87-95.

Brodwin, M.G., & Orange, L.M. (2002) Attitudes toward disability. In J.D. Andrew & C.W. Faubion (Eds.), *Rehabilitation services: An introduction for the human services professional (pp. 145-173).* Osage Beach, MO: Aspen Professional Services.

Brown, S. E. (1997). 'Oh, Don't You Envy Us Our Privileged Lives?' A Review of the Disability Culture Movement. *Disability and Rehabilitation 19, (8),* 339-49.

Brown, S. L. (2000). The effect of union type on psychological well-being: Depression among cohabitors versus marrieds. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 41*, 241–255.

Burchardt, T. (2004). Capabilities and disability: The capabilities framework and the social model of disability. *Disability and Society, 19,* 735-751.

Bury, M. (2000) On chronic illness and disability, in: C. E. Bird, P. Conrad & A. M. Fremont (Eds*) Handbook of medical sociology* (5th edn). New Jersey: PA, Prentice Hall.

Callahan, M. J., & Garner, B. (1997). *Keys to the workplace: Skills and supports for people with disabilities*. London: Paulh Brookes.

Cameron, L., & Rutland, A. (2006). Extended contact through story reading in school: Reducing children's prejudice toward the disabled. *Journal of Social Issues*, *62(3),* 469 - 488.

Campell, J. & Oliver, M. (1996) *Disability Politics: understanding our past, changing our future*. London: Routledge.

Cesare, S. J., Tannenbaum, R. J., & Dalessio, A. (1990). Interviewers' decisions related to applicant handicap type and later empathy. *Human Performance, 3*, 157-171.

Chen, R. K., Brodwin, M. G., Cardoso, E., & Chan, F. (2002). Attitudes toward people with disabilities in the social context of dating and marriage: A, comparison of American Taiwanese, and Singaporean college students. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 68*, 5-11.

Chan, F., Livneh, H., Pruett, S., Wang, C.-C., & Zheng, L. X. (2009). Societal attitudes toward disability: Concepts, measurements, and interventions. In F. Chan, E. da Silva Cordoso, & J. A. Chronister (Eds.), *Understanding psychosocial adjustment to chronic illness and disability: A handbook for evidence-based practitioners in rehabilitation* (pp. 333–367). New York, NY: Springer.

Conyers, L. M., Koch, L. C., & Szymanski, E. M. (1998). Life-span perspectives on disability and work: A qualitative study. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 42 (1),* 52-76.

Demir, B., & Kumkale, G. T. (2013). Individual differences in willingness to become an organ donor: A decision tree approach to reasoned action. *Personality and Individual Differences, 55,* 63–69.

Desforges, D. M., Lord, C. G., Ramsey, S. L., Mason, J.A., Van Leeuwen, M. D., West, S.C., & Lepper, M.R. (1991). Effects of structured cooperative contact on changing negative attitudes toward stigmatized social groups. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol. 60,* 531.44.

Diksa E., & Rogers E. S. (1996). Employer concerns about hiring persons with psychiatric disability: Results of the employer. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 40 (1),* 31-45.

Drake, R. (1999). *Understanding Disability Policy*. London: Macmillan.

Dunkel, C. S., & Harbke, C. (2017). A review of measures of Erikson's stages of psychosocial development: Evidence for a general factor. *Journal of Adult Development, 24(1),* 58-76.

Dunn, S., D. (2015). *The Social Psychology of Disability*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Duriez, B., & Van Hiel, A. (2002). The march of modern fascism. A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*, 1199–1213.

Dush, C. M. K., & Amato, P. R. (2005). Consequences of relationship status and quality for subjective well-being. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22(5),* 607-627.

English, R. W. (1977). Correlates of stigma towards physically disabled persons. In J. Stubbins (Ed.), *Social and psychological aspects of disability: A handbook for practitioner* (pp. 207- 224). Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Erikson, E. H. (Ed.). (1963). *Youth: Change and challenge*. New York: Basic books.

Erikson, E. H. (1964). *Insight and responsibility*. New York: Norton.

Erin, J. R., Rudin, D., & Njoroge, M. (1991). Religious beliefs of parents of children with visual impairments. *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 85,* 157-162.

Esmail, S., Darry, K., Walter, A., & Knupp, H. (2010). Attitudes and perceptions towards disability and sexuality. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, *32*(14), 1148-1155.

Equal Opportunities Commission (2010). Baseline Survey on Public Attitudes towards Persons with a Disability2010. Retrieved from: ftp://203.85.114.1/ftproot/public/ResearchReport/201109/Disability_Executive _Summary(eng).pdf.

Farber, B. (1968). *Mental retardation: Its social context and social consequences*. Boston, MA: Houghton, Mifflin Company.

Finkelstein, V. (1997). *Emacipating Disability Studies* in T. Shakespeare, ed., The Disability Studies Reader. London: Cassell. pp. 28–49.

Finkelstein, V. (2001). *The social model repossessed*. The Disability Studies Archive UK, Centre for Disability Studies, University of Leeds. Available online at: www.leeds.ac.uk/disability-stud-ies/archiveuk/archframe.html.

Fichten, C. S., & Amsel, R. (1986). Trait attributions about physically disabled college students: Circumplex analyses andmethodological issues. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 16,* 410–427.

Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General Psychology, 4,* 132-154.

Fraley, C., R. (2002). Attachment stability from infancy to adulthood: Meta-analysis and dynamic modeling of developmental mechanisms. *Personality and social psychology review*, *6(2),* 123-151.

Fraley, R. C. (2018). Adult Attachment Theory and Research. Retrieved from: http://labs.psychology.illinois.edu/~rcfraley/attachment.htm.

Furnham, A., & Thompson, R. (1994). Actual and perceived attitudes of wheelchair users. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 7 (1)*, 35-52.

Gade, E., & Toutges, G. (1983). Employers' attitudes toward hiring epileptics: Implications for job placement. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*.

Garland, R. (1995). *The Eye of the Beholder: Deformity and Disability in the Graeco Roman World*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70* (3), 491-512.

Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., Adetoun,B., Osagie, J. E., Akande, A., Alao, A., Brunner, A., Willemsen, T. M.,Chipeta, K., B., Dardenne, Dijksterhuis, A., Wigboldus, D., Eckes, T., Six-Materna, I., Expósito, F., Moya, M., Foddy, M., Kim, H. J., Lameiras, M.,Sotelo, M. J., Mucchi-Faina, A., Romani, M., Sakalli, N., Udegbe, B., Yamamoto, M., Ui, M., Ferreira, M. C., López, W. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 763-775.

Gillath, O., Karantzas, G. C., & Fraley, R. C. (2016). *Adult attachment: A concise introduction to theory and research*. Academic Press.

Ginkel, Ross (2011). *An Examination of the Effects of Religious Orientation on Attitudes toward the Disabled* (Doctoral dissertation, Pacific University). Retrieved from: http://commons.pacificu.edu/spp/217.

Goffman, E. (1968). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of a Spoiled Identity.* Harmondsworth, London: Penguin.

Goldstein, S. B., & Johnson, V. A. (1997). Stigma by association: Perceptions of the dating partners of college students with physical disabilities. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *19*(4), 495-504.

Goreczny, A. J., Bender, E. E., Caruso, G., & Feinstein, C. S. (2011). Attitudes toward Individuals with Disabilities: Results of a Recent Survey and f Those Implications oResults. Research In Developmental Disabilities: *A Multidisciplinary Journal, 32(5),* 1596-1609.

Greenbaum, J. J., & Wang, D. D. (1965). A semantic-differential study of the concepts of mental retardation. *Journal of Genetic Pscyhology, 73*, 257-272.

Grob, G. N (1990). Marxian Analysis and Mental Illness. *History of Psychiatry, 1,* 223-32.

Hamdy, N. N., Auter, P. J., Humphrey, V. F., & Attia, A. (2011). A cultural perspective: A survey of U.S. and Egyptian students regarding their perceptions of people with 90disabilities. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1* (5), 83-93.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *52*(3), 511.

Hergenrather, K., & Rhodes, S. (2007). Exploring undergraduate student attitudes toward Persons with disabilities: Application of the disability social relationship scale.*Rehabilitation and Counseling Bulletin, 50:2,* 66-75.

Hernandez, B., Keys, C., & Balcazar, F. (2000). Employeers Attitudes toward Workers with Disabilities and Their ADA Employment Rights: A Literature Review. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 66 (4),* 4-16.

Hirsch, K. (1995). Culture and Disability: The Role of Oral History. *Oral History Review, 22,* 1-27.

Hood, R. W. (1973). Dogmatism and opinions about mental illness. *Psychological Reports, 32*, 1283-1290.

Horwitz, A. V., & White, H. R. (1998). The relationship of cohabitation and mental health: A study of a young adult cohort. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60,* 505–514.

Howland, C. A., & Rintala, D. H. (2001). Dating behaviors of women with physical disabilities. *Sexuality and Disability*, *19*(1), 41-70.

Hunt, B., & Hunt, C. S. (2000). Attitudes toward people with disabilities: A comparison of undergraduate rehabilitation and business majors. *Rehabilitation Education, 14,* 269– 283.

Jackson, L. M., & Hunsberger, B. (1999). An intergroup perspective on religion and prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 38,* 509-523.

Jankauskas, R., & A. Urbanavicius (1998). Diseases in European Historical Populations and Their Effects on Individuals and Society. *Collegium Antropologicum (*22), 46-76.

Karellou, J. (2003). Laypeople's attitudes towards the sexuality of people with learning disabilities in Greece. *Sexuality and Disability*, *21*(1), 65-84.

Kayacı, E., (2007). *Özürlüler İçin Verimli Bir İstihdam Politikası Oluşturulması*, Unpublished Speciality Thesis, Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı, Türkiye İş Kurumu Genel Müdürlüğü.

Kemmelmeier, M. (1997). Need for closure and political orientation among German university students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 137(6),* 787–789.

Kroll, J. (1973). A Reappraisal of Psychiatry in the Middle Ages. *Archives of General Psychiatry (29),* 27-83. Livneh, H. (1982). On the origin of negative attitudes toward people with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Literature*, *43*, 338–347.

Mamatoğlu, N., Yaşın- Dökmen, Z., & Yıldırım, F. (2015). İş Yerinde Engelliye Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 32 (2),* 183-204.

Man, M., Rojahn, J., Chrosniak, L., & Sanford, J. (2006). College students' romantic attraction toward peers with physical disabilities. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities, 18*, 35–44.

Mansour, M. (2009). Employers' attitudes and concerns about the employment of disabled people. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, *5*(4), 209-218.

Maras, P., & Brown, R. (2000). Effects of different forms of school contact on children's attitudes toward disabled and non-disabled peers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *70*(3), 337-351.

Marini, I., Wang, X., Etzbach, C. A., & Del Castillo, A. (2013). Ethnic, gender, and contact differences in intimacy attitudes toward wheelchair users. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *56*(3), 135-145.

Markstrom, C. A., & Kalmanir, H. M. (2001). Linkages between the psychosocial stages of identity and intimacy and the ego strengths of fidelity and love. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, *1*(2), 179-196.

McLeod, S. A. (2018, May 03). *Erik Erikson's stages of psychosocial development*. Retrieved from https://www.simplypsychology.org/Erik-Erikson.html.

McManus, J. L., Feyes, K. J., & Saucier, D. A. (2011). Contact and knowledge as predictors of attitudes toward individuals with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *28*(5), 579-590.

McQuilkin, J. I. (1990). Attitudes of college students toward handicapped persons. *Journal of College Student Development, 31,* 17-22.

Miles, M. (2000). Signing in the Seraglio: Mutes, Dwarfs and Jestures at the Ottoman Court 1500-1700. *Disability & Society* 15 (1), 115-34.

Miller, E., Chen, R., Glover-Graf, N. M., & Kranz, P. (2009). Willingness to engage in personal relationships with persons with disabilities: Examining category and severity of disability. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 52*, 211–224.

Morris, J. (1991). *Pride against Prejudice. Transforming Attitudes to Disability.* London: The Women Press.

Moore, M., & Slee, R. (2012). *Disability studies, inclusive education and exclusion*. In Watson, N., Roulstone, A., & Thomas, C. (Eds.). Routledge handbook of disability studies. New York: Routledge.

Mora, G. (1992). The History of Psychiatry in the United States: Historiographic and Theoretical Considerations. *History of Psychiatry, 3,* 187- 201.

Nario-Redmond, M. R. (2010). Cultural stereotypes of disabled and non-disabled men and women: Consensus for global category representations and diagnostic

domains. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 49*(3), 471-488.

Nota, L., Santilli, S., Ginevra, M. C., & Soresi, S. (2014). Employer attitudes towards the work inclusion of people with disability. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *27*(6), 511-520.

Oliver, M. (1981). *A New Model of the Social Work Role in Relation to Disability* , in J. Campling, (Ed.), The Handicapped Person: A New Perspective for Social Workers. London, UK: RADAR.

Oliver, M. (1996). *Understanding disability: from theory to practice*. Basingstoke: Macmillan

Öner-Özkan, B. (2007). Future Time Orientation and Religion. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal, 35, (1),* p.51-62.

Özdemir, F. (2013). *The predictors of attitudes toward military: Turkish identity, uninational ideology, ambivalent sexism, conservatism, and religious orientation*.Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Özmen, E.S. (1996*). İşverenlerin Engelli Bireylerin İşe Alınması ve Birlikte Çalışılmasına Yönelik Tutumlarının Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından Karşılaştırılması* Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi.

Öztürk, M. (2011). *Türkiye'de Engelli Gerçeği* (Report No: 30). İstanbul: Müsiad.

Parasuram, K. (2006). Variables that affect teachers' attitudes towards disability and inclusive education in Mumbai, India. *Disability & Society, 21,* 231-242.

Park, J. H., Faulkner, J., & Schaller, M. (2003). Evolved disease-avoidance process and contemporary anti-social behavior: Prejudicial attitudes and avoidance of people with physical disabilities. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavioral, 27*, 65-87.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23,* 173–185.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49,* 65–85.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 90 (5):* 751–783.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology. 38 (6):* 922–934.

Priebe, S., Warner, R., Hubschmid, T., & Eckle, I. (1998). Employment, attitudes toward work, and quality of life among people with schizophrenia in three countries. *Schizophrenia bulletin, 24*(3), 469-477.

Ray, C. & West, J. (1984). I. Social, sexual and personal implications of paraplegia. *Paraplegia, 22,* 75–86.

Retief, M., & Letšosa, R. (2018). Models of disability: A brief overview. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies 74(1),* 47-38.

Rimmerman, A. (1998). Factors relating to attitudes of Israeli corporate executives toward the employability of persons with intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 23 (3),* 245-255.

Rimmerman, A. (2013). Historical roots and conceptualising disability. *Social inclusion Of people with disabilities (*pp. 13-23*).* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rimmerman, A. (2013). Social exclusion and social inclusion. *Social inclusion of people with disabilities (*pp. 33-54*).* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, E. V. (1989). A History of the Independent Living Movement: A Founder's Perspective in B. W. Heller, L. M. Flohr, L. S. Zegans (Eds). *Psychosocial Interventions with Physically Disabled Persons.* NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Roberts, F. K. (1986). Education of the Visually Handicapped: A Social and Educational History in G. T. Scholl (Ed). *Foundations of Education for Blind and Visually Handicapped Children and Youth: Theory and Practice*, New York City: American Foundation for the Blind.

Robles, T. F., Slatcher, R. B., Trombello, J. M., & McGinn, M. M. (2014). Marital quality and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*, 140–187.

Roccas, S. (2005). Religion and value systems. *Journal of Social Issues, 61* (4), 747-759.

Roosens, E. (1979). *Mental Patients in Town Life: Gheel Europe's First Therapeutic Community*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Roulstone, A., Thomas, C., & Watson, N. (2012). The changing terrain of disability Studies. In Watson, N., Roulstone, A., & Thomas, C. (Eds.). *Routledge handbook of disability studies.* New York: Routledge.

Russell, S. T., & Consolacion, T. B. (2003). Adolescent romance and emotional health in the United States: Beyond binaries. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *32*(4), 499-508.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. [Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Reliability and Validity]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi. 17* (49), 47-58.

Sakallı - Uğurlu, N., & Shaver, P. R. (2013). *Religious orientation scale*. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Psychology, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism-collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagıtcibasi, S-C, Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (p. 85-119). London: Sage.

Scotch, R. K. (2001). American disability policy in the twentieth century. In Longmore, P. K., & Umansky, L. (Eds.). The new disability history: American perspectives (History of disability). New York: New York University Press.

Scull, A. (1991). Psychiatry and Social Control in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. *History of Psychiatry, 2,* 149-69.

Selcuk, E., & Ong, A. D. (2013). Perceived partner responsive-ness moderates the association between received emotional support and all-cause mortality. *Health Psychology, 32*, 231– 235.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1994). *What you can change and what you can't*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Shakespeare, T. (2000). Disabled sexuality: toward rights and recognition. *Sexuality and Disability, 18*(3), *159-166.*

Shakespeare, T., & Watson, N. (2001). The social model of disability: an outdated ideology? *Research in social science and disability, volume 2, exploring and expanding methodologies*. Atlanta: Elsevier Inc.

Shakespeare, T. (2005). Review article: Disability studies today and tomorrow. *Sociology of Health and Illness, 27,* 138-148.

Shakespeare, T. (2018). *Disability: The Basics*. Routledge, New York.

Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Loreman, T. (2008). Impact of training on pre-service teachers' attitudes and concerns about inclusive education and sentiments about persons with disabilities. *Disability & Society*, *23*(7), 773-785.

Sheridan, J., & Scior, K. (2013). Attitudes towards people with intellectual disabilities: A comparison of young people from British South Asian and White. British backgrounds *Research in developmental disabilities*, *34*(4), 1240-1247.

Siller, J. (1963). Reactions to physical disability. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 7,* 12-16.

Smart, J. (2001). *Disability, society, and the individual*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues. 41 (3):* 157–175.

Stephan, W. G., &Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues. 55 (4):* 729–743.

Strohmer, D. C., Grand, S. A., & Purcell, M. J. (1984). Attitudes toward persons with a disability: An examination of demographic factors, social context, and specific disability. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, *29*(3), 131.

Sunoo, B. P. (2001). Accommodating workers with disabilities. *Workforce, February*, 86-93.

Suzuki, A. (1991). Lunacy in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century England: Analysis of Quarter Sessions Records. Part I. *History of Psychiatry (2),* 437-56.

Szasz, T. S. (1971). *The Manufacture of Madness*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Tobias, D. L. (1989). *Attitudes of employers in manufacturing toward hiring the handicapped*. A Bel and Howel Information Company.

Tait, K., & Purdie, M. (2000). Attitudes toward disability: Teacher education for inclusive environments in an Australian university. *Journal of Disability, Development, andEducation, 47,* 25-38.

Thomas, M., & Thomas, M. J. (2002). Status of women with disabilities in South Asia. *Selected readings in community-based rehabilitation, series*, *2*.

Thomas, C. (2004). How is disability understood? An examination of sociological approaches. *Disability and Society 19:6,* 569-583.

Tervo, R. C., Azuma, S., Palmer, G., & Redinius, P. (2002). Medical students' attitudes toward persons with disability: A comparative study. *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation, 83,* 1537-42.

Tervo, R. C., & Palmer, G. (2004). Health professional student attitudes towards people with disability. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, *18*(8), 908–915.

Tracey, W. R. (1995). *Training employees with disabilities*. New York: Amacom.

Tufan, İ., & Arun, Ö., (2002). *Türkiye Özürlüler Araştırması 2002 İkincil Analiz*, TÜBİTAK, Proje No: SOBAG-104K077.

Turkish Labor Law (2003). Retrieved from:
http://www.turkis.org.tr/dosya/ghp9Q32hDZKL.pdf

UPIAS (1976). Fundamental Principles of Disability. London: Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation.

Van Hiel, A., & Kossowska, M. (2007). Contemporary attitudes and their ideological representation in Flanders (Belgium), Poland, and the Ukraine.International Journal of Psychology, 42, 16–26.

Vilchinsky, N., & Findler, L. (2004). Attitudes towards Israel's Equal Rights for People with Disabilities Law: A multi-per-spective approach. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 49*, 309–316.

Vilchinsky, N., Findler, L., & Werner, S. (2010). Attitudes toward people with disabilities: The perspective of attachment theory. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, *55*, 298–306.

Yıldırım, Z. (2007). *Religiousness, conservatism and their relationship with traffic behaviours.* Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Yılmaz, Z., (2007). *Çalışan Özürlülerin İş Yaşamında Karşılaştıkları Sorunlar ve Bunları Etkileyen Etmenler,* Özveri. Retrieved from:
http://www.ozida.gov.tr/ozveri.

Yuker, H. E., Block, J. R., & Younng, J. H. (1966). *The measurement of attitudes toward disabled persons*. Albertson, NY: Human Resources Center.

Yuker, H. E. (Ed.). (1988). *Attitudes towards persons with disabilities*. New York, NY: Springer.

Yuker, H. E. (1994). Variables that influence attitudes toward people with disabilities:Conclusions from the data. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *9*, 3–22.

Waite, L. J. (1995). Does marriage matter? *Demography, 32,* 483–508.

Weisel, A., & Zaidman, A. (2003). Attitudes of secular and religious Israeli adolescents towards person with disabilities: A multidimensional analysis. *International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education, 50,* 309-323.

White, M. J., Gordon, P., & Jackson, V. (2006). Implicit and explicit attitudes toward athletes with disabilities. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 72*, 33-40.

William, S. (1999). Is anybody there? Critical realism, chronic illness and the disability debate, *Sociology of Health and Illness, 21 (6),* 797-819.

Winzer, M., A. (1993). *The History of Special Education: From Isolation to Integration*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Wolfensberger, W. (1981). The Extermination of Handicapped People in World War II Germany. *Mental Retardation 19 (1),* 1-7.

Woodly, A., & Metzger, N. (2012). *Employers Attitudes towards Employing Disabled People.* Retrieved from: Ministry of Social Development website: https://www.odi.govt.nz/assets/Guidance-and-Resources-files/Employers-Research .pdf.

World Health Organization (2011). *World Report on Disability*. Retrieved from: http://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/report/en/.

Zernitsky-Shurka, E. (1988). The impact of cultural, ethnic, religious, and national variables on attitudes toward persons with a physical disability: A review. In. Yuker, H E. (Ed.), *Attitudes toward persons with disabilities* (pp. 96-106). New York: Springer Publishing Company.

APPENDICES

A. INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Bu araştırma, ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümü Sosyal Psikoloji yüksek lisans öğrencilerinden Melek Mert'in yüksek lisans tez çalışmasıdır. Bu form sizi araştırma koşulları hakkında bilgilendirmek için hazırlanmıştır.

Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir?

Araştırmanın amacı, genç yetişkinlerin evlenmeye ve iş yaşamına dair tutumlarını etkileyen faktörleri Türkiye örnekleminde araştırmaktır.

Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz?

Araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ederseniz, sizden beklenen, ankette yer alan bir dizi soruyu derecelendirme ölçeği üzerinde yanıtlamanız ve üç açık uçlu soruyu kısaca cevaplandırmanızdır. Bu çalışmaya katılım ortalama olarak 20 dakika sürmektedir.

Sizden Topladığımız Bilgileri Nasıl Kullanacağız?

Araştırmaya katılımınız tamamen gönüllülük temelinde olmalıdır. Ankette, sizden kimlik veya kurum belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli tutulacak, sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir. Katılımcılardan elde edilecek bilgiler toplu halde değerlendirilecek ve bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır. Sağladığınız veriler gönüllü katılım formlarında toplanan kimlik bilgileri ile eşleştirilmeyecektir.

Katılımınızla ilgili bilmeniz gerekenler:

Anket, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek sorular içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi

rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda anketi uygulayan kişiye, anketi tamamlamadığınızı söylemek yeterli olacaktır.

Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isterseniz:

Anket sonunda, bu çalışmayla ilgili sorularınız cevaplanacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Psikoloji Bölümü yüksek lisans öğrencisi Melek Mert (E-posta: e171837@metu.edu.tr) , Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan (E-posta: bengi@metu.edu.tr) ya da Dr. Müjde Koca Atabey (mujde.koca.atabey@gmail.com)   ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman yarıda kesip çıkabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum. (Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).

Katılımcının Adı-Soyadı: **Tarih:**

İmza: **----/----/----**

B. ATTITUDE TOWARD DISABLED PEOPLE IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF DATING SCALE

Lütfen, aşağıda size verilen ölçeklerde her bir maddede belirtilen ifadeye cevap verirken zihinsel engelliler hariç (zeka geriliği gibi) diğer tüm engel gruplarını düşünerek, o ifadeye <u>ne</u> <u>kadar katıldığınızı</u> <u>ya da katılmadığınızı</u> o ifadenin yanında yer alan seçeneklerden birini işaretleyerek belirtiniz. Soruların doğru ya da yanlış yanıtı yoktur, önemli olan sizin ne düşündüğünüzdür. Bu nedenle, hiç bir ifadeyi atlamamanız ve ifadeleri içtenlikle değerlendirmeniz son derece önemlidir. Ayrıca, araştırmanın bilimselliği açısından her bir ifade için tek bir seçeneği işaretlemeniz gerekmektedir

1= Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

2= Katılıyorum

3= Katılmıyorum

4=Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum

_____ 1. Engelli bir birey ile romantik bir ilişki içinde olabilirim.

_____ 2. Kişinin bir engelinin olup olmaması o kişi ile romantik ilişki yaşamamda bir kıstas değildir.

_____ 3*. Engelli bir sevgilim olsa arkadaşlarıma onu tanıtırken utanırım.

_____ 4. Engelli biri çekici olabilir.

_____ 5. Görünür bir engeli olmayan biri ile romantik bir ilişki içinde olabilirim.

_____ 6*. Ailem engelli bir birey ile romantik ilişki içinde olmama izin vermez.

_____ 7. Engelli bir birey seksi olabilir.

_____ 8*. Bir arkadaşım bana bir randevu ayarlayacak olsa o kişinin engelli olduğunu öğrendiğimde o kişi ile tanışmaktan vazgeçerim.

_____ 9*. Engelli bir birey ile romantik bir ilişki yaşayamam.

_____ 10. Çekici bulduğum bir birey ile romantik ilişkiye başlama kararı alırken o kişinin engelli olması beni etkilemez.

_____ 11*. Engelli birinin cinsiyeti olduğunu hissedemem.

_____ 12*. Engelli sevgilimi ailem ile tanıştıracağım zaman ailemin vereceği tepkiden endişe duyarım.

_____ 13*. Engelli birine karşı hissedeceğim duygular arkadaşlıktan öteye gitmez.

_____ 14. Engelli biri ile sevgili olmak bana o kişiye yardım ediyormuşum hissini verir.

_____ 15*. Engelli bir bireye karşı hissettiğim acıma hissi engelli bir sevgiliyi eşitmişiz gibi görebilmemi etkiler.

* = Reversed items.

C. ATTITUDE TOWARD DISABLED PEOPLE IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF MARRIAGE SCALE

Lütfen, aşağıda size verilen ölçeklerde her bir maddede belirtilen ifadeye cevap verirken zihinsel engelliler hariç (zeka geriliği gibi) diğer tüm engel gruplarını düşünerek, o ifadeye <u>ne</u> <u>kadar katıldığınızı</u> <u>ya da katılmadığınızı</u> o ifadenin yanında yer alan seçeneklerden birini işaretleyerek belirtiniz. Soruların doğru ya da yanlış yanıtı yoktur, önemli olan sizin ne düşündüğünüzdür. Bu nedenle, hiç bir ifadeyi atlamamanız ve ifadeleri içtenlikle değerlendirmeniz son derece önemlidir. Ayrıca, araştırmanın bilimselliği açısından her bir ifade için tek bir seçeneği işaretlemeniz gerekmektedir

1= Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

2= Katılıyorum

3= Katılmıyorum

4=Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum

_____ A_1.0. Engelli biri ile evlenebilirim.

_____ A_2.0*. Eğer cinsel fonksiyonlarını yerine getirebiliyor ise engelli biri ile evlenebilirim.

_____ A_3.0*. Engelli biri ile evlenirsem hayatımı istediğim gibi yaşayamam.

_____ A_ 4.0. Benim için, bir kişinin engelli olup olmaması evlenme açısından bir kıstas değildir.

_____ A_5.0. Engelli bir eşin/partnerin bana fiziksel olarak bağımlı olması beni rahatsız etmez.

_____ A_6.0*. Ailem engelli biri ile evlenmemi kabul etmez.

_____ A_7.0*. Engelli biri ile evlendiğimde eşime/partnerime sevgimi gösterirken rahat hissedemem.

_____ A_8.0. Kendi hayatını idame ettirebilen bir engelli ile evlenebilirim.

_____ A_9.0*. Engelli biri eş/partner olarak yeterli biri olamaz.

_____ A_10.0. Engelli bireylerin engelsiz bireyler ile evlenmesinin normal olduğunu düşünüyorum.

_____ A_11.0. Engelli birinden çocuk sahibi olmak benim için sorun değildir.

_____ A_ 12.0. Dışarıdan görünmeyen bir engeli olan biri ile evlenebilirim.

_____ A_13.0*. Engelli biri ile yakınlaşsam bile evlenmeyi düşünmem.

_____ A_14.0*. Evlilik sadece iki engelsiz bireyin gerçekleştirebileceği birşeydir.

_____ A_15.0*. Engelli biri ile sevişme fikri beni rahatsız eder.

_____ A_16.0. Engelsiz birinin engelli biri ile evlenmesi bende merhamet duygusunu uyandırır.

* = Reversed items.

D. ATTITUDES TOWARD DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT

Lütfen aşağıda sunulan fikirlerin başındaki boşluğa (__)aşağıdaki ölçeği kullanarak size en uygun olan rakamı yazınız.

1=Hiç katılmıyorum   2=Katılmıyorum   3=Ortadayım   4=Katılıyorum
5=Tamamen
katılıyorum

_____1.Bir engelli, çalıştığı bölümün verimini düşürecek unsurlardan biridir.

_____2.Genel olarak engelli insanlar duygu sömürüsü yapmaya eğilimlidirler.

_____3. Engelliler, çalıştıkları ortamın estetiğini bozarlar.

_____4.Eğitimleri ne olursa olsun, engelliler yalnızca vasıfsız işlerde çalışabilirler.

_____5.Engellileri kolay işlerde çalıştırmak fazla yorulmaMAları açısından faydalıdır.

_____6.Engelliler çalışma arkadaşları üzerinde olumlu etki yaratırlar.

_____7.Genel olarak engelli insanlar kendine güvensizdirler.

_____8. Engellilerin çalıştığı iş ortamında iletişim problemi yaşanması olasılığı oldukça yüksektir.

_____9.Engellileri terfi ettirmek, onlardan yapabileceklerinden fazlasını istemek olur.

_____10.Engellilere iş sağlayarak, onlara yardımcı olunması gerektiğine inanıyorum.

_____11.Bir departmana fazla sayıda engelli almak, o departmana yapılan haksızlıktır.

_____12.Genel olarak engelli insanlar uyumsuzdur.

_____13.Engelli bir insanın becerileri konusunda kendini geliştirebileceğine inanmıyorum.

_____14. Engelliler hakkında fazla bilgim olmadığından, aynı iş ortamında çalışmayı tercih etmezdim.

_____15. Engellilerin çalıştığı iş ortamında huzursuzluk yaşanması olasılığı oldukça yüksektir.

_____16.Genel olarak engelli insanlar alıngandırlar.

_____17.Yasal bir zorunluluk olmasaydı, mutlaka engelli bir eleman çalıştırayım diye bir kaygım olmazdı.

_____18.Bu şirkette engellileri sadece vasıfsız pozisyonlar için istihdam etmeyi tercih ederim.

_____19.Engelli kişiler çalışmayı sevmezler.

_____20.Engellilerin iş kazalarına neden olma olasılığı daha yüksektir.

_____21.Yeterli mesleki eğitim alırlarsa, engellilerin de engelsizler gibi çalışabileceklerine inanıyorum.

_____22.Bu şirkette engelli istihdamına yönelik düzenlemeleri yapmak için, şirket bütçesinden belli bir miktar ayrılması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.

_____23.Engellilere yardım etmek sevaptır.

_____24.Engelli insanlar kompleks sahibi kişilerdir.

_____25. Kurumda gerekli düzenlemeler ve gerekli imkanlar sağlanırsa engellilerin de engelsizler gibi çalışabileceklerine inanıyorum.

_____26.Genel olarak engelli insanlar sorumluluktan kaçarlar.

_____27. Şirketimizde, engellilerin mesleki eğitimi için kaynaklarımızın harcanMAması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.

_____28. Şirkette engelli çalıştırmanın çalışnlar arası uyumu bozacağını düşünüyorum.

_____29. Engelli birini işe alsam, onu hangi işta çalıştıracağımı bilemem.

_____30. Engelli çalışanların işte hata yapma oranı daha yüksektir.

_____31. Bir engelliye, sahip olduğu vasıflardan düşük seviyede iş yaptırmak, ona karşı yapılan bir haksızlıktır.

_____32.Genel olarak engelli insanlar işi kaytarma eğilimdedirler.

_____33.Engellilere her yardımcı olduğumda içimde bunun huzurunu hissediyorum.

_____34. Engellilere sağlanan ek imkanlar diğer çalışanlar arasında kıskançlık ve huzursuzluk yaratabilir.

_____35. Engelli çalışanların azmi ve çalışkanlığı, çalışma arkadaşlarını da motive eder.

_____36.Genel olarak engelli insanlar alıngandır.

_____37. Engellilerin iş ortamında bulunması, diğer çalışanların konsantrasyonunu bozar.

_____38. Engellilerle uyum içinde çalışmak için, tüm çalışanlara bu konuyla ilgili (örn. Engellilerle nasıl iletişim kurulması gerektiği, vs.) eğitim verilmelidir.

_____39. Engelli birini işe alsam, ona nasıl davranacağımı bilemem.

_____40. Engellilerle sürekli aynı ortamda çalışmak, üzüntü ve mutsuzluk yaratabilir.

E. RELIGIOSITY SCALE

Lütfen, her bir ifadeye ne derece katılıp katılmadığınızı belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Kesinlikle

katılmıyorum.

Kesinlikle

katılıyorum.

_____1. Evrensel bir güce ya da tanrıya inanırım.

_____2. İnançlarımın benim hayatımı önemli kıldığını düşünürüm.

_____3. Benliğimin oluşmasında inancımın rolü büyüktür.

_____4. Maneviyatı yüksek bir insanım.

_____5. Hayatta her şeyin bir sebebi olduğuna inanırım.

_____6. Mutlak bir tanrıya inanmam.

_____7. Kendimi dindar biri olarak görüyorum.

_____8. Düzenli ibadet ederim.

_____9. Dini kurallara uymanın gerekli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

_____10. İnancımın gerektirdiklerini yapmaya çalışırım.

F. GENERAL CONSERVATISM SCALE

Aşağıdaki her bir ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyup, kendi duygu/düşünce/davranışlarınıza göre ne kadar katılıp katılmadığınızı en uygun rakamı yazarak belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Kesinlikle   Kesinlikle

                                                                              katılıyoru

katılmıyorum.   m.

Factor 1: Conservation of Values

_____ 1)- Toplum milli değerlerini korumalıdır.

_____ 2)- Aile ilişkilerimi korumaya önem veririm.

_____ 3)- Ailem ve akrabalarım içerisindeki büyüklerime saygı duyarım.

_____ 4)- Aile değerlerine bağlı kalmak geri kafalılıktır.*

_____ 5)- Aile ve akrabalar içerisindeki büyüklere itaat etmek geri kafalılıktır.*

_____ 6)- Toplumun dini değerlere bağlı kalması tamamen gereksizdir.*

_____ 7)- Yaşlıların deneyimlerine saygı gösteririm.

Factor 2: Resistance to Change

_____ 1)- Bir insan kendi yararına olacaksa geleneklere karşı çıkabilir.*

_____ 2)- Gelenekleri ve görenekleri devam ettirmek toplumun yararı açısından gereklidir.

_____ 3)- İçinde bulunduğum toplumu ve düzenini olduğu gibi kabul ederim.

_____ 4)- Toplumun oluşturduğu ve uyguladığı katı kurallar korunmalıdır.

_____ 5)- Toplum milli ve dini değerlerine öncelik vermelidir.

_____ 6)- Değişim toplumun yararı açısından gereklidir.*

---

*reverse item

G. RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION SCALE

Aşağıdaki her bir ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyup, kendi duygu/düşünce/davranışlarınıza göre ne kadar katılıp katılmadığınızı en uygun rakamı yazarak belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Kesinlikle   Kesinlikle

                                                                                                          katılıyoru

katılmıyorum.   m.

Factor 1: Intrinsic Religious Orientation

_____ 1)- İçimden geldiği için Allah'a inanırım.

_____ 2)- Allah'ın varlığını hissettiğim zamanlarda şükrederim.

_____ 3)- Allah'ın varlığını sık sık derinden hissederim.

_____ 4)- İbadet, benim için Allah'tan bir şey dileme fırsatı değil, sükûnet ve Allah'ın varlığını hissetme yoludur.

_____ 5)- Allah'a gönülden bağlı olmanın doğru ve mükemmel bir din anlayışına sahip olmaktan daha önemli olduğunu düşünüyorum.

_____ 6)- İçimden geldiği için dua ederim.

Factor 2: Extrinsic Religious Orientation

_____ 1)- Dua etmemin amacı mutlu ve sakin bir hayatı garanti etmektir.

_____ 2)- İbadet etmek için en önemli sebep Allah'ın yardımını ve korumasını sağlamaktır.

_____ 3)- Öbür dünyada cezalandırılmamak adına dini kurallara bağlı yaşamaya çalışırım.

_____ 4)- Sevap kazanmak için ibadet ederim.

Factor 3: Quest Religious Orientation

_____ 1)- Dini sorgulamadan sunulduğu gibi kabul edemem.

_____ 2)- Dinin kurallarını sorgular ve kendime göre uygularım.

_____ 3)- Ben değiştikçe dini inançlarım da benimle birlikte değişip gelişir.

_____ 4)- Dine şüpheci yaklaşmanın beni yeni açılımlara yönlendirdiğini düşünüyorum.

_____ 5)- Birçok dini konu hakkındaki görüşlerim hâlâ değişmektedir.

Factor 4: Fundamentalist Religious Orientation

_____ 1)- Din kuralları değiştirilemez bir bütündür; ya hepsini olduğu gibi kabul edersiniz, ya da hepsini reddedersiniz.

_____ 2)- İnançlı bir kişi olarak dini kuralların yarım yamalak uygulanmasına karşıyım.

_____ 3)- Hayatta her konuda dini kuralları temel alırım.

_____ 4)- Dinimin öngördüğü kurallar üzerinde sorgulanıp, yorum yapılmasını dine karşı gelmekle bir tutarım.

H. AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY

Aşağıdaki her bir ifadeyi dikkatlice okuyup, kendi duygu/düşünce/davranışlarınıza göre ne kadar katılıp katılmadığınızı en uygun rakamı yazarak belirtiniz.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Kesinlikle   Kesinlikle

katılmıyorum.   katılıyorum.

Factor 1: Hostile Sexism

_____ 1)- Adaletli bir yarışmada kadınlar erkeklere karşı kaybettikleri zaman tipik olarak kendilerinin ayrımcılığa maruz kaldıklarından yakınırlar.

_____ 2)- Kadınlar işyerlerindeki problemleri abartmaktadırlar.

_____ 3)- Kadınlar erkekler üzerinde kontrolü sağlayarak güç kazanmak hevesindeler.

_____ 4)- Bir kadın bir erkeğin bağlılığını kazandıktan sonra genellikle o erkeğe sıkı bir yular takmaya çalışır.

_____ 5)- Gerçekte birçok kadın ''eşitlik'' arıyoruz maskesi altında işe alınmalarda kendilerinin kayırılması gibi özel muameleler arıyorlar.

_____ 6)- Kadınlar çok çabuk alınırlar.

_____ 7)- Birçok kadın erkeklerin kendileri için yaptıklarına tamamen minnettar olmamaktadırlar.

_____ 8)- Feministler erkeklere makul olmayan istekler sunmaktadırlar.

_____ 9)- Feministler gerçekte kadınların erkeklerden daha fazla güce sahip olmalarını istemektedirler.

_____ 10)- Erkeklere cinsel yönden yaklaşılabilir olduklarını gösterircesine şakalar yapıp daha sonra erkeklerin tekliflerini reddetmekten zevk alan birçok kadın vardır.

_____ 11)- Birçok kadın masum söz veya davranışları cinsel ayrımcılık olarak yorumlamaktadır.

Factor 2: Benevolent Sexism

_____ 1)- Erkekler kadınsız eksiktirler.

_____ 2)- Ne kadar başarılı olursa olsun bir kadının sevgisine sahip olmadıkça bir erkek gerçek anlamda bütün bir insan olamaz.

_____ 3)- Karşı cinsten biri ile romantik ilişki olmaksızın insanlar hayatta gerçekten mutlu olamazlar.

_____ 4)- Her erkeğin hayatında hayran olduğu bir kadın olmalıdır.

_____ 5)- Kadınlar erkekler tarafından el üstünde tutulmalı ve korunmalıdır.

_____ 6)- Erkekler hayatlarındaki kadın için mali yardım sağlamak için kendi rahatlarını gönüllü olarak feda etmelidirler.

_____ 7)- Bir felaket durumunda kadınlar erkeklerden önce kurtarılmalıdır.

_____ 8)- İyi bir kadın erkeği tarafından yüceltilmelidir.

_____ 9)- Kadınlar erkeklerden daha yüksek ahlaki duyarlılığa sahip olma eğilimindedirler.

_____ 10)- Birçok kadın çok az erkekte olan bir saflığa sahiptir.

_____ 11)- Kadınlar erkeklerden daha ince bir kültür anlayışına ve zevkine sahiptirler.

I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

1. Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın ( ) Erkek ( )

2. Yaşınız: …………………………………………

3. Eğitim durumunuz:

İlkokul ( )   Ortaokul ( )   Lise ( )   Yüksek okul öğrencisi ( )

Yüksek okul mezunu ( )   Üniversite öğrencisi ( )   Üniversite mezunu ( )

Yüksek lisans öğrencisi ( )   Yüksek lisans mezunu ve üstü ( )

4. Hala eğitim görüyor iseniz, üniversiteniz: …………………………….

5. Hala eğitim görüyor iseniz, fakülteniz: ……………………………..

6. Hala eğitim görüyor iseniz, bölümünüz: …………………………….

7. Mesleğiniz: …………………………….

8. Medeni durumunuzu belirtiniz.

Evli ( )   Bekar ( )

9. Evli iseniz çocuğunuz var mı? Sayısını belirtiniz.

( ) Çocuğum var. .... Sayıda çocuğum var.

( ) Çocuğum yok.

10. Bekar iseniz ilişkiniz var mı? Kaç aydır birlikte olduğunuzu belirtiniz.

( ) İlişkim var. .... aydır birlikteyiz.

( ) İlişkim yok.

11. Annenizin eğitim durumu:

Okur-yazar değil ( )   Okur yazar ( )   İlkokul ( )

Ortaokul ( )   Lise ( )   Yüksek okul ( )

Üniversite ( )   Yüksek Lisans ( )   Doktora ()

12. Babanızın eğitim durumu:

Okur-yazar değil ( )   Okuryazar ( )   İlkokul ( )

Ortaokul ( )   Lise ( )   Yüksek okul ( )

Üniversite ( )   Yüksek Lisans ( )   Doktora ()

13. Aylık gelirinizi belirtiniz:

0-1000 ( )   1001-2000 ( )   2001-3000 ( )   3001-4000 ( )

4001-5000 ( )   5001-6000 ( )   6001 ve üstü ( )

14. En uzun süre yaşadığınız yerleşim birimini belirtiniz.

Köy ( )   Kasaba ( )   İlçe ( )   Şehir ( )   Büyükşehir ( )

15. Hangisi sizin ve ailenizin sosyo-ekonomik statüsünü tanımlar?

( ) Alt

( ) Ortanın altı

( ) Orta

( ) Ortanın üstü

( ) Üst

16. Herhangi bir engeliniz var mı? Engelinizin ne olduğunu belirtiniz.

( ) Engelim var. ....

( ) Engelim yok.

17. Ailenizde engelli birey/bireyler var mı?

( ) Var   ( ) Yok

18. Engelli aile bireyi ile akrabalık ya da yakınlık ilişkinizi belirtiniz (anne, kardeş, dayı, kuzen gibi)

( ) Akrabalık ilişkinizi yazınız ………………………………………

( ) Ailemde engelli biri yok.

19. Engelli aile bireyinin engel türünü belirtiniz.

( ) Engel türünü yazınız …………………………………………..

( ) Ailemde engelli biri yok.

20. Engelli yakınınız ya da yakın arkadaşınız var mı?

( ) Var   ( ) Yok

21. Engelli birey ile yakınlık ilişkinizi belirtiniz (okul arkadaşı gibi)

( ) Yakınlığınızı belirtiniz……………………………………

( ) Engelli bir yakınım yok.

21. Engelli yakınınızın engel türünü belirtiniz.

( ) Engel türünü belirtiniz…………………………..

( ) Engelli bir yakınım yok.

22. Hangi sıklıkta engelli birey herhangi bir birey ile etkileşim içinde olursunuz:

( ) Günde birden çok defa

( ) Günde bir kez

( ) Haftada birkaç kez

( ) Haftada bir kez

( ) Ayda bir kaç kez

( ) Ayda bir kez

( ) Engelli bireyler ile etkileşimim yoktur

23. Hayatınız boyunca engelli bir bireyden hoşlandınız mı?:

( ) Evet   ( ) Hayır

24. Engelli biri ile sevgili oldunuz mu?:

( ) Evet   ( ) Hayır

25. Engelli biri ile evlendiniz mi?

( ) Evet   ( ) Hayır

J. DEBRIEFING FORM

Bu araştırma, daha önce de belirtildiği gibi, ODTÜ Psikoloji Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Melek Mert'in yüksek lisans tez çalışmasıdır. Araştırmanın amacı, engelsiz bireylerin engelli bir birey ile romantik ilişki yaşama, evlenme ve aynı iş ortamında çalışmasına yönelik tutumlarını etkileyen faktörlerin Türkiye örnekleminde araştırılmasıdır.Bu çalışmadaki ölçüm araçları engelsiz bireylerin engelli bir birey ile ilişki yaşama, evlenmesine ve aynı iş ortamında çalışma dair tutumlarını etkileyen faktörleri açık (explicit) olarak ölçmek üzere tasarlanmaktadır.

Bu çalışmada sizlere Engelli Bireyler ile Romantik İlişki Yaşama ve Evlenmeye Dair Tutum, Dindarlık ve Dini Yönelim, Genel Muhafazakarlık, Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik ve İşyerinde Engelliye Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçekleri bu çalışmanın hipotezlerini incelemek amacı ile sizlere verilmiştir. Bu çalışmada katılımcıların sorulara verdikleri yanıtlar, bu soruların belirtilen amaç doğrultusunda ne derece iyi tasarlandığı konusunda katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Bu çalışmadan alınacak ilk verilerin Haziran 2019 sonunda elde edilmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Elde edilen bilgiler sadece bilimsel araştırma ve yazılarda kullanılacaktır. Çalışmanın sağlıklı ilerleyebilmesi ve bulguların güvenilir olması için çalışmaya katılacağını bildiğiniz diğer kişilerle çalışma ile ilgili detaylı bilgi paylaşımında bulunmamanızı dileriz. Bu araştırmaya katıldığınız için tekrar çok teşekkür ederiz.

 Araştırmanın sonuçlarını öğrenmek ya da daha fazla bilgi almak için aşağıdaki isimlere başvurabilirsiniz: Melek Mert (e171837@metu.edu.tr)

Çalışmaya katkıda bulunan bir gönüllü olarak katılımcı haklarınızla ilgili veya etik ilkelerle ilgi soru veya görüşlerinizi ODTÜ Uygulamalı Etik Araştırma Merkezi'ne iletebilirsiniz. e-posta: ueam@metu.edu.tr

K. METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 / 63

11 ARALIK 2018

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu

(İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Prof.Dr. Bengi Öner ÖZKAN

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız Melek MERT'in "**Engelsiz Bireylerin Romantik İlişki, Evlenme ve İş Yaşamı Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumlarını Etkileyen Faktörlerin Türkiye Örnekleminde İncelenmesi**" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay **2018-SOS-194** protokol numarası ile araştırma yapması onaylanmıştır.

Saygılarımla bilgilerinize sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Tülin GENÇÖZ

Başkan

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

Prof.Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI (4.)

Üye

Prof.Dr. Ali Emre TURGUT

Üye

Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

Doç.Dr. Üyesi Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

L. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

1. GİRİŞ

İnsanoğlu mükemmelin her yerde olduğunu düşünür. Oysa ki bu sadece bir yanılgıdır. İnsanoğlunun sınırları vardır ve bu sınırların ötesine geçemez. Bizler fiziksel, duyusal ya da zihinsel sorunları olan kişileriz. İnsanların inandığının aksine engelli bireyler toplumda küçük bir azınlık grup değillerdir. Dünya üzerinde bir milyardan fazla engelli birey yaşamaktadır (World Health Report, 2011; Shakespeare, 2017).

Engellilik bireysel bir deneyim olmakla birlikte aynı zamanda global bir deneyimdir. Engelliliğin bireysel ve toplumsal deneyim olması sebebi ile dünyada birçok farklı alandan akademisyenler bu konu üzerine çalışmaktadır (Drake, 1999; Barnes, Oliver, &Barton, 2002). Ancak engellilik konusu üzerine yapılan çalışmaların uzun bir geçmişi yoktur. 1960'lara dek engelli bireyler toplumda kabul edilmeyen eğitim ve iş hakkı dahil olmak üzere neredeyse hiçbir hakkı olmayan kimselerdi (Rimmerman, 2013; `The Murder of the Handicapped´, n.d., para. 3). 1960 ve 1970'lerde özellikle peolitika ve sosyal politika alanında çalışan kişilerin engelli bireylerin hakları konusunda ulusal ve uluslararası yaptıkları çalışmalar sonucunda engellilik konusu üzerine ilk çalışmalar yapılmaya başlanmıştır (Roulstone, Thomas, & Watson, 2012; Moore, & Slee, 2012; Rimmerman, 2013).

Engelli bireylerin hakları konusunda yapılan tüm çalışmalara rağmen, günüzümde bir milyardan daha fazla nüfusa sahip olan engelli bireyler toplumun her alanında dışlanma, ayrımcılık ve negatif tutumlara maruz kalmaktadırlar (Park, Faulkner, & Schaller, 2003; White, Gordon, & Jackson, 2006; Rimmerman, 2013). Örneğin günümüzde engelli nüfusunun sadece %44'ü bir işe sahip, yarısı sağlık giderlerini ödeyebilecek durumda ve gelişmekte olan ülkelerde yaşayan engelli çocukların sadece %10'u gerekli eğitimi alabilmektedir (WHO, 2011). Engelsiz bireylerin engelli bireylere karşı yaptıkları ayrımcılık, dışlama ve sahip oldukları negatif

tutumlar sebebi ile engelli bireyler toplumdan dışlanmaktadırlar (Anthonak, &Livneh, 2000).

Mevcut alanyazında engelsiz bireylerin engelli bireylere yönelik olan negatif tutumlarını araştırmak için birçok çalışma yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmalar farklı hedef grupları (örneğin sağlık çalışanları, öğrenciler ve çalışanlar gibi) ile birçok akademik alandan gelen araştırmacılar ile yapıldı. Ancak bu çalışmalarda genellikle eğitim ve iş yaşamı bağlamlarında engelli bireylere yönelik çalışmalar yapıldı (Hunt, & Hunt, 2000; Brodwin, & Orange, 2002; Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Chan, Livneh, Pruett, Wang, & Zheng, 2009). Eğitim ve iş yaşamı kapsamında engelsiz bireylerin engelli bireylere karşı olan tutumlarının nedenlerini incelemek için birçok çalışma yapılmış olmasına karşın sosyal ve özellikle bireysel alan bağlamında yapılan çalışmalar çok azdır. Özellikle romantik ilişki yaşama ve evlenme bağlamlarında engelsiz bireylerin engelli bireylere karşı tutumlarını inceleyen çalışma sayısı oldukça kısıtlıdır (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002).

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türk örnekleminde engelsiz bireylerin engelli bireylere karşı tutumlarının romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamlarında incelenmesidir. Özellikle dindarlık, dini yönelik, muhafazakarlık ve çelişkili duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin bu tutumlara etkisi incelenecektir. Ayrıca bu çalışmada cinsiyet, yaş, eğitim durumu, gelir seviyesi ve engelli bireyler ile temasta olma durumları ile engelli bireylere karşı romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamı arasındaki ilişki incelenecektir.

1.1. Engelliliğin Tarihi

Modern Homo Saphiens'ten önce hem insanlar hem de maymunlar fiziksel olarak yaralanmış varlıklardı. Yemek elde etmek için insanlar ellerini, kollarını ve dişlerini sıkça kullanmak zorundaydılar. Bu kullanımlardan dolayı insan vücudunda oldukça fazla hasar görmüş bölge yer almaktaydı (Berkson, 1993; Braddock, & Parish, 2001).

Ortaçağ boyunca salgın hastalıklar, yetersiz beslenme ve savaşlar yine oldukça yaygındı. Bu sebeplerden dolayı bu dönemde de engellilik oldukça yaygın bir durumdu (Jankauskas, & Urbanavicius, 1998). Bu dönemde toplumda engellilere yönelik iki farklı tutum vardı. Bunlardan ilkinde, engelli bireylerin doğaüstü güçleri olduğuna inanılmakta ve içlerinde şeytanı barındırdıkları söylenmekteydi. Bu yüzden bu dönemde insanlar cadı ya da şeytanın yer yüzündeki temsilcileri oldukları sebepleri ile yakılmışlardır (Braddock, & Parish, 2001; Rimmerman, 2013; `The Murder of the Handicapped´, n.d., para. 3). Diğer yandan engelli bireyler toplumun sıradan üyeleri olarak görülmüştür. Çünkü neredeyse her ailede en azından bir engelli birey vardı ve bu kişilerin iyileşmesi için dini liderler küçük hastaneler kurmakta idi (Kroll, 1973; Roseens, 1979).

Endüstri Devrimi ve bu dönemle birlikte gelen köyden şehre olan göçlerle birlikte 19. Yüzyılda engelli bireylerin eğitilmesi en temel amaçlardan biri haline geldi. Bu dönemde tüketici olmaktansa üretici olmanın amaçlanması sebebi ile birçok farklı engel grubu için farklı okullar Avrupa ve Amerika'da açılmaya başladılar. Buna ek olarak, göçler ve toplumsal değişimle birlikte ortaya çıkan sorunlar sebebi ile toplumun düzeninin korunması öncelikli hale geldi. Bundan dolayı toplumda anormal olarak görülen bireylerin toplumdan uzaklaştırılması amaçlandı. Toplumsal yapının korunması için engelli bireylerin toplumdan uzaklaştırıldığı büyük hastaneler yapıldı. Bu hastaneler şehirden uzakta ve kapalı yapılardı. Bu hastanelerde engellilerin kötü muamele gördüğü, aç kaldığı, şiddete uğradığı ve hiçbir terapatik tedavi görmediği gözlemlenmiştir (Grob, 1990; Braddock, & Parish, 2001).

İkinci Dünya Savaşı sırasında engelli bireylere karşı yapılan yok etme politikaları birçok insanın dikkatini çekmiştir. Bu dönemde sivil vatandaşlar, aktivistler ve savaşta savaşan askerler engelli bireylerin haklarını korumak için harekete geçmeye başlamışlardır. 1960'ların sonunda İngiltere'de engelli bireylerin sokaklarda aç ve bakımsız olarak yaşamaları sebebi ile bu kişilere maddi destek sağlamak amacı ile Engelli Gelir Grubu kurulmuştur. Daha sonra sadece maddi destek kapsamından

çıkarak Engellilik Paktı ve Ayrımcılığa Karşı Fiziksel Engelliler Birliği kurulmuştur (Aysoy, 2004; UPIAS 1976).

1.2. Engellilik Modelleri

Tarihte engelliliği açıklayan ilk model medikal model idi. Bu modele göre engellilik bireysel bir trajedi olup, toplumsal hiç bir yanı yoktur. Bununla birlikte bu model engelliliğin tıbbi yöntemler ile tedavi edilebileceğini savunmuştur (Morris, 1991).

1970'lerin sonunda İngiltere'de engellilik konsusunda bir başka akım ortaya çıkmıştır. Sosyal model olarak tanımlanan bu modelde bireyin sahip olduğu fiizksel sorunlar tek başına kişiyi engelli yapmaz. Toplumun kendisi engelleyicidir. Toplum bireyin önüne engeller, dışlanmalar ve yok sayılmaları koyarak onu engelli statüsüne getirir, bu sebeple engelin kendisi toplumdur (Oliver, 1996).

1.3. Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumlar

Engelli bireylere karşı tutumlar konusunda birçok farklı alanda çalışmalar yapılmıştır. Yapılan çalışmaların temelinde bu tutumalrın altında yatan nedenleri anlamak ve iki grup arasında pozitif bir etkileşim yaratmaktır (Yuker, 1965; Siller, 1984). Yapılan tutum çalışmaların ortaya çıkan en temel nokta engellilere karşı tutumların karmaşık ve çok yönlü bir yapıya sahip olduğu idi (Yuker, 1988).

Engelsiz bireylerin engelli bireylere karşı tutumlarının incelendiği çalışmalarda bir çok farklı değişken ile tutumlar arasındaki ilşki incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmalarda dindarlık, dini yönelim ve muhafazakarlık ile engelli bireylere yönelik tutumlar arasında genel olarak negatif bir ilişki olduğu gözlemlenmiştir (Allport & Ross, 1967; Backstörm, & Björklund, 2007; Brandes, & Crowson, 2009).

Engelli bireylere karşı tutumlarda incelenen bir diğer değişken grubu ise demografik bilgilerdir. Yapılan çalışmalarda cinsiyet, yaş, eğitim ve gelir düzeyi ile engelsiz

bireylerin engelli bireylere tutumları arasındaki ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmalarda kadınların, genç bireylerin, eğitim ve gelir düzeyi yüksek kişilerin engelli bireylere daha pozitif tutumları olduğu görülmüştür (Siller, 1963; Tait & Purdie, 2000; Au, & Man, 2006; Parasuram, 2006).

1.3.1. İş Yaşamı Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar

İş yaşamında engelli bireylerin daha az şansının olmasının en temel sebeplerinden biri iş verenlerin tutumudur. Engelli bireyler iyi bir eğitime ve yeterli donanıma sahip olsalar bile iş verenler genel olarak bu bireylere karşı oldukça olumsuz tutumlara sahiptirler İş verenler ekonomideki istikrarsızlık ve pazarlamanın taleplerinden dolayı firmaların en büyük amacının yüksek oranda üretim ve üretkenlik olduğunu belirtmektedirler. Ancak iş verenler engelli bireylerin yeterli donanıma sahip olmayan, verimsiz ve süreçlere uyumsuz olduklarına inandıkları için engelli bireyleri işe almamaktadırlar (Diksa, & Rogers, 1996; Sunoo, 2001; Baybora, 2006). Bununla birlikte çalışan kişiler de olası engelli iş arkadaşlarının yeterli düzeyde verimli ve iş için yeterli olamayacaklarını ve gelen müşterinin onlarla çalışmaktan rahatsız olacağını düşündükleri için engelli bireylere karşı olumsuz tutum içindedirler (Priebe, Warner, Hubschmid, & Eckle, 1998; Bricout, & Bentley, 2000; Woodley, & Metzger, 2012).

1.3.2. Romantik İlişki ve Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar

Romantik ilişki ve evlenme bağlamında engelli bireylere yönelik tutum çalışmaları ile alakalı alan yazını oldukça sınırlıdır. Olan çalışmalar genel olarak Amerika, Batı Avrupa ve Asya kültürleri ile sınırlı olup akademik çalışmaların sonuçlarının genellenebilirliği hakkında soru işaretleri vardır (Chan, Livneh, Pruett, Wang, & Zheng, 2009; Miller, Chan, Glover- Graf, & Kranz, 2009; Marini, Wang, Etzbach, & Castillo, 2012). Akademik çalışmalar göstermektedir ki engelli bireyler engelsiz bireyler tarafından çocuksu, cinsiyetleri olmayan (ne kadın ne de erkek olarak görülmektedirler) ve arzulanmayan kişiler olarak görüldükleri için genel olarak

romantik partner olarak seçilmemektedirler (Ray, & West, 1984; Fichten, Amsel, 1986).

Romantik ilişki ve evlenme bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumların incelendiği çalışmalarda genel olarak kadınların engelli bireylere karşı daha pozitif tutum içinde oldukları görülmüştür (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Vilchinsky, Findler, 2004). Ancak yapılan bazı çalışmalarda da erkeklerin daha pozitif tutum içinde oldukları da görülmüştür (Hamdy, Auter, Humphrey, & Attia, 2011). Ayrıca ilgili alanyazında yer alan çalışmalara göre engelli bireyler ile günlük hayatta etkileşimi olan kişilerin de daha pozitif tutum içerisinde oldukları görülmüştür (Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Marini, Wang, Etzbach, & Castillo, 2012). Son olarak konu ile alakalı olan kısıtlı alanyazında çelişik duyulu cinsiyetçilik ile romantik ilişki ve evlenme bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumların ilişkili olduğu gözlemlenmiştir (Björnsdottir, & Traustadottir, 2010; Nario- Redmond, 2010).

1.4.Erikson'ın Psikososyal Gelişim Dönemleri

Erik Erikson'ın Psikososyal Gelişim Kuramı'nda yer alan gelişim dönemlerine göre kişiler 18-40 yaş arasında bireyler hayatlarında yakınlık duygusuna olan ihtiyaç ortaya çıkar. Bu dönemde ortaya çıkan temel süreçte, aile dışındaki bireyler ile yakın ilişkiler oluşturma, bunları devam ettirmek ve romantik ilişkiler yaşamaktır (Erikson, 1963). Kişi bu dönemi başarılı bir şekilde tamamlayabilirse güvenli şekilde sevgiyi alma ve verebilme yetisine sahip olur. Son olarak, bu aşamanın başarılı bir şekilde tamamlanması, partnerler arasındaki iki taraflı taahhütlerle nitelendirilen Aşk erdemini getirecektir (Markstrom, & Kalmanir, 2001; Dunkel, & Harbke, 2017).

1.5. Sosyal Temas Kuramı

Gordon Allport'un Sosyal Temas Kuramı'na göre sosyal temas ile dış grup üyelerine ilişkin önyargıların azaltılabileceği fikri öne atılmıştır (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew, & Troop, 2006). Sosyal Temas Kuramı bir çok çalışmacının ilgisini çekmiş ve konu ile

alakalı alanyazında oldukça fazla sayıda akademik çalışma vardır. Bu çalışmalar dış grup üyeleri ile sosyal temas halinde olan bireylerin önyargılarının azaldığını belirtmiştir (Maras et al., 2000; Cameron et al, 2006; McManus et al, 2011). Romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamlarının birbirinden bağımsız incelendiği çalışmalarda, engelli bireyler ile sosyal temasta bulunmanın engelsiz bireyin bu gruba karşı olan önyargılarını azaltarak pozitif yönde değişim sağladığı görülmüştür (Rimmerman, 1998; Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Sheridan, & Scior, 2013).

1.6. Çalışmanın Amaçları

Mevcut alanyazından yola çıkarak, bu çalışma engelli olmayan kişilerin engelli kişilere yönelik tutumlarını romatik ilişki, evlenme ve iş sosyal bağlamlarında incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca din, dini yönelim, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve muhafazakarlık da önemli değişkenler olduğu için dikkate alınacaktır. Başka bir deyişle, dinin, dini yönelimin, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin ve muhafazakarlığın, engelli olmayan kişilerin romantik ilişki, evlenme ve engelli bir insanla çalışma eylemlerinin yordayıcısı olup olmadığı incelenecektir. Ayrıca, cinsiyet, yaş, eğitim ve gelirin, romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamında engellilere yönelik tutumların olası yordayıcıları olup olmadığı incelenecektir. Son olarak, engelli bir kişiyle iletişim kurmanın etkisi, engelli olmayan kişilerin romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamlarındaki tutumlarındaki etkisi incelenecektir.

2. YÖNTEM

2.1. Katılımcılar

Çalışmanın katılımcıları, 432'si kadın (%69), 134'ü erkek (%31) toplam 626 kişiden oluşmaktadır. Katılımcıların yaş aralığı 18 ile 40 arasında olup, yaş ortalamaları 24.98'dir. Katılımcıların 522'si (% 83.4) bekar olduklarını, 97'ı (% 15.55) evli olduklarını, 3'ü (% 0.5) boşanmış olduklarını belirtmiştir. Katılımcıların 527'si (%

82.6) herhangi bir engelli yakını olmadığını, 426'sı (% 68.1) ise ne engelli yakın arkadaşının ne de engelli tanıdıklarının olmadığını belirtmiştir. Diğer demografik bilgiler için tablo 2.1 incelenebilinir.

2.2. Ölçüm Araçları

Katılımcılara internet yoluyla ulaştırılan ölçek paketi yaş, cinsiyet, medeni durum ve eğitim durumuyla ilgili sorular içeren Demografik Bilgi Formu; Romantik İlişki ve Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği; Engellilerin Çalışmasına Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği; Dindarlık Ölçeği; Dini Yöenlim Ölçeği, Muhafazakarlık Ölçeği ve Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeğinden oluşmaktadır.

2.2.1. Romantik İlişki ve Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği

Ölçek tezin yazarı (2016) tarafından geliştirilmiş olup, engelli bireylere karşı romantik ilişki ve evlenme bağlamlarındaki tutumları ölçmek amacıyla kullanılmaktadır. 4'lü likert üzerinden puanlanan ölçek, 31 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Yapılan faktör analizleri ölçeğin 1 alt boyuttan oluştuğu görülmektedir. Ölçeğin Cronbach alpha güvenirlik puanı .92'dir.

2.2.2. Engellilerin Çalışmasına Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği

Ölçek Aycan (2005) tarafından geliştirilmiş olup, engelli bireylerin çalışmasına yönelik tutumları ölçmek amacıyla kullanılmaktadır. 5'li likert üzerinden puanlanan ölçek, 40 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Yapılan faktör analizleri ölçeğin 1 alt boyuttan oluştuğu görülmektedir. Ölçeğin Cronbach alpha güvenirlik puanı .89'dur.

2.2.3. Dini Yönelim Ölçeği

Ölçek Sakallı-Uğurlu ve Shaver (2013) tarafından geliştirilmiş olup, bireylerin dini yönelim türünü belirlemek amacıyla kullanılmaktadır. 7'li likert üzerinden

puanlanan ölçek, 19 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Yapılan faktör analizleri ölçeğin arayış, aşırı tutucu, içsel ve dışsal dini yönelim olmak üzere 4 alt boyuttan oluştuğu görülmektedir. Alt ölçekler için Cronbach alpha güvenirlik puanları Amerikan örneklemi için .73 ile .88 arasındadır. Türk örnekleminde Cronbach alpha güvenirlik puanları alt ölçekler için .70 ile .84 arasındadır.

2.2.4. Muhafazakarlık Ölçeği

Ölçek Yıldırım (2007) tarafından geliştirilmiş olup Türkiye'de insanların muhafazar tutumlarını ölçmek amacıyla kullanılmaktadır. 7'li likert üzerinden puanlanan ölçek, 13 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Yapılan faktör analizleri ölçeğin değerlerlere karşı muhafazakarlık ve değişime karşı direnç olmak üzere 2 alt boyuttan oluştuğu görülmektedir. Alt ölçekler için Cronbach alpha güvenirlik puanları .71'dir.

2.2.5. Dindarlık Ölçeği

Ölçek Peterson ve Seligman (2004) tarafından geliştirilmiş olup kişilerin genel dindarlıklarını ölçmek amacıyla kullanılmaktadır. 7'li likert üzerinden puanlanan ölçek, 10 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Yapılan faktör analizleri ölçeğin 1 alt boyuttan oluştuğu görülmektedir. Türkçeye Demir ve Kumkale (2013) tarafından çevrilen ölçeğin Cronbach alpha güvenirlik puanı .90'dır.

2.2.6. Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği

Ölçek Glick ve Fiske (1996) tarafından geliştirilmiş olup, toplumda bireylerin kadınlara yönelik olarak sahip oldukları çelişik duyguları ve tutumları ölçmek amacıyla kullanılmaktadır. 6'lı likert üzerinden puanlanan ölçek, 22 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Yapılan faktör analizleri ölçeğin düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ve korumacı cinsiyetçilik olmak üzere 2 alt boyuttan oluştuğu görülmektedir. Alt ölçekler için Cronbach alpha güvenirlik puanları .80 ile .92 arasındadır. Türkçeye Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002) tarafından uyarlanan ölçeğin Cronbach alpha güvenirlik puanları alt ölçekler için .78 ile .87 arasındadır.

2.3. Prosedür

Öncelikle, ODTÜ Etik Komitesi'nden gerekli etik izni alınmış ve ardından yukarıda sözü geçen ölçek paketi katılımcılara internet üzerinden ya da kağıt-kalem ile doldurabilecekleri şekilde ulaştırılmıştır. Katılımcılar, önce bilgilendirme yazısını okumuşlar, ardından ise ölçeklerin bulunduğu soru setini ortalama 15 dakikada tamamlamışlardır.

3. SONUÇLAR

3.1. Çalışmanın Değişkenleri Arasındaki Correlasyon Değerleri

Yapılan korrelasyon analizleri sonucunda Romantik İlişki Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeğinin hem Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği hem de Engelli Bireylerin Çalışmasına Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği ile pozitif ilişkili olduğu görülmüştür. Romantik İlişki Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeğinin Dindarlık, Dini Yönelim, Muhafazakarlık ve Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçekleri ile negatif ilişkili olduğu gözlemlenmiştir.

Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeğinin Dindarlık, Muhafazakarlık ve Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçekleri ile negatif ilişkili olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Ancak Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği ile Dini Yönelim Ölçeği arasında herhangi bir ilişki bulunamamıştır.

Engelli Bireylerin Çalışmasına Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeğinin Dini Yönelim Ölçeği ile pozitif, Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği ile de negatif ilişkili olduğu görülmüştür. Buna ek olarak bu ölçeğin Muhafazakarlık Ölçeği ve Dindarlık Ölçeği ile ilişkili olmadığı görülmüştür.

Yapılan korelasyon analizinde yaş değişkeninin Romantik İlişki Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği ve Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere

Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği ile negatif ilişkili olduğu ancak Engelli Bireylerin Çalışmasına Yönelik Tutumlar Ölçeği ile ilişkili olmadığı görülmüştür. Eğitim ve gelir seviyesi değişkenlerinin de bu üç ölçek ile herhangi bir ilişkisi olmadığı görülmüştür.

3.2. Cinsiyet Farkı

Katılımcıların cinsiyetinin çalışmanın üç temel sürekli değişkeni olan Romantik İlişki Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar, Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar ve Engelli Bireylere Yönelik Tutumlar ile olan ilişkisini incelemek için bağımsız örneklemli T-test yapılmıştır. Analiz sonucuna göre sadece Engelli Bireylerin Çalışmasına Yönelik Tutumların erkeklere göre kadınlarda anlamlı olarak pozitif olduğu bulunmuştur.

3.3. Regresyon Analizleri

Dindarlık, dini yönelim, muhafazakarlık ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin engelli bireylere karşı tutumları (romantik ilişki yaşama, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamlarında) yordayıp yordamadığının incelenmesi amacı ile farklı 3 grupta regresyon analizleri yürütülmüştür.

3.3.1. Romatik İlişki Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumu Yordayan Faktörler

Yapılan analiz sonucunda yaşın Romatik İlişki Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumları negatif yönde yordadığı bulunmuştur. Bununla birlikte muhafazakarlığın ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin de Romatik İlişki Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumları negatif yönde yordadığı bulunmuştur. Ancak eğitm seviyesi, gelir düzeyi, dindarlık ve dini yönelimin bu tutumları yordayıcı etkileri bulunamamıştır.

3.3.2. Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumları Yordayan Faktörler

Analiz sonucunda yaş ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin Evlenme Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumları negatif yönde yordayan faktörler olduğu bulunmuştur. Ancak eğitim düzeyi, gelir seviyesi, muhafazakarlık, dindarlık ve dini yöenlimin bu tutumları yordayıcı etkileri bulunamamıştır.

3.3.3. İş Yaşamı Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumları Yordayan Faktörler

Analiz sonucunda çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin İş Yaşamı Bağlamında Engelli Bieylere Karşı Tutumları negatif yönde yordadığı fakat muhafazakarlık ve dini yönelimin bu değişkeni pozitif yönde yordadığı görülmüştür. Bununla birlikte yaşın, eğitim seviyesi, gelir düzeyi ve dindarlığın bu değişkeni yordamadığı görülmüştür.

3.4. Engelli Bireyler ile Temasın Sürekli Değişkenler Üzerindeki Etkisi

3.4.1. Engelli Aile Bireyine Sahip Olma Durumu

Engelli aile bireyine sahip olmanın sürekli değişkenler ile olan ilişkisini incelemek için bağımsız değişkenli T-test yapılmıştır. Yapılan analiz sonucunda engelli aile bireyine sahip olan kişilerin İş Yaşamı Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumlarının engelli aile bireyi olmayan kişilere göre anlamlı olarak daha pozitif olduğu bulunmuştur.

3.4.2. Engelli Yakın Arkadaş ya da Tanıdığa Sahip Olma Durumu

Engelli yakın arkadaş ya da tanıdığa olmanın sürekli değişkenler ile olan ilişkisini incelemek için bağımsız değişkenli T-test yapılmıştır. Yapılan analiz sonucunda engelli yakın arkadaş ya da tanıdığa sahip olan kişilerin İş Yaşamı Bağlamında

Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumlarının engelli yakın arkadaşı ya da tanıdığı olmayan kişilere göre anlamlı olarak daha pozitif olduğu bulunmuştur.

3.4.3. Günlük Hayatta Engeli Birey ile Temasta Olma Sıklığı

Günlük hayatta engelli birey ile temas içerisinde olma durumunun sürekli değişkenler ile olan ilişkisini incelemek için MANOVA analizi yapılmıştır. Yapılan analiz sonucunda günlük hayatta engelli birey ile sık temas içerisinde olan bireylerin Romantik İlişki Bağlamında Engelli Bireylere Karşı Tutumlarının günlük hayatta engelli birey ile nadir temas içerisinde olan kişilere göre anlamlı olarak daha pozitif olduğu bulunmuştur.

4. TARTIŞMA

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı dindarlık, dini yönelim, muhafazakarlık, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve cinsiyet, yaş, eğitim ve gelir gibi sosyo-demografik değişkenler ile engelli olmayan kişilerin romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektedir. Bununla birlikte bu çalışmada engelli bireyler ile temas halinde olmanın engelli bireylere karşı tutumlar (romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamında) ile ilişkisini incelemektir.

Bu çalışmanın ilk sonucu olarak cinsiyet farkı sadece iş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumlarda anlamlı olarak bulunmuştur. Alanyazında iş yaşamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumlarda kadınların erkeklere göre daha pozitif tutum içerisinde olduğu bulunmuştur (Cesare, Tannenbaum, & Dalessio, 1990; Rimmerman, 1998). Romantik ilişki ve evlenme bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumlar konusunda yapılan çalışmalarda birbiri ile çelişen sonuçlar yer almaktadır. Kimi çalışmalar kadınların daha pozitif tutum içerisinde olduğunu ifade eden sonuçlar bulurken kimi çalışmalarda erkeklerin daha pozitif olduğunu bulmuştur (Vilchinsky, & Findler, 2004; Hamdy, Auter, Humphrey, & Attia, 2011).

Bu çalışmada yaş, eğitim düzeyi ve gelir seviyesinin sürekli değişkenleri yordayıp yordamadığı incelenmiştir. Katılımcıların yaşının romantik ilişki ve evlenme bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları yordarken iş yaşamı bağlamında yordayıcı özelliğinin olmadığı görülmüştür. Yapılan çalışmalarda genç bireylerin yaşlı bireylere göre romantik ilişki ve evlenme bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı daha pozitif tutum içersinde olduğu bulunmuştur (Tait & Purdie, 2000; Marini, Wang, Etzbach, & Castillo, 2012). İş yaşamı bağlamında ise mevcut alanyazında yaşlı çalışanların genç çalışanlara göre engelli bireylere karşı daha pozitif tutum içerisinde oldukları görülmüştür (Gade, & Toutges, 1983; Akardere, 2005). Bu çalışmanın sonucunda eğitim seviyesi ve gelir düzeyinin romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları yordamadığı bulunmuştur. Ancak mevcut alanyazında hem eğitim seviyesinin hem de gelir düzeyinin engelli bireylere karşı tutumlarda (romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamları da dahil olmak üzere) anlamlı değişkenler oldukları bulunmuştur (Karellou, 2003; Akardere, 2005; Au, & Man, 2006; Parasuram, 2006).

Bu çalışmada dindarlık, dini yönelim, muhafazakarlık ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik değişkenlerinin romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları yordayıp yordamadığı ayrı ayrı incelenmiştir.

Romantik ilişki bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları yordayan faktörlerin incelenmesi sonucu çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve muhafazakarlığın negatif yönlü yordayıcılar oldukları bulunmuştur. Mevcut alanyazında muhafazakar bireylerin engelli bireylere karşı daha negatif tutumlara sahip oldukları görülmüştür (Backstörm, & Björklund, 2007; Brandes, & Crowson, 2009). Ayrıca bu çalışmada dindarlık ve dini yönelim değişkenlerinin bağımlı değişkeni yordamadığı bulunmuştur. Mevcut alanyazında dindarlığın romantik ilişki bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları yordayıcı özelliği bulunmamıştır (Strohmer, Grand, & Purcell, 1984).

114

Evlenme bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları yordayan faktör olarak çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik bulunurken; dindarlık, dini yönelim ve muhafazakarlık değişkenlerinin yordayıcı etkisi bulunmamıştır. Mevcut alanyazında nitel çalışmalarda engelliliğin kişinin cinsiyetinin algılanmasında etkili faktör olduğu belirtilmiştir. Engelli bireylerin geleneksel cinsiyet rollerine sahip olmadıkları, cinsiyetsiz, çocuksu ve cinsel dürtülerden yoksun oldukları algısının engelsiz bireyler arasında yaygın olduğu belirtilmiştir (Björnsdottir, & Traustadottir, 2010). Alanyazındaki birçok çalışma dindarlık, dini yöenlim ve muhafazakarlığın engelli bireylere karşı tutumları yordayan önemli değişkenlerden olduğunu vurgulasa da bu çalışmada bu yordayıcı etkiler bulunamamıştır ((Strohmer, Grand, & Purcell, 1984; Donahue, 1985; Backstörm, & Björklund, 2007).

İş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları yordayan faktörler olarak muhafazakarlık, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve dini yönelim bulunmuştur. Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin negatif yönlü yordayıcılık gücü bulunurken dini yönelim ve muhafazakarlığın pozitif yönlü yordayıcılık özellikleri bulunmuştur. Mevcut alanyazında bu üç değişkenin de iş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları negatif yönlü yordayıcılık gücü bulunmuştur (Cesare, Tannenbaum, & Dalessio, 1990; Rimmerman, 1998; Björnsdottir, & Traustadottir, 2010). Bu çalışmada dindarlığın iş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumlarıyordamadığı bulunmuştur. Ancak mevcut çalışmalar bu bulguların tam tersini ifade etmektedir (Cesare, Tannenbaum, & Dalessio, 1990; Rimmerman, 1998).

Bu çalışma sonucunda engelli aile bireyi olan ya da engelli yakın arkadaşı veya tanıdığı olan kişilerin iş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı daha pozitif tutumlara sahip olduğu bulunurken günlük hayatta engelli bireyler ile daha sık temasta olan kişilerin romantik ilişki bağlamında engelli bireylere daha pozitif tutum içerisinde olduğu bulunmuştur. Allport'un Sosyal Temas Kuramı'nda da bahsettiği gibi azınlık grup ile temasta olma gruplararası önyargıyı azaltmaktadır (Pettigrew, 1998). Alanyazında yer alan birçok çalışma engelli bireyler ile temasta olan kişilerin

(romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamları da dahil olmak üzere) engelli bireylere karşı daha pozitif tutumları olduğunu belirtmektedir (Rimmerman, 1998; Chen, Brodwin, Cardoso, & Chan, 2002; Sheridan, & Scior, 2013).

4.2. Çalışmanın Katkıları

Öncelikle bu çalışma Türk örnekleminde romantik ilişki, evlenme ve iş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumları yordayan faktörleri incelemiştir. Bu çalışmada yaş, eğitim düzeyi ve gelir seviyesi kontrol edildiğinde dindarlık, dini yönelim, muhafazakarlık ve çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin bağımlı değişkenleri yordama gücü incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmadaki bazı bulgular mevcut alanyazını desteklerken, bazı bulgular ise mevcut çalışmalardan farklı sonuçlar vermiştir. Yuker'in de (1988) bahsettiği gibi engellilere karşı tutumlar karmaşık bir yapıya sahiptir ve bu sebeple engelli bireylere karşı tutumların altında yatan faktörleri incelemek için farklı yöntemlerin kulanıldığı birçok çalışmanın yapılması gerekmektedir.

Bu çalışmada engelli aile bireyine ya da engelli yakın arkadaş veya tanıdığa sahip olan bireylerin sadece iş yaşamı bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı daha pozitif tutum içerisind eoldupu bulunmuştur. Bu bulgu bize toplumsal bir farkındalık sağlamaktadır. Şöyle ki Türk İş Kanununa göre özel ve kamu kurumları belli oranda engelli kişileri çalıştırmak zorundadırlar (Turkish Labor Law, 2003). Bu kanuna göre kişiler engelli bireyler ile zorunlu olarak aynı iş ortamını paylaşmak durumundadır. Bu yüzden kişiler engelli bireylere karşı daha pozitif tutum içindedir. Ancak romantik ilişki ve evlenme gibi kişinin partnerini seçme hakkının olduğu durumlarda bireyler engelli bireylerle aralarına mesafe koymayı ve onalrı romantik partner olarak seçmeyebiliyorlar. Çalışmanın sonucu da göstermektedir ki eğer engelli bireyler ile aramızdaki mesafeyi seçebilme hakkımız olduğunda ne yazık ki onları yakınımızda istemiyoruz. Ancak kanun gibi zorlayıcı durumlarda onlarla yakın olmayı kabul edebiliyoruz.

Son olarak bu çalışma bize göstermektedir ki engellilere yönelik olumsuz tutumumuzla yüzleşebilirsek, toplumumuzu daha adil yöne doğru değiştirebiliriz. Kendimizle ve olumsuz tutumumuzla yüzleşmek için cesur olmalıyız. Bu çalışmanın bulguları, engellik konusu ve engelli bireyler yakın olursak, dünyanın en büyük azınlık grubu olan engellilere karşı olan ayrımcılığa ve onlara karşı olan olumsuz tutumlardan kurtulabileceğimizi ortaya koymaktadır.

4.3.Çalışmanın Sınırlılıkları ve Öneriler

Bu çalışmada kadın ve erkek katılımcı sayısındaki eşitsizlik ve katılımcıların büyük çoğunun belli bir gelir düzeyinden olması çalışmanın sonuçlarının genellenebilirliğini sınırlamaktadır. Bu sebeple gelecekteki çalışmaların daha homojen bir örneklem ile yapılması daha yararlı olacaktır.

Romantik ilişki ve evlenme bağlamında engelli bireylere karşı tutumlar konusu incelenmesi ve araştırılması zor bir konudur. Bu konunun incelenmesi sırasında kişilerin sosyal istenirlik etkisinden dolayı nicel soruları cevaplarken tüm açıklıkları ile cevap vermeme olasılığı olduğu için gelecek çalışmaların nitel olarak da yapılması alanyazını açısından önemli olacaktır.

M: TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Social Sciences ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐
Enformatik Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü/ Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı/ Surname : Mert Kastner
Adı / Name : Melek
Bölümü / Department: Psikoloji

TEZİN ADI/ TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English) : Attitude toward Disabled People in the Social Context of Dating, Marriage and Work: Religiosity, Religious Orientation, Conservatism and Ambivalent Sexism.

TEZİN TÜRÜ/ DEGREE:**Yüksek Lisans**/ Master ■   **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /**Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ■

2. **Tez <u>iki yıl</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır./** Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **<u>two years.</u> *** ☐

3. **Tez <u>altı ay</u> süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. /** Secure the entire work for period of **<u>six months</u>. *** ☐

**Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.*
A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature............................**Tarih**/ Date…………………………