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Increasing numbers of students with disabilities enrolling in postsecondary education combined with the mandate for institutions of higher education to successfully retain and graduate students necessitate an enhanced understanding of factors that may help or hinder the success of students with disabilities. Students with disabilities have reported negative impacts from subtle negative faculty attitudes and inconsistency in the implementation of reasonable accommodations. Thus it is important to understand factors that impact faculty attitude towards students with disabilities and their willingness to implement accommodations. Over the past decade there has also been increasing recognition that social justice advocacy is an essential component to the profession of counseling as well as increasing acknowledgement of the role of social justice in promoting full inclusion of people from traditionally underrepresented groups, including persons with disabilities.

The purpose of the current study with 178 participants was to investigate faculty attitudes related to disability in postsecondary education. The study specifically sought to understand to what extent social justice attitudes contribute to understanding faculty willingness to provide accommodations and attitude toward students with disabilities.
after controlling for several covariates. Additionally, the study evaluated the extent to which social justice attitudes were correlated with faculty knowledge of disability law. Participants were faculty at a large public university in the mid-west. Through regression analysis, it was determined that social justice attitude accounted for 10.6% of unique variance ($p < .001$) in faculty willingness to accommodate after controlling for covariates. Results showed that social justice attitude does not significantly account for variations in faculty attitude toward students with disabilities and that social justice attitude is not related to knowledge of disability law. A discussion of these results and their implication for practice and future research in higher education, counseling, and counselor education are presented.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The evolving disability rights movement and student population have resulted in a growth in the total numbers and diverse array of disabilities represented by college students. The National Center for Educational Statistics (Lewis & Farris, 1999) identified an increase from 29% of people with disabilities 16 years or older having at least attended college in 1986 to a reported 45% in 1994. Wolanin and Steele (2004) estimated that the 9% of college students reporting a disability represented a tripling of the relative population of students with disabilities since 1978, when only 2.6% of first-time freshmen reported a disability (Henderson, 1995).

Most recently, Raue and Lewis (NCES, 2011) provided a snapshot of the diverse types of disabilities with which students are coming to college.

Regarding the types of student disabilities reported by institutions, about one-third of disabilities reported by institutions were specific learning disabilities (31 percent). Eighteen percent of disabilities reported by institutions were for students with ADD/ADHD, 15 percent of disabilities were mental illness/psychological or psychiatric conditions, and 11 percent of disabilities were a health impairment/condition. (p.8)

Many similarities remain in the distribution of reported types of disabilities today compared to the breakdown of reported disabilities documented by Henderson (1995) regarding the 1994 incoming freshmen with disabilities. One notable difference was a slight decrease in health impairments from 16.4% in 1994 to 11% in 2011. There was no specific data to support a particular reason why there was a decrease in reported health
impairments. However it may be that the total numbers of students with health
impairments were relatively stable while there was significant increase in students with
learning disabilities.

Beilke and Yssel (1999) suggest the overall growth in numbers may be due in part
to the first generations of students who benefitted from the Individual with Disabilities
Education Act of 2004 which assured the rights of students with disabilities in primary
and secondary schools. This greater inclusion at the elementary and secondary level has
resulted in larger numbers of students with disabilities seeking entrance to colleges and
universities (Wolanin & Steele, 2004). Regardless of the cause, it is important to
understand the changes in representation of students with disabilities in higher education,
not only in total number but in types of disabilities reported, to understand the context of
faculty and staff understanding and attitudes on campuses. These rapid changes in the
student population coupled with the relative recency of the disability legislation
impacting postsecondary education have left many institutions struggling to fully meet
the spirit of the current legislation such as Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1975
(P.L. 93-112) and the Americans with Disabilities Amendments Act (P.L. 101-336).

**Faculty Attitude Toward Students with Disabilities**

Neutral or negative attitudes of faculty can cause students with disabilities to feel
reluctant or inferior, but Bourke, Strehorn, and Silver (2000) found a connection between
the perceptions and attitudes of faculty and the provision of required accommodations. In
particular, they suggested that personal beliefs and attitudes can bias the implementation
of necessary accommodations. Although negative attitudes may be a more significant
barrier, neutral attitudes may also be problematic. Disbelief an accommodation is necessary or the perception of the accommodation as unfair or lowering standards may result in the accommodation not being implemented effectively causing significant barriers to access. While some faculty may believe neutrality is desirable, students may perceive neutrality as problematic (Bento, 1996). Faculty who are neutral may only provide accommodations because they are required to do so rather than due to a belief that such accommodations provide an equitable opportunity. This can convey a message to students with disabilities that faculty believe they are not being held to the same academic standard or are receiving an advantage over other students (Bento; Beilke & Yssel, 1999). Beyond the immediate effects of the barriers created by poorly delivered accommodations, Hartman-Hall and Haaga (2002) identified long-term consequences for students. In their investigation, students were given hypothetical scenarios in which the faculty member had positive or negative responses to requests for accommodations. Negative reactions resulted in decreased willingness to request additional assistance from that faculty member or for other courses as opposed to positive reactions encouraging students to pursue assistance in the future.

Although faculty attitude is often described as being “generally positive,” there are subtle ways in which negative attitudes can be conveyed. Junco (2002) brings light to the fact that, even if a student with a disability has developed the ability to self-advocate, these subtle signals can reduce the student’s capacity to effectively self-advocate. Junco noted negative attitudes often are expressed through non-verbal communication that may discourage students from requesting accommodations. In addition to non-verbal signals,
negative attitudes can be communicated when faculty do not understand the intent of accommodations and communicate a sense that the student with a disability is receiving an unfair advantage. Several years later, Skinner (2007) also concluded these subtle negative responses reduce the likelihood students will communicate their needs regarding disability and accommodation.

The impact of negative faculty attitudes was echoed in the results of focus groups of students with disabilities at ten different colleges or universities across the United States (Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005). Students consistently relayed experiences in which faculty interactions and comments conveyed a belief that disability meant students were unable to achieve. Many students shared feeling stigmatized and having to devote a significant amount of time and energy to get faculty to implement even basic accommodations in some instances. These experiences require that students with disabilities develop greater resiliency and self-reliance than may be required of students without disabilities to achieve similar educational outcomes (Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005).

Recent trends in higher education place more importance and accountability on institutions to increase the retention and graduation rates of all students (Aldeman & Carey, 2009; Kelly & Lautzenheiser, 2013). Although Section 504 and the ADA provide the basis for assuring equal access through non-discrimination and the provision of reasonable accommodations, simply providing access may no longer be sufficient in this changing climate. The previous section reviewed some of the factors that may prove useful in increasing the retention and graduation rates of students with disabilities. While
many of these are personal attributes or skills of the individual student, faculty
knowledge and attitude toward disability and accommodation are related to student
success and largely outside the control of the individual student. These aspects require
further examination so postsecondary institutions may create a campus culture that
supports the success of students with disabilities.

**Social Justice**

The term social justice can have a variety of meanings representative of the many
disciplines contributing to the scholarship of social justice (Zajda, Majhanovich, & Rust,
2006). Most common and prevalent throughout counseling literature is the concept of
social justice as fairness in opportunity, resources, and power across social groups
(Constantine, Hage, Kindaichi, & Bryant, 2007; Cook, 1990; Fouad, Gerstein, &
Toperek 2006; Prilleltensky & Nelson 2002, Zadja et al., 2006). At a very basic level,
social justice requires that access and resources be fairly distributed amongst all
individuals regardless of their place within a traditionally oppressed group (Fouad,
Gerstein, & Toporek, 2006) and realizes that basic human rights are interdependent. A
truly just society requires extinguishing all forms of oppression (Adams, 2000; Wronka,
2008). In 2000, Adams noted that oppression encompasses a variety of “isms,” including
ableism. Furthermore, Israel (2006) realized that the common experience shared by
disenfranchised groups is the subordinate/dominate relationship between the oppressed
group and others. The very heart of the social justice counseling movement recognizes
that the discrimination against oppressed people is inextricably linked with quality-of-life
for many individuals (Vera & Speight, 2003). This underlying value should further compel us to explore the application of this paradigm to people with disabilities.

The past decade has seen much scholarship focused on the integral connection between counseling and social justice. Several authors have detailed the importance of a social justice focus due to the impact of contextual factors on clients (Chang, Crethar, & Ratts, 2010; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007), a shifting paradigm of multicultural counseling towards a commitment to social justice (Arrendondo & Perez, 2003; Smith, Reynolds, & Rovnak, 2009; Vera & Speight, 2003), and the subsequent shift in the counselor role to that of both advocate and activist (Goodman, Liang, Helms, Latta, Sparks, & Weintraub, 2004; Smith, Reynolds, & Rovnak, 2009). This shifting counseling paradigm and discussion of social justice have seen much dialogue on issues of race, gender, and class. However, relatively little has been explored concerning the application of a social justice focus for people with disabilities despite the fact that many people with disabilities experience barriers that result in lack of fair access to social and political resources (Barclay, 2011).

**Statement of the Problem**

The current body of research has limited contribution to understanding how institutions of higher education can effectively promote a positive attitude toward disability and accommodations among faculty. Previous research has helped to identify some factors related to attitude such as gender and academic discipline (Beilke & Yssel, 1999; Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009).
However, these factors are largely not factors that can be manipulated to alter the attitude of faculty. Benham (1997) specifically examined what portion of variation in faculty attitude is accounted for by the combined variables of academic discipline, gender, years teaching experience, prior experience with disability, age, prior instructional experience, types of accommodations used, and faculty rank. Although specifics of the analysis were not detailed in the publication, Benham reported the combined model accounted for 54% of variation in faculty attitude. Since the individual contribution of each variable is unknown, there is a lack of knowledge to critically evaluate the value of the model. This perpetuates a lack of understanding about what faculty development ought be provided to encourage more positive faculty attitudes. There is a need to identify variables such as social justice attitude that can be altered through faculty development as well as effective means of fostering positive attitudes and willingness to accommodate students with disabilities in the postsecondary environment (Murray, Lombardi, Wren, & Keys, 2009).

Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, and Benz (2009) examined more specifically the relationship among perceived institutional support, personal beliefs, comfort level with students with disabilities, and provision of accommodations. Zhang et al. concluded that personal beliefs regarding the education of students with disabilities had the most influence on actual provision of accommodations to students. While they suggested that the key to faculty development to elevate the attitude of faculty is to alter personal beliefs, the authors stop short of identifying a means by which this can be achieved. They also note that negative faculty attitudes will continue to prevent full
access for students with disabilities. With that in mind, it becomes essential to further investigate faculty attitudes related to disability in postsecondary education.

**Research Questions**

1. How much variation in faculty willingness to provide accommodations to college students with disabilities is explained by their social justice attitude as measured by the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012) after controlling for academic discipline, gender identity, years of experience, academic rank, knowledge of disability law, and prior experience with disability? Willingness to provide accommodations to college students will be measured by the combined score of adjustment of course assignments and requirements and accessibility of course material factors of the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners instrument (Lombardi & Murray, 2011).

2. How much variation in faculty attitude toward college students with disabilities is explained by their social justice attitude as measured by the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012) after controlling for academic discipline, gender identity, years of experience, academic rank, knowledge of disability law, and prior experience with disability? Faculty attitude toward students with disabilities will be measured by the fairness in providing accommodations, willingness to invest time, and performance expectations factors of the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners instrument (Lombardi & Murray, 2011).
3. Is there a relationship between faculty knowledge of disability law factor of the ExCEL (Lombardi & Murray, 2011) and social justice attitude as measured by the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012)?

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine social justice attitude as a predictor of faculty attitude towards students with disabilities and implementing accommodations in postsecondary education. Prior research has established relationships between teaching experience, prior contact with students with disabilities, academic discipline, status, rank, and gender with attitude towards accommodating students with disabilities (Beilke & Yssel, 1999; Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). Although these factors have been related to attitude and willingness to accommodate, they are relatively fixed and cannot be altered to change the attitude of an individual faculty even if causality were established. This study sought to understand the relationship between social justice attitude and faculty attitude and willingness to accommodate when controlling for demographic factors.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to this study that are presented by the design and subject matter. Since the sample was exclusively from one particular university it was difficult to generalize results beyond institutions with a similar demographic profile and academic environment. The exploratory nature of the design precludes the investigation of a specific hypothesis and, instead, potentially creates a platform from which future
hypothesis can be developed. A final limitation is prospective social desirability effects
given the topics of disability and social justice that comprise the survey.

**Definition of Terms**

**Academic discipline** refers to the overarching academic area such as business or
fine arts to which an individual department belongs rather than specific areas of
study such as finance or music. This study utilized the categories of physical and
natural sciences, social science and humanities, fine arts, business, engineering,
health professions, communications, education, and human and consumer
sciences.

**Academic rank** is used to describe the position a faculty members holds within
the institution and includes full professor, associate professor, assistant professor
and adjunct faculty/instructor/lecturer.

**Accommodation** is used to describe specific actions taken or modification made
by an individual faculty member in response to the need to create access to offset
the impact experienced by an individual student’s impairment (P.L.93-112, P.L.
101-336).

**Assistant professor** refers to faculty who are full-time professors who expected
to conduct research, perform service, and teach in their academic discipline and
may or may not be tenure track.

**Associate professor** describes individual faculty who are full-time professors
who expected to conduct research, perform service, and teach in their academic
discipline have attained tenure and been promoted to associate professor through rigorous peer review process.

**Adjunct faculty/instructor/lecturer** are used interchangeably and refer to individuals who may work full or part time strictly in a teaching capacity, generally without tenure.

**Attitude toward disability** is used to describe an individual’s collective set of beliefs and values related to disability and can include belief about the existence of a particular disability and assumptions about the ability of a person with a disability that are not related to the impairments they experience (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012).

**Faculty** refers specifically to individuals whose primary responsibilities are focused on teaching and scholarship in the postsecondary environment regardless of rank, educational attainment, or employment status.

**Full professor** describes individual faculty who are full-time professors expected to conduct research, perform service, and teach in their academic discipline have attained tenure and been promoted to full professor through rigorous peer review process.

**Gender identity** refers to one’s identification along the socially constructed categories of masculinity and femininity regardless of biological sex.

**Knowledge of disability law** is defined as knowledge of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act as applied to higher education (Lombardi & Murray, 2011).
**Impairment** describes the direct effect of an underlying medical or psychological condition on the functioning of an individual. This is based on the medical model and relies on a concept of normality and that individuals who have impairments are different from normal (Riddle, 2014).

**Prior experience with disability** in the context of this study refers specifically to numbers of students with disabilities with whom an individual faculty has worked in the postsecondary setting.

**Status** describes the level of employment with the institution and includes part-time and full-time employment for the purposes of this study is an individual.

**Social justice attitude** in this study is defined as one’s perceived self-efficacy, values, and willingness to engage in behaviors and activities that promote equity and full participation for all (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012).

**Student with a disability** describes a student at the postsecondary level who would typically be eligible for protection under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 101-336) and/or the Americans with Disabilities Amendments Act or a student at the primary/secondary level who is protected under the Americans with Disabilities Amendments Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (P.L.93-112), and/or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (P. L. 101-476). It is not presumed that all students with disabilities as defined by these laws would conceptualize themselves as having a disability or as being disabled.

**Tenure** in American universities refers to the faculty right to not be dismissed without just cause or due process once a probationary period has passed and key
accomplishments have been reached as determined by senior faculty and university leadership (http://www.aaup.org/issues/tenure).

**Willingness to accommodate** is conceptualized as the level of agreement with creating accessibility in a course, adjusting the assignments or course requirements, and reducing barriers for students with disabilities (Lombardi & Murray, 2011).

**Years of experience** refers to the years of experience teaching at the postsecondary level.

**Conclusion**

Years of growth in the numbers of college students with disabilities has resulted in a significant portion of the overall population enrolled in postsecondary education (Wolanin & Steele, 2004). Increasing numbers of students combined with greater institutional accountability for retention and graduation has increased the need to understand how to best assure students with disabilities have an equal opportunity for success (Aldeman & Carey 2009; Kelly & Lautzenheiser 2013). Bourke, Strehorn, and Silver (2000) have demonstrated a connection between the attitude of faculty and the implementation of required accommodations. Additionally, Junco (2002) brought to light the connection between subtle indicators of negative faculty attitudes and reduced ability to self-advocate for needs in the future.

Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, and Benz (2009) concluded that addressing the personal beliefs of faculty is the most effective way to create an inclusive campus in which students with disabilities have access to accommodations and may better persist to
completion. Since social justice is often described as assuring fair access to resources and opportunity (Constantine, Hage, Kindaichi, & Bryant, 2007; Cook, 1990; Fouad, Gernstein, & Toperek, 2006; Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2002; Zadja et al., 2006), this study examined the relationship between social justice attitude and willingness to implement accommodations in university faculty as a means to further understand how faculty attitudes may be connected to factors that can be addressed through professional development.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Introduction

A primary tenant of social justice requires that individuals first have a fundamental understanding of the impact oppression may have on members of an oppressed group (Ratts, 2008). Lopez-Baez and Paylo (2009) concluded, “Understanding a client’s situation/environment is a crucial consideration when working with individuals who experience oppression, discrimination, and prejudice within their community and in society as a whole” (p. 278). Similar statements are found throughout the discussion of counseling and social justice (Smith, Reynolds, & Rovnak, 2009; Lewis, Ratts, Paladino, & Toperek, 2011). While each individual client will bring to the table their own personal context, Lopez-Baez and Paylo’s statement highlights the need to also understand the larger social context for people with disabilities.

While serving to help better understand the big picture regarding disability and the oppression of people with disabilities, a basic understanding of people with disabilities will also help to develop a sense of urgency for including disability rights in social justice advocacy. Kiselica and Robinson (2001) discussed the need for counselors to discover a “moral imperative to serve as the driving force” (p. 396). It may be possible to find an immediate imperative within the situation of a particular client but is more likely that counselors can sustain advocacy efforts and advance change with an understanding of the oppressed group (Harley, Alston, & Middleton, 2007).

As a group, people with disabilities have faced, and continue to face, significant architectural, social, and economic barriers to full inclusion in the United States and have
been subject to a culture which undervalues the potential and contributions of people with disabilities (Castaneda & Peters, 2000; Lowen & Pollard, 2010). Although policy makers and those in positions of institutional power are a crucial part of creating a culture which values people with disabilities, Torres-Harding, Siers, and Olson (2012) remind us that any individual can take social action through their own work and personal interactions. Ridell, Tinklin, and Wilson (2005) articulate that this approach reduces the exclusion of people with disabilities in everyday life by reducing the impact of the individual’s impairment. If we accept that negative attitudes and fears may be one of the most challenging barriers (Reiser, 2006, Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009) then extension of social justice to include people with disabilities may be the most effective approach to creating equity in education.

**Professional Counselor Standards**

It is essential to the profession of counseling that counselors and counselor education programs seek to attain the standards set forth by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). CACREP provides guidance as to the core skills, abilities, and competencies that are integral to maintain a united professional identity (CACREP, 2014). As described in the 2016 CACREP standards, counselor education programs must foster baseline knowledge for all counselors in eight core areas: professional counseling orientation and ethical practice, social and cultural diversity, human growth and development, career development, counseling and helping relationships, group counseling and group work, assessment and testing, and research and program evaluation (CACREP, 2014).
There are a few expectations for counselor preparation that are of particular importance to effectively serving individuals with disabilities are found in several core competencies. In regard to career development, counselors must learn effective strategies for advocating for career and educational development (Standard 2.F.4.g). Additionally, professional counseling orientation and ethical practice expectations denote required knowledge regarding advocacy to address barriers to access, equity and clients (Standard 2.F.1.e). Counselors pursuing the clinical rehabilitation counseling specialization have additional requirements related to demonstrating understanding of contextual dimensions of disability as outlined in Standard 5.2 (CACREP, 2014). The totality of these standards highlights the need for counselors to know the legal and systemic framework that provides protection from discrimination in educational settings as well as understanding the social and political dynamics and attitudes that may prevent the success of individuals with disabilities.

Beyond the career development and professional identity, standards around social and cultural diversity require counselors to have a more in-depth understanding of general issues of disability and accessibility. Standard 2.F.2.a calls for an understanding of characteristics within diverse groups while standard 2.F.2.c specifically references the need to know multicultural counseling competencies. As a flagship professional organization, the American Counseling Association (ACA) has adopted specific guidelines for multicultural and social justice counseling competencies (Ratts, Singh, Nassar-McMillan, Butler, & McCullough, 2015). The competencies identify four overarching areas that lead to cultural competence: counselor self-awareness, client
worldview, counseling relationship, and counseling and advocacy interventions. These competencies are grounded in understanding privilege and marginalization and how this impacts the experience and response of individuals from groups that have experienced oppression as well as groups who have access to power. Achieving cultural competence includes knowledge of how social constructs and historical events contribute to the experience of client while also allowing for difference in how individuals within a marginalized group may be specifically impact. In addition to understanding how to apply individual interventions appropriately, the multicultural competencies compel counselors to also intervene and advocate systemically to achieve necessary client outcomes.

Social Justice Advocacy and Disability

Chang, Crethar, and Ratts (2010) described social justice advocacy as a participatory process that takes into account the community of which affected people are a part. As such, the advocacy work of counselors is to first and foremost connect with this community in order to clarify the understanding of issues, build rapport, and empower people such that the community’s independence is maintained (Goodman, Liang, Helms, Latta, Sparks, & Weintraub, 2004; Vera & Speight, 2003). Lopez-Baez and Paylo (2009) observed the ultimate purpose is to create a better system of interdependent parts. This requires counselors to assist with creating new systems, empower community members, and identify community leaders that are an integral part of the day-to-day experience of people in the community while being cognizant to avoid a hierarchical relationship.
Several authors have discussed the application of the American Counseling Association Advocacy Competencies in the context of social justice counseling (Lewis, Ratts, Paladino, & Toporek, 2011; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007; Vera & Speight, 2003). The ACA Advocacy Competencies (American Counseling Association, 2005) run along multiple dimensions of acting with, or on behalf of, clients and operating at the micro or macro levels (or anywhere along these continuums). Operationalizing these continuums offers the counselor six domains for consideration: Client empowerment and client advocacy (client level advocacy); community collaboration and systems advocacy (community level); and public information and social/political advocacy (public level). In a summary view of the advocacy competencies, Vera and Speight (2003) proposed that eight roles emerge for counselors: “adviser, advocate, self-help group facilitator, facilitator of indigenous support and healing systems, consultant, change agent, counselor, and psychotherapist” (p. 263). Contemplating these roles, it is notable that some emerge more as leadership-oriented actions. Lee and Rodgers (2009) described the needed leadership characteristics as the ability to speak up about injustices without fear, create a strategy or vision, and to be able to gather information and craft that information into compelling reasons for social change. While client level advocacy is important to the conversation of social justice counseling, the focus of the following analysis for engaging in social justice advocacy that is inclusive of disability issues will be on those leadership activities at the community and public levels.

**Community collaboration.** Counselors have, as part of their professional skill set, the requisite communication skills to engage in active listening and empathic
understanding (Kiselica & Robinson, 2001) that can be utilized to connect with members of the disability community. Identifying and participating with local, regional, or state disability interest groups and committees provides a natural avenue by which a counselor can engage with people with disabilities and other disability advocates. This level of engagement is an important mechanism to assess and affirm commitment to people with disabilities as a whole and to gain a more complete understanding of their experience, concerns, and key stakeholders (Toporek, Gerstein, Fouad, Royiscar, & Isreal, 2006). Engagement with the community also fosters the shared power dynamic that underscores social justice and is of particular importance in advocating with groups of people with disabilities whose voices have typically been absent from the discussion of policies and issues that intimately affect them.

The opportunities presented to a counselor may vary from one community to another; however, there are many potential ways to connect. Counselors may investigate the existence of local or state commissions that are an established part of a city council or state government. These groups are often comprised of local or state leaders of the disability community as well as professionals and other key stakeholders such as business owners. Additional opportunities may be present at the local level through agencies that serve individuals with disabilities such as the state vocational rehabilitation commission, the mental health board, the board of developmental disabilities, or the agencies with whom they contract. Often such agencies involve consumers of their services on an advisory board that may offer easy identification of people who have already emerged as leaders interested in advocacy efforts. Finally, counselors may also choose to connect
with groups of people with specific disabilities and their allies. These types of organizations may include state chapters of the National Federal for the Blind, local chapters for those living with physical conditions such as Lupus or Multiple Sclerosis, The ARC (formerly the Association of Retarded Citizens), or county chapters of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI).

After the identification of leaders or groups with whom a counselor may connect, it is important to invest time in developing rapport and get to know the leaders and constituencies of these organizations (Lee & Rodgers, 2009). As rapport builds, counselors may find the opportunity to employ skills of group facilitation and an understanding of group dynamics to help the voices of community and organizations emerge and take shape (Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). In order to work towards the creation of self-sustaining systems, counselors may engage with members and leaders to teach skills of leadership, communication, information gathering, and group dynamics which assist the community members in developing their own vision as well as being better prepared to engage the public, administrators, and policy makers of the institutions which perpetuate systems of oppression (Stringfellow & Muscari, 2003). The process of building rapport and developing relationships may also reveal additional skills that counselors may share to assist community members in developing their strengths.

**Systems advocacy.** Moving forward at a systems level may take several forms including collaboration, professional organization, and using professional relationships and connections. Once the counselor has engaged with the community to develop an understanding of the strengths, concerns, and challenges of people with disabilities and
enters into advocacy at the systems level, it is important to remain connected to assure that actions on behalf of community members are consistent with their needs and desired outcomes (Lee & Rodgers, 2009). The overarching goal of system advocacy is to affect organizational culture change that eliminates or minimizes continued marginalization and recognizes and maximizes the strengths of the community (Goodman et al., 2004).

Emarking on a mission to evoke system-wide changes may at first seem daunting. However, understanding distinct opportunities to initiate such change can make it more tangible.

Counselors should examine the professional systems in which they operate. Toporek (2006) noted that often counselors and counselor educators are in a position to directly influence policies in the educational systems and agencies in which they work. Counselors who work in an administrative capacity can engage people with disabilities to actively participate on advisory boards or host focus groups aimed at assessing the accessibility of policies, procedures, services, and the buildings in which services are provided and elicit feedback about modifications that would be helpful. A place to begin may even be a review of the program’s existing policies with an eye toward identifying policies that are perceived as administratively neutral that may actually perpetuate bias against people with disabilities (Pincus, 2000). Even if one does not have direct administrative oversight, with intimate knowledge of the program’s operation, counselors may advocate for such activities to occur in their places of employment and even find ways to incorporate such activities into pre-existing opportunities. As an example, many agencies conduct satisfaction surveys or program evaluations; advocating for systems
change might include incorporating questions about accessibility into the annual survey or evaluation. Additionally, many of the workplaces that employ counselors may also offer professional development or allow time away to engage in professional development. Advocating for systems change might include making co-workers aware of conferences that address issues of disability and/or inviting members of the disability community to facilitate a seminar regarding accessibility within the community. In 2003, Vera and Speight recognized one of the barriers to implementing social justice counseling is the system of funding and payment reimbursement in which many counselors operate. Systems advocacy approaches might also include counselors using their connections to funding and payment sources to change this part of the system as well.

Beyond positions within organizations, systems advocacy for people with disability can be moved forward by fostering intersystem collaboration. People with disabilities may be affected by multiple systems including vocational rehabilitation, public assistance, employment, transportation, healthcare, and education to name a few. To extend the influence of systems level impacts, counselors may develop an interdisciplinary advocacy team to develop a response across systems. Toporek et al. (2006) concluded that these types of links across systems enhance the likelihood of change. Using professional connections to develop allies within other systems may afford the opportunity to address issues that are beyond the scope of one program and a multitude of voices may act to reinforce a need to institute change (Lopez-Baez & Paylo, 2009).
A final avenue to promulgate system change lies within our own professional organizations. As noted by Toporek (2006), there have been recent efforts to examine the leadership of counseling organizations to assure that they are reflective of diverse populations. In considering the inclusion of people with disabilities, counselors should also advocate for professional meetings and conferences to be held in facilities accessible to people with disabilities, to make plans for accommodations (i.e., sign language interpreting or captioning) to be provided and to be inclusive of the topic of disability in programming. It also seems fitting to examine the policies and procedures of professional organizations to be sure that they are not excluding people with disabilities (i.e., electronic communication and websites not accessible to screen reading software for people with visual impairments) to first model the process we advocate other systems employ.

**Public information.** Implementation of advocacy efforts in the arena of public information is largely focused on the counselor’s knowledge and use of media and on its ability to raise public awareness on the issues of oppression (Kilesica & Robinson, 2001; Lee & Rodgers, 2009). Media may be used as an outlet to reach a broad range of people who may otherwise remain uninformed. Counselors may strategically use media, in conjunction with people with disabilities, by first developing a uniform message. Working together, counselors and people with disabilities can determine what would be valuable for potential allies and members of the public to know that might garner support for the necessary social change. In the Kessler report *The ADA 20 Years Later* (Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, 2010), many people with disabilities
indicated receiving pity from members of the larger community, experienced discrimination at work, or faced barriers in accessing needed transportation to participate in work or civic life.

In collaboration with members of the local disability community, counselors may try to engage local television or radio stations to focus a human interest piece on a person who happens to have a disability to combat the image that people with disabilities are “unable” or in need of sympathy. Furthermore, counselors and disability leaders can partner to organize an editorial letter writing campaign on current issues in the community to highlight how recent events impact the particular experience of people with disabilities. The growing power of social media may also serve as an outlet for people with disabilities and counselors to develop networks with key community stakeholders (i.e., local chamber of commerce or community center) to voice their needs and access the “virtual community.” Counselors may also be able to wager their professional clout to produce opportunities to co-author periodic pieces in the community interest pages of a local newspaper. Finally, counselors may assist disability leaders in the use of public service announcements to promote information that alters the public image of people with disabilities or offers suggestions on creating access.

Community outreach is another component of the public information domain that fits very naturally with the skill set of counselors. Counselors and members of the disability community may partner to offer trainings to local businesses on “disability etiquette,” speak with business members at the chamber of commerce about the benefits of employing people with disabilities, or attend meetings of civic organizations to discuss
pressing issues and garner support for community change. While these activities themselves may not yield policy change at a wide level, Strickland (in Shullman, Celeste, & Strickland, 2006) noted the importance of “emotional readiness” of key stakeholders and constituents as an important precursor to social policy change.

**Social/political advocacy.** Perhaps the most daunting domain of advocacy for many counselors is the macro level social/political advocacy. While the political realm may not be a context in which many counselors envision themselves, there are many manageable ways in which counselors can use their everyday skills to affect change. Sullivan (in Sullivan, Celeste, & Strickland, 2006) remarked of her political advocacy experience as a counselor:

> My social justice advocacy activities involved sending letters, making telephone calls, sending e-mails, meeting with legislators (or legislative staff), testifying, developing information and research summaries, giving invited presentations, debating, training others to advocate, making and soliciting financial contributions and persuading other colleagues to get involved. (p. 502)

Her experience lends insight about activities that may be incorporated into counselor’s everyday work that ultimately impacts social policy. Utilizing an understanding of particular social impacts and having professional training in the understanding and use of data, counselors can offer themselves as consultants to legislators or lobbying organizations to prepare pertinent information that can be reviewed by policy makers. This can even evolve one step further through testifying at hearings of legislation regarding the impact on people with disabilities. Others may find it more accessible to
engage in writing letters and emails to key legislators detailing the concerns of people with disabilities and discussing the impact of social policy on the everyday lives of people with disabilities.

Toporek (2006) also highlights that many employers or professional organizations with whom counselors are connected may provide avenues to easily engage in political advocacy. Professional organizations may arrange advocacy days in which members have the opportunity to meet face to face with legislators or may provide examples of letters that can easily be adapted and sent to local leaders urging action on a particular issue. The relationship with professional organizations should also be reciprocal in that members may also share their concerns and knowledge to garner the attention of a larger national or state organization aiming to support the advocacy concerns of people with disabilities.

**Counselors as Advocates for Disability in Higher Education**

The shifting role of the counselor to include that of advocate and activist (Goodman et al., 2004; Smith et al., 2009), as with any change, may present counselors with challenges inherit in a new context of social justice. However, to remain consistent with the values of the counseling profession, the necessity of engaging in social justice advocacy cannot be ignored. Although serving students with disabilities in postsecondary education is a specialized field and the backgrounds of disability services professionals are varied, approximately one third report having a background in counseling, psychological services, or mental health (Kasnitz, 2011). Counselors who find themselves in disability services are bound by their counseling identity as well as the
disability services professional standards to promote access and inclusion at an institutional level through outreach, training, and advocacy (The Association of Higher Education and Disability, n.d.). It is essential that disability services professionals, particularly those who are counselors, engage in activities that support community collaboration, systems advocacy, public information, and social/political advocacy.

Harvey (1992) specifically described education as both a material and social good to which students with disabilities must be afforded equal opportunity in order to achieve a just society. Although there is legislation such as the Americans with Disabilities Amendments Act and Section 504, Bento (1996) challenged postsecondary institutions to engage in conversations that broaden the view of disability and foster dialogue. Specifically regarding faculty, Skinner (2007) echoed this sentiment when describing the ultimate goal of fostering a high level of willingness to accommodate students and an attitude that conveys an assurance that students with disabilities be given the necessary resources to remove barriers to education.

While counselors and disability services professionals have a variety of avenues to promote social justice for people with disabilities, Liasidou (2014) concluded that “professional development for social justice and inclusion on the grounds of disability should constitute an integral aspect of attempts to enhance accessibility in higher education” (p. 130). Bento (1996) suggests that this attitudinal change can best be accomplished through focused interventions and trainings with different campus constituencies. For those who teach students with disabilities, Rutherford (2011) noted the importance of the teacher’s belief that students with disabilities are valued and
capable in supporting positive learning outcomes. Specifically in the context of postsecondary education, Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, and Benz (2009) concluded that “improving the personal beliefs of faculty regarding the education of students with disabilities is one of the most important ways to enhance the provision of accommodations and supports for students with disabilities” (p. 281). As such, focusing on advocacy and education of faculty should be primary for counselors and disability service providers in postsecondary education.

**Disability in a Social Justice Context**

Social justice requires subscription to the notion that individuals’ own personal contexts affect how they view, understand, and experience the world. This is particularly important for a person who is not part of an oppressed group to realize and remedy through including people impacted by oppression, otherwise systemic oppression will likely be perpetuated (Bryan, 2000). The involvement of affected people should be achieved through various avenues. Initially, individuals must establish themselves as a co-learner or ally with shared power in the advocacy agenda and process (Goodman Liang, Helms, Latta, Sparks, & Weintraub, 2004; Lopez-Baez & Paylo, 2009) in order to gain a better understanding of the specific context for an individual or community. Further, one must ascribe to the sincere belief that the potential solutions and actions to overcome systemic challenges are known to, or can be revealed by, those who are members of the community (Goodman et al., 2004; Greenleaf & Bryant, 2012).

Effective advocacy requires empowerment of the individual or community in order to encourage participation and avoid development of dependency on the “expert”
Understanding and strict attention to these dynamics may be of particular importance in social justice work with people with disabilities. As noted by Smart (2007), a long history of reliance on, and control by trained “experts” has created a significant power differential between people with disabilities and “others” of which one must be aware. This same dynamic is reflected in Castaneda and Peter’s (2000) observation that, in contrast to other civil rights movements, much of what is written about disability is written from the perspective of experts outside the group.

Although social justice has been largely focused on issues of social class and equitable distribution of resources, Polat (2011) recognized the expansion of social justice to include race and gender and contends that addressing equity for people with disabilities is a natural extension. Further, Liasidou (2014) maintains it is appropriate to extend thoughts about social justice to include disability due to the variety of sources of disadvantages experienced by people with disabilities and the sum of their impacts. This idea is strengthened when simultaneously considering that many of the barriers experienced by people with disabilities continue to be created by society (Lowen & Pollard, 2010). Inclusion of people with disabilities cannot be achieved until we collectively commit to removing barriers in order to assure personal choice and full participation of people with disabilities (Barclay, 2011).

Most recent counseling literature has addressed the theory and application of social justice to multicultural and feminist paradigms, the ACA advocacy model (American Counseling Association, 2005) and basic tenants of social justice present a
context transferrable to addressing the systemic discrimination towards people with disabilities. A brief understanding of the historic exclusion of people with disabilities from participating in discussion of legislation and social policies that often resulted in further alienation, or at the very least not addressing the most poignant concerns of people with disabilities, provides a lens with which to examine the development of the Disability Rights Movement (DRM) and the potential for counselors to engage in advocacy with members of the disability community.

Early victories of the DRM, including the 1978 Rehabilitation Act Amendments and the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) demonstrate the strengths and capacity of many individuals with disabilities to engage in social activism. The current experience and reality of many people with disabilities, however, should compel counselors to join with the disability community and leaders. Although counselors may have much of the requisite skill set to perform advocacy work both with and on behalf of people with disabilities, we must work together intentionally to rally stakeholders and develop a common vision to guide efforts toward sustainable change (Lopez-Baez & Paylo, 2009). Counselors who find connection to the stories and experiences of people with disabilities can find many ways in which to engage in social justice advocacy. Harley et al. (2007) observed that large-scale action is not required to enact social change, rather people acting individually or collectively towards change enact it. This is an important thought to keep in mind as counselors seek ways to integrate advocacy with and for people with disabilities a part of their professional commitment.
Disability legislation: A recent history. A cursory review of the extensive legislation pertaining to disability in the United States might give the false impression that the Disability Rights Movement (DRM) has a longstanding history of addressing social justice for people with disabilities. Closer examination, however, reveals that much of the legislation prior to 1973 was developed with little to no input from people with disabilities (Bryan, 2000). The beginning of the DRM is most often perceived to have occurred in 1962 when Edward Roberts won a court battle to enroll at the University of California-Berkley (McCarthy, 2003) which significantly changed the inclusion of people with disabilities in social and political processes. While the legislative developments and DRM have not always worked in tandem, it is pertinent to discuss the two simultaneously in order to better develop a succinct view of the present context for people with disabilities in the United States.

Early attempts to legislate the experience of people with disabilities emerged from existing legislation regarding vocational training and education that was largely focused towards wounded soldiers in World War I and World War II. The first extension of this vocational rehabilitation legislation to non-Veteran citizens developed in the 1920s (Patterson, Bruyere, Symanski, & Jenkins, 2005). The first such federal legislation, the Smith-Fess Act (P.L. 66-236), was passed in 1920 and provided funding to states for the provision of employment assistance for people with physical disabilities. In the following years, efforts to encourage pathways for people with blindness to earn income was also legislated through the Randolph-Sheppard Act of 1936 (P.L. 74-732), which offered the opportunity for people who are blind to operate vending stands in federal buildings.
Similarly, the Wagner-O’Day Act of 1938 (P.L. 75-739) required the federal government to purchase products produced in sheltered workshops by people who were blind.

The first legislation with widespread impact for people with severe disabilities was the Social Security Act (SSA) (P.L. 74-271). Passed in 1935, the SSA provided financial assistance and expanded vocational rehabilitation services, but failed to meet the needs of many people with disabilities who were potentially capable employees (Fleisher & Zames, 2001). Additionally, the first extension of services to civilians with disabilities occurred in 1943 with the passage of the G.I. Bill (P.L. 78-346, Servicemen’s Readjustment Act) and the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1943 (P.L. 78-113). These extensions expanded services beyond vocational rehabilitation to include assistance such as tuition, counseling, monetary allowances for unemployment or underemployment, and home loans. The Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments Act would later serve as a critical point of expansion for services to non-Veteran citizens.

Legislatively, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act received amendments on three occasions. A 1954 amendment increased funding for existing rehabilitation services and also improved on and expanded new programs as well as addressed the growing need for research and training of rehabilitation professionals (P.L. 83-565). Later, in 1965, the continued expansion and funding of vocational rehabilitation services was assured through additional amendments as well as required reader and interpreter services for individuals with blindness and deafness and established the National Commission on Architectural Barriers (P.L. 89-333). Two years later, additional amendments created the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults (P.L. 90-99). Concurrent to these
legislative developments, grassroots organizations such as League for the Physically Handicapped along with individual activists around the country began to gain the right to leave institutions and live within the community while receiving services essential to their independence (Fleisher & Zames, 2001).

Post disability rights movement legislation. Faulty assumptions about disability served as the basis for prevailing social attitudes and legislation prior to the DRM. Such assumptions included the propositions that a person with a disability is a victim who requires help and social support, that the experience of having a disability is uniform and central to one’s identity, and that all problems experienced by a person with a disability are related to the impairment experienced (Fine & Asch, 2000). It is precisely these assumptions that created social oppression for people with disabilities and spurred the initial grassroots organizations of people with disabilities during this same time span. The League of the Physically Handicapped formed in New York City in the 1930s to oppose discrimination and later joined the League for the Advancement of the Deaf in 1936 to specifically address employment discrimination (Fleischer & Zames, 2001). The 1950s and 1960s were a time of continuing expansion for legislation as well as continued grassroots organizing for what was to become the Disability Rights Movement.

The DRM emerged after the successes of civil rights movements for women and African Americans, largely benefitting from their examples of political action by enacting a similar model of social advocacy (Scotch, 1989). However, the political potential of the DRM was increased with the passage of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act (P.L. 93-112). Although the Rehabilitation Act continued to be largely drafted by politicians and
professionals with little input from people with disabilities, it legally recognized people with disabilities as a “class” of people, which lent organizational power to the DRM (Bryan, 2000). This political momentum enabled disability rights activists to be instrumental in influencing the subsequent 1978 Amendments to the Rehabilitation Act, thereby increasing services beyond employment and training to include the development and funding of Independent Living Centers mandated to be headed predominantly by individuals with disabilities (Scotch, 1989). These gains were significant, but definitive legal protection of civil rights for people with disabilities was not achieved until the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990 (P.L. 101-336). Since this recognition of people with disabilities as a legal class of people, disability legislation has had a focus distinct from prior legislation. While early legislation was instrumental in the development of rehabilitation services, the legal developments of the past 30 years have been primarily concerned with the recognition of rights of people with disabilities and the provision of equity of opportunities.

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) is one of the first pieces of legislation to actively involve a leader from the DRM and likely responsible for closing much of the gap in attainment of high school education for people with disabilities today. The law was heavily influenced by Judy Heumann, a key activist in the DRM and person with a disability, who assisted during her work as a legislative intern (Scotch, 1989). The fundamental impact of this law was to halt the exclusion of children with disabilities from public education and also required the development of individualized plans that included assessment and determination of appropriate support
services. The law was amended in 1990 as the more commonly known Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA (P.L. 101-476), and included a provision to end segregation to special education classrooms and emphasized planning to transition students to either employment or postsecondary education after graduation.

The lobbying power of the DRM set in motion another series of amendments to the Rehabilitation Act beginning in 1975: the Developmentally Disabled Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (P.L. 94-103). These amendments recognized the need to expand services for and actively protect the rights of people with physical and developmental disabilities that limited cognitive functioning. The outcomes of the Developmentally Disabled Assistance and Bill of Rights were amplified with the 1978 Rehabilitation, Comprehensive Services, and Developmental Disabilities Amendments (P.L. 95-602), which expanded to individuals with severe physical disabilities beyond the realm of employment to include services required for independent living (IL). An unmistakable mark of the DRM can be seen in this legislation, not only in the recognition of the importance of deinstitutionalization but also in the requirement that centers providing IL should explicitly include people with disabilities in the management of such organizations (Scotch, 1989). The IL efforts of the DRM were extended in 1984 when the Rehabilitation Amendments (98-221) made funding for IL permanent and required that each state have an IL center.

Further influence of the DRM is evident in the 1992 Amendments to the Rehabilitation Act (P.L. 102-569) in which the prior language of “individuals with handicaps” was replaced with “individuals with disabilities” and consumer voice was
given to vocational rehabilitation services through the creation of consumer advisory councils for state rehabilitation agencies. The most recent amendments to the Rehabilitation Act passed in 1998 were incorporated into Title IV of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA; P.L. 105-220) and expanded Section 508 to include access to electronic information including websites and digital documents. Additionally, the Workforce Investment Act sought to streamline resources and created networks between local social services (e.g., county employment centers) and state vocational rehabilitation.

Concurrent with the evolution of services and supports for people with disabilities contained in the many Rehabilitation Act amendments, DRM activists also recognized the importance of widespread attainment of the basic civil rights that had been specifically extended to women and racial minority groups in the 1960s. Disability advocates ultimately found success in the passage of the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA; P.L. 101-336). The ADA surpassed the limitations of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act by extending employment nondiscrimination to private employers with 15 or more employees, improving architectural access, mandating equal opportunity to participate in all government programs and services, providing protection from discrimination in public venues (e.g., restaurants, banks, recreational facilities), establishing telecommunication access for people with hearing impairments, and creating a call to reasonably accommodate. After nearly twenty years, the ADA Amendments of 2009 was passed to include expanded guidance as to who is recognized as a person with a disability and to consider the evaluation of a person’s disability in the absence of mitigating measures such as assistive technology or medical intervention.
While far from an exhaustive review of legislation and the DRM, such a snapshot offers national and historical developments that inform the personal context of people with disabilities. This review brings to light four key factors: (1) the relative exclusion of people with disabilities from the early efforts to affect services and attitudes towards people with disabilities; (2) the recent-ness of the DRM in achieving civil rights legislation; (3) legislation protecting the civil rights of people with disabilities has remained separate from legislation addressing race, gender, religion, and other protected statuses; and (4) the historic denial of resources and access of people with disabilities.

**Paradigms of disability.** Complementary with the evolution of disability legislature and the DRM, there has been an evolution in the ways in which disability can be conceptualized. Similar to much of individualized counseling theory, the medical model of disability served as the reference point for most of the legislation and historical attitudes towards people with disabilities. The DRM has fought against the medical view of disability due to its implication that a disability is a fixed condition and also weighs judgment of disability on the severity of an underlying medical condition as well as the creation of a dependent relationship with “expert” rehabilitation and medical professionals (Smith et al., 2009). In this model, it is up to the person with a disability to adapt to the world and remedy deficits with the goal of becoming as close to “normal” as possible (Barclay, 2011; Reiser, 2006). As Liasidou (2012) concluded, in this model, attention and responsibility is given to the individual student to overcome deficits regardless of the social context and minimizes the impact of environmental factors and any collective responsibility to become inclusive.
While many disability policies (including the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Social Security Administration) remain grounded in a medical definition of disability, Smart (2007) contends that the diversity of disability has necessitated a movement toward understanding the disability experience as one inclusive of functional, psychological, and social forces. This position is supported by Bryan (2000) who posited that a social model is a more globally accepted lens with which to view disability. A social model of disability focuses on the consequences of exclusion as a result of social inadequacies and aspires to assure people with disabilities are not excluded as a result of social and attitudinal barriers (Gabel & Conner, 2009). Additionally, Smart (2007) asserted that the shift away from a medical model of disability would empower individuals with disabilities, facilitate collaboration among professionals, and bring disability out of the realm of the “expert” into general discussion. Indeed, the introduction of the social model has altered the experience of people with disabilities by offering a way to remove the responsibility for deficits from the individual to the collective community which can lead to personal empowerment and created greater opportunity for political action (Riddle, 2014).

Despite the success associated with the social model of disability, there are limits associated with it as well. Riddle (2014) criticized the social model as well as the medical model and proposed that either model taken literally fails to recognize the complexity of disability by failing to address either the social construction in the case of the medical model or the potential gains of medical treatment in the case of the social model. Wasserman (2001) advocated that disability be considered a complex interaction of
biology, environment, and individual traits. If one accepts Wasserman’s concept of disability, the role of social justice in relation to disability emerges. In considering the medical and social factors people with disabilities may need access to sufficient resources to meet their needs as well as experiencing pathways to full participation in education, employment, and personal endeavors. Regardless of the model of disability one ascribes to, the case can be made that society is still responsible for assuring just distribution of resources whether it be access to medical or care opportunity for barriers to be removed from the environment (Barclay, 2011; Liasidou, 2014).

**Current reality of disability in the United States.** The DRM, as a relatively young movement, has enjoyed some legislative success in gaining recognition of people with disabilities as a class protected from discrimination and harassment. Approaching the twentieth anniversary of the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, *The ADA 20 Years Later* (Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, 2010) sought to capture the impact of legislation on particular experiences by people with disabilities. However, a review of the report confirmed the assertion that attitudes cannot be changed by legislation alone (Vera & Speight, 2003). Indeed, 61% of respondents surveyed indicated the ADA has made no difference in their lives while only 23% perceive the ADA has made their lives better.

The 2010 report was based on data collected by Harris Interactive from a sample of 1000 adults with disabilities and 1000 adults without disabilities in the United States. The administered surveys collected data regarding education, income, employment, general satisfaction, access to healthcare, and access to transportation. The data was then
used to identify gaps between people with and without disabilities. *The ADA 20 Years Later* (Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, 2010) contains an extensive account of the discrepancies between the reality for people with and without disabilities today. Several key points from the report can be utilized to construct a basic understanding of today’s context:

- “Among all working-age (18-64) people with disabilities, only 21% say they are employed full or part-time, compared to 59% of working-age people without disabilities – a gap of 38 percentage points.” (p.10)
- “People with disabilities are more than twice as likely as people without disabilities to report that they have a household income of $15,000 or less (34% versus 15%, respectively) – a gap of 19 percentage points.” (p.12)
- “17% of people with disabilities report they have not completed high school, compared to 11% of people without disabilities – a gap of 6 percentage points.” (p.13)
- “19% of people with disabilities have reportedly graduated from college compared to 27% of their non-disabled counterparts. Important to note, these figures have increased for both groups (up from 14% in 2004 for people with disabilities and up from 25% in 2004 for people without disabilities).” (p.14)
- “People with disabilities are more likely to say that they have gone without needed health care on at least one occasion in the past year when compared to people without disabilities (19% and 10%, respectively) – a gap of 9 percentage points.” (p.14)
• “People with disabilities are much more likely than people without disabilities to consider inadequate transportation to be a problem (34% versus 16%, respectively) – a gap of 18 percentage points.” (p.15)

The ADA 20 Years Later (Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, 2010) also lends support to the belief that people with disabilities still experience the impact of negative social attitudes. For example, 28% of respondents indicated that others show pity towards them (described as “acting as if sorry for you”) and 43% claim they have experienced some form of job discrimination in their lives. Perhaps most indicative is the 27 percentage point gap between people with and without disabilities concerning if an individual is “very satisfied with life in general”. In sum, this presents a convincing imperative to foster a sense of inclusiveness and social justice among faculty to increase opportunities for people with disabilities to participate in postsecondary education and experience the lifelong benefits associated with completing education post high school.

Disability in Postsecondary Education

Since the attainment of a postsecondary degree is a positive indicator of employment outcomes for Social Security Disability Income recipients (Livermore, Goodman, & Wright, 2007), attention to issues of access to higher education emerge as a key issue for people with disabilities. In the post-secondary environment, federal laws such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (As Amended 2009) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1978 have formalized efforts to increase accessibility of the physical campus as well as the academic environment (Dukes & Shaw, 1998). These civil
rights laws provide colleges and universities with guidance on the requirements of legal compliance, but provide little direction as to how an institution may achieve these outcomes.

In discussion of the implications of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, West, Kregel, Getzel, Zhu, and Ipsen (1993) wrote “…a school need not create a totally barrier-free environment, so long as it does not significantly hinder the participation of students with disabilities in a program when viewed in its entirety” (p. 456) which demonstrates the large degree of flexibility that institutions have been afforded in implementing accessibility. As noted by Tiedeman (2008), some universities go beyond minimum legal standards to varying degrees; however, all universities must comply with minimum legal standards. Key differences remain between high school and postsecondary education in that legislation at the postsecondary level calls for nondiscrimination and reasonable accommodation with no expectations of supporting academic achievement (Wolanin & Steele, 2004).

According to the 2010 report The ADA 20 Years Later (Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability, 2010), people with disabilities still experience significant gaps in employment and postsecondary education. The report cites that only 21% of people with disabilities are currently employed (compared to 59% of people without disabilities) with 37% of those unemployed indicating that lack of access to accommodations is a factor in their unemployment. The gap between employment rates of people with and without disabilities is further problematic when considering only 40% of people with disabilities complete college, a full 36% less than people without
disabilities. Although significant gains have been made in reducing the gap in high school completion rates, the Education Commission of the States Policy Brief (2000) reminds us that 25% of students with disabilities in college fail remedial coursework and that more students with disabilities require this coursework than peers without disabilities. Furthermore, the dropout rate of students with disabilities is higher (Stodden & Dowrick, 2001).

**Postsecondary educational attainment for students with disabilities.**

Significant gains related to high school completion were noted in *The ADA 20 Years Later* report (2010), but trends for postsecondary education were less optimistic. Although increasing numbers of students with disabilities are seeking postsecondary education, only 19% report having completed college compared to 27% of people without disabilities. Wagner, Newman, Cameto, Garza, and Levine (2005) found through the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 that students with disabilities remain much less likely than their counterparts without disabilities to attend four-year colleges and universities in particular. These statistics, coupled with the link between lower education level and unemployment in people with disabilities (Livermore, Goodman, & Wright, 2007), suggest there remains much to be done to assure equitable opportunities for people with disabilities.

The National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 results estimate that 10% of people with disabilities had enrolled in a four-year college or university during their first two years after high school graduation (Wagner, Newman, Cameto, Garza, & Levine, 2005). While the gap between the numbers of students with disabilities graduating high school
and the number enrolling in postsecondary education is not fully understood. Halpern, Yovanoff, Doren, and Benz (1995) found that the strongest predictor is the student’s satisfaction with high school instruction. Additional predictors include participation in transition planning and student completion of basic curriculum. In addition to lower representation at four-year institutions, the completion rates are often lower than students without disabilities. Murray, Goldstein, Nourse, and Edgar (2000) examined the enrollment and completion of students with learning disabilities in particular and found that only 2% of high school graduates with learning disabilities completed a four-year degree within ten years after high school while 46% of a matched sample of people without disabilities completed a four-year degree within the same time frame. When examining the five year graduation rates of students with learning disabilities and those without, Murray et al. found 80% of the students with learning disabilities had not graduated compared to 56% of students without learning disabilities.

In an intensive study of students with disabilities and their families, Hartzell and Compton (1984) compared students with learning disabilities to their siblings without learning disabilities to better understand outcomes for students with disabilities and factors that affected those outcomes. The authors specifically examined academic, social, and job success and found that intellectual functioning (IQ) combined with the effective functioning of the family accounted for 35% of the variance in academic success. This finding was true for students with mild to severe learning disabilities. Although Hartzell and Compton’s research was completed 30 years ago, Murray and Wren (2003) similarly concluded that intellectual functioning and procrastination of academic tasks were the
significant predictors of grade point average for students with disabilities supporting these findings to have continued relevance.

Emerging data regarding the retention and completion of students with disabilities in postsecondary education has prompted some exploration of factors that create barriers to success. McGuire, Scott, and Shaw (2003) and Scott, McGuire, and Shaw (2003) discussed the differences in instructional methods or environments between high school and college as a significant challenge. In their exploration of the application of Universal Design for Learning, Scott et al. (2003) noted that faculty at the college level are not primarily trained as teachers in most disciplines and teaching may compete with other aspects of their jobs (i.e., research and scholarship) for time and attention. During interviews with faculty who had been recognized as outstanding teachers, some faculty reported experiences in which other faculty expressed this disinterest and even a belief that altering teaching methods to reach larger numbers of students may do a disservice to students who would usually not succeed in lower level, difficult courses (Scott et al., 2003). This reality in addition to the fact that many students with disabilities, particularly students with learning disabilities, have received some level of specialized instruction during high school can create a difficult gap for a student to navigate when entering postsecondary education.

In addition to overall differences in instructional environment, Maudus and Shaw (2004) proposed that disparities in obtaining and receiving support are additional barriers for students with disabilities. Specifically, Maudus and Shaw note that, although Section 504 provides a common vocabulary, the subparts pertaining to secondary education and
postsecondary education create very different delivery of supports for students. When students transition to postsecondary education, it becomes their responsibility to initiate requests for accommodations and provide any necessary documentation to support their request (P.L. 93-112). While students may be accustomed to having a specialized professional who advocates on their behalf and communicates with teachers in high school, students become the primary source for initiating requests and communicating with faculty in college. Further, in the postsecondary environment, students who received waivers or substitutions for courses or completed a modified curriculum in subjects with significant disability impact in high school, will likely not receive those same modifications and waivers in college. While the regulations specific to the secondary environment take into account the right of every student to free and appropriate education, these same allowances do not apply to colleges and universities. If a course is an essential component of a degree and required for all students, students with disabilities may find themselves being required to complete coursework that is particularly challenging due to the specific impacts of disability rather than the rigor of the course itself.

In addition to personal attributes and systemic differences, the use and effectiveness of university supports and accommodations contribute to the success of students with disabilities at the postsecondary level. Vogel, Hruby, and Aldeman (1993) noted common characteristics among students with disabilities who successfully completed college: resilience, determination, and well-developed compensatory strategies. Although no evidence was presented to confirm the authors’ notion, they
posited that students with these characteristics were more likely to access accommodations and support resources in postsecondary education. Ten years later, Trammel (2003) studied a sample of students with learning disabilities and/or ADHD to examine their use of accommodations and predictors of academic success. Results of the study indicated that students who received accommodations generally achieved better grades; however, some evidence suggested that as the number of requested accommodations increased, students’ grades decrease. This finding could not be conclusively stated due to low numbers of students in the sample receiving multiple accommodations.

Managing systemic differences between secondary and postsecondary education and developing resilience and determination can be difficult for students, but campus culture and attitude toward disability presents perhaps the most significant barrier to successful completion for students with disabilities that is outside their control (Beilke & Yssel, 1999; Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005; Stodden & Dorwick, 2001; Wilson, Getzel, & Brown, 2000; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). As a part of their in-depth program evaluation at Virginia Commonwealth University, Wilson et al. (2000) identified several themes that emerged from open-ended questions from a survey distributed to all students with disabilities. While some themes were more specific to the institution, the belief that faculty had the most impact on students’ success or failure is a universal theme present in other studies. Students described how faculty who had unfavorable opinions of students with disabilities (e.g., believing students are unable or are “faking a disability”) or failed
to implement accommodations, whether unwilling or lacking in resources or knowledge, presented substantial barriers to success.

This same notion of faculty attitude as a barrier was confirmed in Dowrick et al.’s (2005) study that consisted of structured focus groups of students across ten institutions of higher education. Students largely described faculty as being willing to provide accommodations, but when the interaction was negative, it was more impactful on their future requests. Students who participated in focus groups for Burgstahler and Doe’s (2006) study described negative experiences as discouraging them from seeking accommodations in the future. The examples of negative attitudes ranged from making arrangements for accommodations that meant missing out on other aspects of class to assumptions that disability meant students could not be successful or that students were “abusing” their disability by getting accommodations the faculty did not believe they required. Existing research supports the idea that negative attitude in and of itself can have a negative effect on the persistence of students with disabilities, but the negative beliefs about people with disabilities has also been shown to directly influence the faculty provision of accommodations (Bourke et al., 2000; Gitlow, 2001; Zhang et al., 2009).

Although accessibility on college campuses has been mandated since the passage of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act in 1973 (P.L. 93-112), over 40 years later students with disabilities are still not participating in and completing postsecondary education at a level that suggests equitable opportunity is available to students with disabilities. Since the underlying principle of social justice is a fair distribution of resources and opportunity among all people (Fouad, Gerstein, & Toporek, 2006) and the
opportunity to complete postsecondary education is not as equitable for students with disabilities, it is imperative that we seek to better understand the impact of, and how to shift, faculty attitudes.

**Faculty Attitudes toward Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education**

Faculty attitude toward disability and willingness to implement reasonable accommodations has been studied over the last 30 years (Baggett, 1994; Beilke & Yssel, 1999; Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005; Fonsoch & Schwab, 1981; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). Although many of these studies examined different aspects of faculty attitude and willingness or sought to describe the attitudes relative to a specific population, considering these studies collectively reveals that faculty attitudes are relatively homogenous and positive overall. Despite this, there remain some subtle differences that prevent a fully welcoming and accessible environment at many postsecondary institutions.

Despite overall positive attitudes towards students with disabilities, faculty generally exhibit less willingness to provide “major” accommodations that may be more time intensive or be perceived as potentially fundamentally altering the course or program (Matthews, Anderson, & Skolnick, 1987; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999). Vogel et al. (1999) found that most faculty reported spending less than 30 minutes per week arranging accommodations specifically for students with learning disabilities. Additionally, Vogel et al. found that underneath the overall willingness to provide accommodations, faculty were generally less willing to
provide those that required more time and were more complex although the authors note the potential connection between accommodations that are complex or time consuming and perceptions that complex accommodations may lower academic standards. Bourke, Strehorn, and Silver’s (2000) examination of faculty attitudes mirrored these results and further suggested it is unclear as to whether time or academic integrity was the primary cause of concern.

Several studies have attempted to identify specific accommodations that faculty may be more hesitant to provide. In their survey of faculty at a public university in the northeast, Matthew et al. (1987) found that faculty were less willing to provide extra credit assignments not available to others, leniency with spelling and grammar errors, or course substitutions. Based on participant comments and analysis of the data, Matthews et al. proposed that reluctance to provide more significant accommodations may be connected to faculty concerns about fairness and academic standards. Nelson, Dodd, and Smith (1990) concluded that faculty were generally willing to accommodate if they could be assured that accommodations did not lower academic expectations. This concern was identified again by Dodd, Rose, and Belcourt (1992) as a factor in willingness to implement specific accommodations.

A review of pertinent legislation and key legal cases led Scott (1997) to challenge faculty to examine academic standards at a fundamental level. While acknowledging that faculty must be engaged in conversations about academic standards and accommodations, she proposed faculty must consider the instructional components and competencies that are absolutely necessary in a particular course. This approach reduces
potential faculty bias in responding to accommodation requests while also maintaining academic standards. Further, maintaining focus on the underlying competencies and objectives of a course reduces the opportunity for students to perceive faculty as having a negative attitude due to unwillingness to alter how requirements are met or demonstrating skepticism regarding a disability that may not be readily apparent.

Bigaj, Shaw, and McGuire (1999) examined the willingness of faculty at a community technical college to provide accommodations for students with learning disabilities. Although confirming the same general willingness to accommodate students, faculty willingness to provide accommodations related to evaluation were less positive. In particular, faculty were less willing to provide significant accommodations such as extra credit not offered to others and adjusting performance expectations on assignments. However, many faculty indicated lack of willingness to allow additional time for completion of assignments, provide alternate formats of assignments, and allow alternate formats of exams including reading questions aloud. Comments submitted with the completed surveys indicated belief that these accommodations would lower the academic standards of the course.

Houck, Asselin, Troutman, and Arrington (1992) found attitudinal barriers through telephone surveys and interviews with faculty of a mid-sized public four-year institution to better understand the perceptions related to students with learning disabilities. After analysis of the survey responses and comments from faculty, Houck et al. raised the possibility that the label of “learning disability” may prejudice the expectations of faculty. In particular, some faculty may believe that students with
learning disabilities cannot succeed in college or, at least, may not be able to succeed in certain academic majors or careers.

Through qualitative interviews with faculty and students, Bento (1996) identified that faculty often did not communicate their ethical concerns, and if they did express these concerns, students often perceived faculty to be insensitive or unfair. In this study, ethical concerns were identified that included both the issue of compromising academic standards as well as the belief that some accommodations for students with disabilities were unfair to others in the class. In situations where communication did not occur, both faculty and students were often left feeling the other was inflexible and unfair.

Beilke and Yssel (1999) found similar themes through qualitative interviews of students with disabilities that consistently described experiences with faculty which included disbelief of the disability, unwillingness to communicate, being directed to consider other courses or programs of study, and suggesting that students did not, in fact, need accommodations for their course. The authors concluded that until these ethical issues could be resolved for faculty, the attitudinal barriers were likely to persist.

Although overall positive attitude toward students with disabilities and providing accommodations have been noted, the impact of residual attitudinal barriers on the experience of students with disabilities is important to explore. Farone, Hall, and Costello (1998) conducted a qualitative study using open forums attended by students with and without disabilities and faculty members and found several themes preventing full inclusion of students with disabilities. One theme that emerged from students with disabilities in particular was attitudinal barriers. Specifically, Farone et al. concluded that
students with disabilities were attuned to the fact that many others considered reasonable accommodations to be lowering academic standards. Further, this attitude was associated with feelings of intimidation and discrimination in students who experience the poor attitudes described above.

Factors Related to Faculty Attitude

Examination of many studies related to faculty attitude toward accommodating students with disabilities reveals several factors that have varying relationships with attitude (Baggett, 1994; Beilke & Yssel, 1999; Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005; Fonosch & Schwab, 1981; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). Of these factors, the majority are fixed demographic characteristics such as age, academic discipline, gender, academic rank, and employment status. Gender and academic discipline are the most researched and have consistently been connected to faculty attitude and willingness, with education faculty and female faculty generally having more favorable attitudes and greater willingness to accommodate (Benham, 1997; Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Leyser, Vogel, Weiland, & Brulle, 1998; Lewis, 1998; Lombardi & Murray, 2011; Murray, Wren, & Keys, 2008; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Rao & Gartin, 2003; Schoen et al., 1987; Skinner, 2007; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999). Fewer non-fixed variables have been found to be related to faculty attitude and willingness to accommodate, but include prior experience with disability, knowledge of disability law, and prior training (Leyser, Vogel, Weiland, & Brulle, 1998, Murray, Lombardi, Wren, &
Age. Research regarding the relationship between faculty age and attitude toward students with disabilities or willingness to provide academic accommodations has been inconsistent (Benham, 1997; Schoen, Uysal, & McDonald, 1987; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999). Schoen et al. (1987) conducted a survey of Clemson University faculty to determine their overall attitude toward students with disabilities and found no relationship between age and attitude. Their study utilized the Attitude Toward Treatment of Disabled Students scale in an adapted form and did not focus on a specific category of disability. The authors reported that the majority of participants in this study were males between the ages of 31-50, so, although there were no significant effects of age, one limitation of this study was a lack of response from faculty across the lifespan. Ten years later, Benham (1997) surveyed faculty across three mid-sized universities to understand the attitudes and knowledge of faculty. In this study, the Attitude Toward Disabled Person scale was utilized to measure general attitude toward people with disabilities and also did not focus on a specific category of disability. The age range of Benham’s respondents was different from Schoen et al., with the majority being aged 50-60 with an age distribution from 25-60 years, yet there were still no significant effects of age on attitude.

Vogel et al. (1999) developed their own survey, A Faculty Survey on Students with Disabilities, to assess the contact of faculty with students with disabilities, demographic information, and willingness to provide specific teaching and examination
accommodations. The instrument was modified from a prior study to focus on students with learning disabilities in particular and sought to determine the attitude toward students with learning disabilities through the willingness to implement accommodations. Vogel et al. found that age was a significant factor in willingness to provide three accommodations. Younger faculty demonstrated greater willingness to meet with students to clarify information and to provide a copy of lecture outlines while older faculty were more willing to provide an alternate format exam.

**Discipline.** Academic discipline as an effect of faculty attitude toward disability or willingness to accommodate has been well researched across time with relatively homogenous results (Benham, 1997; Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Lewis, 1998; Leyser, Vogel, Weiland, & Bruille, 1998; Lombardi & Murray, 2011; Murray, Wren & Keys, 2008; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Rao & Gartin, 2003; Schoen et al., 1987; Skinner, 2007; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999). Generally, research has supported differences in attitude and willingness to accommodate by discipline and shed some light on where the differences lie.

Schoen et al. (1987) first documented differences by discipline in the faculty at Clemson University. Although responses were received from nine different academic colleges, the majority were reported to be from the colleges of Engineering and Liberal Arts with no indication as to how representative the respondents were of the entire faculty. Schoen at al. examined the attitude of faculty toward students with disabilities in general using an adaptation of the Attitude Toward Treatment of Disabled Students scale. The authors found that faculty in Education, Liberal Arts, Architecture, and Forest and
Recreation Resources had the most positive attitudes while faculty in Engineering, Commerce and Industry, and Science had the least positive attitudes. While the reason for the differences by academic discipline were unclear, it is possible that they may be related, in part, to gender with more female faculty being represented in Education, Liberal Arts, Architecture, and Forest and Recreation Resources.

Nelson et al. (1990) utilized a survey that specifically inquired about faculty willingness to provide specific types of assistance or accommodations to students with learning disabilities. The tool was adapted from Matthews et al. (1987), including four sections and using only questions relevant to students with learning disabilities, and was distributed to faculty from three academic divisions: Arts and Sciences, Education, and Business. The authors reported similar response rates for Education and Arts and Sciences with the response rate from Business nearly 15 percentage points higher at 85%. Analysis of variance confirmed faculty in the College of Education had more positive attitudes overall than faculty in other academic divisions. Specifically regarding willingness to implement instructional accommodations, Education faculty were more willing than Arts and Sciences faculty, but no significant difference was found between Education and Business or Business and Arts and Sciences. In relation to willingness to provide accommodations for assignments, Nelson et al. (1990) found significant differences between Education and Business and Arts and Sciences. Education faculty expressed greater willingness to provide accommodations for assignments, though no differences were documented between Business and Arts and Sciences.
Kennedy (1996) utilized an adapted version of the Faculty Survey developed by Bigaj (1995) aimed to assess faculty willingness to use, and experience implementing, specific accommodations for students with learning disabilities. The 26-items related to accommodations fell into two separate factors: instructor-centered accommodations and evaluation accommodations. Through administration to faculty at East Carolina University, Kennedy (1996) identified differences in response patterns for both factors based on faculty discipline. Specifically, Kennedy found those in health-related disciplines were more willing to make instructor-centered accommodations than Physical Science and Mathematics faculty. Faculty in Physical Science and Mathematics were also less willing to make evaluation related accommodations as compared to Humanities, Fine Arts, Education, and Social Sciences.

Benham (1997) concluded there is a significant relationship between academic discipline and attitude toward students with disabilities as measured by the Attitude Toward Disabled Person Scale. This study included faculty from three separate midsized universities and included the academic colleges of Liberal Arts, Education and Psychology, Health and Science, and Technology. Although it is not known how representative the respondents are of all faculty included in the sample, Benham reported larger total numbers of responses from Liberal Arts and approximately equal numbers of responses from the other colleges. The focus of this study was not to understand these differences, but rather to utilize variables found to be related to attitude to explain variance through regression analysis that found the combined set of variables accounted for 54% of the variation in faculty attitude. One shortfall of Benham’s study is the lack of
reporting partial $r$ squared values for individual variables. In conjunction with a list of eight predictor variables, the lack of understanding the individual contribution in predictive value of each variable limits the overall contribution to understanding faculty attitude.

In a 1998 study, Leyser, Vogel, Bruille, and Wyland sought to understand faculty experience, knowledge, and attitude toward accommodating students with disabilities through an instrument adapted from an earlier study they conducted. The instrument was rather extensive and included a section that addressed personal experience with people with disabilities, willingness to accommodate, and knowledge of disability, disability law, and support services. The authors found Education faculty had significantly more experience in teaching students with disabilities and familiarity with the ADA and Section 504. However, there was no significant difference in willingness to accommodate, suggesting this increased knowledge and experience did not equate to more positive attitudes toward students with disabilities.

Lewis (1998) found that both faulty attitude toward students with disabilities and attitude toward accommodating students with disabilities varied by academic discipline. Utilizing the Attitude Towards Disabled Persons scale as well as the Faculty Willingness to Accommodate measure developed by Nelson et al. (1990), Lewis found faculty in Education to have the most favorable attitudes. Although attitudes were positive overall, faculty in Computer Science and Engineering had lower scores on measures of attitude towards students with disabilities as well as willingness to accommodate when compared to faculty in Arts and Sciences, Education, and Health Sciences.
Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, and Brulle (1999) modified the Faculty Input Questionnaire initially developed by Leyser (1989) to examine faculty experience with disability and willingness to accommodate. The instrument was comprised of a total of 35 items that were divided into five sections and reviewed by experts in the field to address content validity. While no overall differences in scores by academic discipline were examined, the significantly higher level of experience reported by College of Education faculty prompted further analysis. When compared with all other faculty on each proposed accommodation, Education faculty were significantly more willing than all other faculty to provide three accommodations in particular: exams in an alternate format, comments on drafts of papers, and assignments in an alternate format. The authors did not report how many disciplines were represented in their responses or analyze for differences between disciplines.

Bourke, Strehorn, and Silver (2000) examined faculty experience and perceptions of implementing accommodations for students with learning disabilities. Utilizing an instrument developed specifically to assess the faculty members’ ability to provide accommodations, their perception of support, and understanding of why accommodations were necessary, Bourke et al. surveyed faculty of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. One difference was revealed, faculty in College of Humanities and Fine Arts expressed greater willingness and ease in administering an alternate means of examination compared to faculty in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

Rao and Gartin (2003) conducted a study at a four-year university in the south-central region to better understand the attitudes of faculty toward providing
accommodations and assistance and to gain an understanding of how demographic factors interact with attitude. Rao and Gartin utilized the Willingness to Provide Accommodations scale used in earlier studies from the late 1980’s to the late 1990’s (Lewis, 1998; Matthews et al., 1987; Nelson et al., 1990). Initial analysis found significant differences in willingness to accommodate students with disabilities by academic discipline. Post hoc examination revealed College of Education faculty demonstrated significantly higher willingness, whereas College of Engineering and College of Law faculty demonstrated significantly lower levels of willingness compared to other colleges. Skinner (2007) confirmed the significantly higher level of willingness in College of Education faculty at a midsized institution in the southeastern region. Using an instrument developed specifically for the study, Skinner assessed faculty willingness to provide specific accommodations associated with students with learning disabilities. While most faculty other than Education still expressed willingness to accommodate, the College of Business faculty scores fell in the “neutral” category.

Murray, Wren, and Keys (2008) conducted research at a large, private university in the Midwest region to broaden the understanding of faculty perceptions regarding students with learning disabilities. The study used an internally developed survey that aimed to assess faculty knowledge of learning disabilities, pertinent disability legislation, teaching accommodations, exam accommodations, support, and personal practices. When comparing responses from each section across academic units, the authors found several differences between groups. Overall, Education faculty showed greater willingness to provide accommodations as well as higher levels of personal action and knowledge when
compared to many of the seven other units. Faculty willingness to provide exam accommodations and teaching accommodations were two areas in which Computer Science and Telecommunications showed greater levels of willingness than some other units. Liberal Arts and Sciences reported greater feelings of resource constraint, lower levels of personal action and less willingness to provide both exam and teaching accommodations. Most recently, Lombardi and Murray (2011) conducted a study at a midsized university in the Pacific Northwest region and reconfirmed variation in faculty attitudes by discipline. Education faculty reported increased knowledge of disability, more experience with students with disabilities, and a greater willingness to accommodate and adopt accessible instructional practices. This study also noted unique differences in that Business faculty were more aware of disability-related campus resources than most other faculty and Architecture faculty were more willing than most to remove architectural barriers.

**Gender.** Research has yielded mixed results over time regarding gender effects on attitude and willingness to accommodate students with disabilities. In their survey of Clemson University faculty, Schoen et al.’s (1987) study resulted in women having slightly higher mean scores on the Attitude Toward Treatment of Disabled Students scale, indicating a more positive attitude. This difference was not found to be statistically significant; however, it is important to note the authors reported a majority of their sample as being male. Although statistical significance was not found, there may have been insufficient sample size of female participants to detect small differences. Many years later, Rao and Gartin (2003) also found a lack of influence of gender on willingness
to provide accommodations. Rao and Gartin utilized the Willingness to Provide Accommodations Scale to assess differences in faculty attitudes at a four-year university in the south central region. While the overall number of responses received was similar to Schoen et al.’s study, Rao and Gartin did not report the percentage of male and female participants.

Several studies have noted differences based on gender in which women have had more positive attitudes and/or greater willingness to accommodate students. Through an examination of faculty willingness to implement accommodations, Kennedy (1996) utilized a multiple regression to understand the significance of gender and several other factors on attitude. Kennedy found female faculty more willing to provide instructor-centered accommodations while there was no effect of gender on willingness to use evaluation-related accommodations. In a study of faculty across multiple institutions, Benham (1997) found significant effects of gender on faculty attitude as measured by the Attitude Toward Disabled Person scale. Specifically, Benham found female faculty have more favorable attitudes than male faculty. In this study, the percentage of male and female respondents were similar although the overall number of responses was lower than previous studies. Similarly, Vogel et al. (1999) detected one difference by gender using their internally developed measure of faculty experience and willingness to accommodate students with learning disabilities in particular. While no overall differences were found, female faculty were more willing to provide recorded (audio) formats of exams.
In a survey of faculty at a large, private university in the Midwest region, Murray et al. (2008) examined perceptions of faculty regarding students with learning disabilities and found some influence of gender. The study used an internally developed survey that assessed faculty knowledge of learning disabilities and pertinent disability legislation, teaching accommodations, exam accommodations, support, and personal practices. Although both men and women showed relatively positive attitudes, female faculty showed significantly more positive attitudes, higher performance expectations for students, more personal investment in student success, and greater perception of fairness to provide accommodations. Most recently, in the course of developing a new survey instrument to measure faculty knowledge, perceptions, and practices related to students with disabilities, Lombardi and Murray (2011) found significant differences by gender on some subscales. In particular, the authors found that female faculty were generally fairer in providing accommodations and made stronger attempts to minimize instructional barriers.

Leyser et al. (1998) were the only researchers to find more favorable attitudes of male faculty. Utilizing A Faculty Survey of Students with Disabilities in a format adapted from previous studies, Leyser et al. assessed the intent and action of faculty related to accommodations for students with disabilities in general. Although female faculty reported having a greater understanding of relevant legislation and received more training than male counterparts, the analysis of attitude scales revealed that male faculty had a stronger overall willingness to provide accommodations compared to female faculty. The
authors posited this difference in attitude could be related to male faculty’s greater amount of teaching experience with students with particular types of disabilities.

**Knowledge of legislation.** Although many studies have examined faculty knowledge of disability and pertinent legislation or faculty attitudes toward disability and accommodations, only one study was located that examined the relationship between knowledge and attitude. Rao and Gartin (2003) utilized the Willingness to Provide Accommodations scale used in earlier studies from the late 1980’s to the late 1990’s (Lewis, 1998; Matthews et al., 1987; Nelson et al., 1990) to understand faculty willingness to accommodate students. This scale relied on faculty self-reported knowledge of disability and legislation. The authors looked specifically at the scaled score for Willingness to Provide Accommodations and analyzed it individually in regards to familiarity with the term “reasonable accommodation,” familiarity with the ADA, and familiarity with Section 504. Faculty familiar with Section 504 were more willing to provide accommodations in general than faculty with less familiarity.

**Prior disability related training.** In 1996, Kennedy examined the effects of several factors, including disability-related training, on faculty willingness to use accommodations for students with learning disabilities. Kennedy found faculty who received more training tended to express greater willingness to provide instructor-centered accommodations. Regardless of training, there was no effect on faculty willingness to use evaluation-related accommodations.

Murray, Lombardi, Wren, and Keys (2009) found that faculty with increased reports of previous training regarding disability had a more positive attitude toward
students with disabilities and implementing accommodations. In a study of full time faculty at a large, urban, private university, the authors utilized an instrument developed by Murray in a previous study to assess faculty attitude and knowledge toward students with learning disabilities as described by ten factors: Willingness to Provide Exam Accommodations, Fairness and Sensitivity, General Knowledge, Resource Constraints, Inviting Disclosure, Insufficient Knowledge, Providing Accommodations, Willingness to Personally Invest, Disclosure and Believability, and Willingness to Make Teaching Accommodations. After controlling for gender, employment status, and rank, statistically significant differences were found on all factors except Willingness to Make Teaching Accommodations and Inviting Disclosure. Murray et al. concluded that prior disability-related training was related to generally more positive attitudes on eight of the factors.

Lombardi and Murray (2011) found that faculty who reported receiving prior training also reported greater knowledge of disability and increased willingness to accommodate students. Although the primary purpose of their study was the evaluation of a comprehensive instrument with which faculty attitudes, perceptions, and knowledge could be assessed, group comparisons were made according to several demographic variables shown to be related to attitude in prior research. The authors concluded that faculty who had participated in training were likely to be more invested in assisting students and minimizing instructional barriers, more knowledgeable and responsive to their responsibility to provide accommodations, and expressed greater knowledge of resources on campus as well as greater expectations of students with disabilities.
**Prior experience with disability.** Several studies have examined the relationship of prior experience or contact with people with disabilities with faculty attitude towards students with disabilities and willingness to accommodate. Prior experience has been described in two different ways: faculty personal contact with people with disabilities and faculty prior contact teaching students with disabilities. Schoen, Uysal, and McDonald (1987) examined both of these aspects in their survey of the Clemson University faculty to determine the overall attitude of faculty toward students with disabilities utilizing an adapted form of the Attitude Toward Treatment of Disabled Students (ATTDS) scale. Shoen et al. found no significant differences in faculty attitude based on levels of prior contact with people with disabilities. Although personal experience was not found to be related to attitude, faculty who had prior experience teaching students with disabilities were found to have generally more positive attitudes. The authors did not examine differences in amount of prior experience.

Rao and Gartin (2003) found similar results using the Willingness to Provide Accommodations scale in a survey of faculty at a public university in the south central region. No relationship was identified between faculty score on the scale and whether or not faculty had personal contact with people with disabilities. There was a significant difference between the scores of faculty who reported experience teaching students with disabilities and those who did not. However, in this study faculty who reported experience teaching students with disabilities were actually less willing to provide accommodations in general.
In contrast to Schoen et al. (1987), Leyser, Vogel, Weiland, and Bruille (1998) found more positive attitudes were associated with increased reports of personal contact with people with disabilities. Specifically, faculty with higher levels of personal contact had increased communication with disability service providers and invested more time in accommodating students with disabilities. Faculty with higher levels of personal contact with people with disabilities also reported a greater amount of experience teaching students with disabilities and knowledge of campus resources as well as increased reports of familiarity with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act. It is unclear if the results of personal contact are different from other studies or connected to correlations with other factors. The relationship between prior contact or experience teaching students with disabilities and attitude was not specifically examined. In a separate related study, Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, and Brulle (1999) explored the relationship of faculty experience teaching students with disabilities with their attitude toward and willingness to accommodate students with learning disabilities. Generally, faculty with experience reported greater awareness of campus resources and familiarity with disability-related legislation. Faculty also reported a greater level of skill and knowledge in teaching students with learning disabilities. Despite the greater awareness, prior experience teaching students with learning disabilities did not result in greater willingness to provide teaching accommodations; however, prior experience was related to increased willingness to provide additional time on exams.

**Academic rank.** Over the decades of research regarding faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities in higher education, the relationship of rank to attitude has been
examined with variable outcomes. Benham (1997) first investigated the relationship between rank and faculty attitude toward students with disabilities as measured by the Attitude Toward Disabled Person Scale (ATDP). This study utilized the categories of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor. No significant differences were found in the scores of the ATDP by rank. Leyser et al. (1998) found a similar lack of relationship between rank and attitude after administering A Faculty Survey of Students with Disabilities to a sample of faculty at a public university in the Midwest. The same four categories of rank were used and failed to identify a relationship between attitude or willingness to accommodate and faculty rank. Differences were noted in terms of higher ranking faculty having more experience teaching students with disabilities and less familiarity with recent legislation such as the ADA. On the other hand, instructors demonstrated greater interest in receiving training and reported more time spent each week providing accommodations. Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, and Brulle’s (1999) further unveiled aspects of the faculty rank relationship with attitude. Specifically, instructors and assistant professors were more willing to provide students with a copy of their lecture outlines or class notes and would be more willing to paraphrase test questions upon request.

Several years later, Skinner (2007) investigated faculty willingness to accommodate students specifically with learning disabilities. Almost no variation in willingness to accommodate students with learning disabilities was found by the rank of faculty. However, Murray, Wren, and Keys (2008) concluded that faculty rank did impact faculty attitude toward students with learning disabilities. The researchers developed a
survey instrument measuring 12 factors regarding faculty attitude toward students with disabilities and accommodations and professional practices related to accommodations. Analysis found that instructors were willing to provide major accommodations (i.e. offering extra credit or altering course requirements) while both instructors and assistant professors were more likely to provide teaching accommodations. The study used the categories of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and full professor.

**Status.** The status of faculty has been an area of inquiry in which much less investigation has been done. The first study to really examine faculty status in relation to students with disabilities (Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000) specifically investigated faculty provision of accommodations for students with learning disabilities and found some differences between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. Non-tenure-track faculty reported greater ease of accommodating students as well as a greater sense of having adequate resources to implement requested accommodations. Additionally, non-tenure track faculty expressed greater belief regarding the need for, and efficacy of, accommodations as well as higher levels of understanding the need for accommodations. Upon examining part-time versus full-time faculty, part-time also expressed greater belief in the effectiveness of accommodations and greater understanding of the need to accommodate; however, it is unclear if the part-time faculty and lower ranks (i.e., instructor) are distinct categories or if instructors are disproportionally represented in the part-time category. The authors speculated that perhaps the variances in attitude emerged from the difference in the relationship faculty with different statuses have with the institution that may result in different expectations about fulfilling their responsibilities.
More than ten years later, Lombardi and Murray (2011) examined faculty attitudes toward disability as well as faculty willingness to accommodate students with disabilities in the development of the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners scale. In general, they found tenure-track faculty to be less flexible and less interested in minimizing barriers to instruction as well as overall less positive attitudes and willingness to accommodate than non-tenure-track faculty.

**Measurement of Faculty Attitudes toward Students with Disabilities**

Over the decades of research regarding faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities and willingness to provide accommodations, several different measures have been utilized (Lombardi & Murray, 2011). Some measures have been general attitude scales, while others have been developed specifically to address the role of faculty. Additionally, several researchers have modified and adapted earlier versions of surveys administered to faculty. This section provides a general overview of measures used in prior studies.

Many researchers have chosen to develop their own instrument specific to their research questions and the institution at which the survey was to be administered (Bigaj, Shaw, & McGuire, 1999; Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Houck, Asselin, Troutman, & Arington, 1992; Murray, Wren, & Keys, 2008; Skinner, 2007). One limitation of evaluating many of these measures is a lack of reported information regarding the psychometric properties. Many authors report utilizing a review of literature and consultation with experienced professionals in the development of their tools but do not disclose the reliability or validity in detail. Customized instruments used by Bigaj et al.
(1999), Bourke et al. (2000), Houck et al. (1992), Murray et al. (2008), and Skinner (2002) have been tailored to measure elements associated with learning disabilities. These measures have attempted to address attitudes toward, or willingness to provide, particular accommodations as well as faculty knowledge of disability and/or disability legislation and perceived resources to support the implementation of accommodations.

The Faculty Survey measure developed by Bigaj et al. (1999) in their study of attitudes toward students with learning disabilities did report psychometric properties. Review of the literature assisted Bigaj et al. in the development of a 41-item, Likert scale survey piloted with 127 faculty across four different community colleges. Resultant data was subjected to item analysis after which 15 questions were eliminated. Subsequently, Bigaj et al. performed factor analysis to determine the congruence of the intended factors with statistically derived factors. Two factors clearly emerged and three items were deleted due to lack of consistency with other items and weak factor loadings. Resultant factors addressed faculty willingness to use specific accommodations and were titled Instructor-Centered Use Scale and Evaluation Use Scale. The reported Cronbach’s alpha for the scales were .87 and .81 respectively.

The Faculty Input Questionnaire was designed specifically to understand faculty knowledge and attitude toward students with disabilities and has been revised, and adapted, and used for several studies. Leyser (1989) developed the original instrument. Beginning with a review of literature to develop themes on the integration of students with disabilities in higher education, Leyser also adapted some items from earlier surveys created by Grosenick and Reynolds and Sharp (as cited in Leyser, 1989, p. 100). The
original survey titled Faculty Input Questionnaire consisted of 30 items that were a
variety of Likert-type, dichotomous, and open-ended questions. Leyser reported the
survey covered demographic information, faculty familiarity with disability legislation,
attitude, integration practices, experiences with people with disabilities, participation in
training, and familiarity with and use of support services. Leyser noted his 1989 survey
instrument may have presented some limitations due to its brevity; however, no reliability
measures or validity checks were reported.

Leyser’s Faculty Input Questionnaire (1989) appears after 1989 in other studies as
Enhancing Success for Students with Disabilities in Higher Education – A Faculty
Survey on Students with Disabilities with some adaptations and data supporting its
validity and reliability (Leyser, Vogel, Wyland, & Brulle, 1998; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland,
& Brulle, 1999). As used in these studies, the instrument was described as being modified
and expanded from the Faculty Input Questionnaire. The authors describe the instrument
as containing 35 major items with some questions having several sub-sections. The items
included both multiple choice and 4-point Likert scale questions as well as some open-
ended questions. Leyser et al. (1998) reported that the feedback of several experts and
faculty members both from within their institution and external institutions was used to
assure content validity. Further, Vogel et al. described the instrument as comprising three
parts: background and demographic information, experiences with people with
disabilities and relevant knowledge, and willingness to provide specific accommodations.
The willingness to provide specific accommodations section contained two somewhat
distinct scales: Teaching Accommodations and Examination Accommodations. Vogel et
al. reported Chronbach alpha values of .75 and .8 respectively for these two scales while the overall Chronbach alpha for the instrument was .86. This instrument was also used without adaptation by Vasek (2005) to assess the knowledge base of faculty; however, no reliability measures were reported from the study.

The first incarnation of the Willingness to Provide Accommodations scale was piloted by Goodin (1984) with a group of his colleagues in disability services in higher education. Goodin developed a list of what he considered to be 25 academic adjustments pertinent to students with learning disabilities and asked faculty to respond with one of three options: if they would advocate for the adjustment, if they would not personally advocate for the adjustment, did they find the adjustment as not detrimental, or if they believed the adjustment was a hindrance to the student’s development and threatened the integrity of the institution.

Goodin’s (1984) scale was later adapted by Matthews et al. (1987) to specifically address faculty attitude toward students with learning disabilities. The final instrument was titled Accommodations for Students with Learning Disabilities and included 23 items. Although the original instrument utilized the dichotomous responses of “would” or “would not” provide the stated accommodation, Matthews et al. elected to add an option of “don’t know” to address instances in which faculty felt more information would be required to make a decision. Since the study was part of program evaluation and planning at one institution, the authors did not explore the validity and reliability of the instrument.
The Accommodations for Students with Learning Disabilities survey was adapted slightly by Nelson, Dodd, and Smith (1990). Nelson et al. removed five items they did not believe constituted instructional accommodations that would be provided by faculty and also returned the survey to its original dichotomous “would/would not” provide the accommodation with space for comments. Reliability or validity was, again, not reported for this survey as was the case several years later when used by Rao and Gartin (2003). In separate studies, Nelson and Lignugaris-Kraft’s (1989) review of 14 postsecondary programs that served students with learning disabilities that identified many accommodations and services offered by support programs and/or faculty was used as the basis for a faculty survey. Dodd, Hermanson, Nelson, and Fischer (1990) developed the initial instrument that was piloted in a study of faculty willingness to accommodate students with learning disabilities at a tribal college. The Willingness to Provide Accommodations Scale was intended to assess willingness to provide 14 instructional adaptations, and gather impressions about whether or not 11 institutional supports should be offered to students with learning disabilities. While validity data was presented in their study, reliability was reported as a Chronbach’s alpha of .80. Dodd, Rose, and Belcourt (1992) later reported a Chronbach’s alpha of .93 for a version of this survey modified to include accommodations and services for a variety of disability types.

Beyond the instruments developed for use in specific research studies, there are few scales with well-documented psychometric properties that have been used to understand faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities or disability-related accommodations. One measure is the Attitude Toward Disabled People (ATDP)
introduced by Yuker, Block, and Young (1970). The ATDP measures attitude toward people with disabilities broadly, rather than examining attitudes associated with specific subgroups of disability. Yuker et al. began with an expansive review of the literature to develop a pool of statements related to disability that were subsequently reviewed by a number of psychologists to verify face validity. As a result of the review, several items were revised and others removed. All items were presented as statements with some having positive wording and others negative wording to which participants were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement. Yuker et al. extensively analyzed the items to assure they sufficiently discriminated among positive and negative attitudes in order to be retained. Additionally, the authors reported sufficient reliability as determined through test-retest, split-half, and immediate parallel form analysis. Although the ATDP has sound psychometric properties, the constructs that underlie the attitudinal statements may no longer be valid. More recent studies have criticized the ATDP and noted limitations presented in administering the survey, specifically participants noted their discomfort with and/or objection to certain statements they perceived to be extremely negative and used outdated language (Benham, 1997; Lewis, 1998).

The Attitude Toward Treatment of Disabled Students (ATTDS) was introduced by Fonosch and Schwab (1981) as a means to assess faculty attitude toward students with disabilities in general. Fonosch and Schwab paired their measure closely with Section 504 regulations, in particular Subsection E that pertains specifically to access in postsecondary education. Based upon the regulations, the authors developed 32 statements that described scenarios that could occur in the classroom. Each item used a 5-
point Likert scale to capture the faculty level of agreement with each scenario. The items were reviewed by experts in Section 504 regulations to establish content validity. Additionally, the correlation of the ATTDS with the ATDP was found to have a statistically significant Pearson correlation coefficient of .342, thereby supporting the validity of the ATTDS through concurrent methods. Fonosch and Schwab reported reliability as a Chronbach alpha value of .88. Several years later, the ATTDS was used by Schoen, Uysal, and McDonald (1987) and again by Bento (1996) with no reported reliability measures.

Murray et al. (2008) described a process of survey development based on five themes pulled from the literature that resulted in a total of 12 distinct factors after exploratory factor analysis was performed. Prior to factor analysis, there were 41 Likert scale questions of which 38 loaded onto 12 factors with the remaining three being removed from the survey: Major Accommodations, Willingness to Provide Exam Accommodations, Fairness and Sensitivity, Knowledge of Learning Disabilities; Willingness to Personally Invest, Willingness to Make Teaching Accommodations, Resource Constraints, Performance Expectations, Disclosure & Believability, Disclosure & Believability, Personal Action: Inviting Disclosure, Personal Action: Insufficient Knowledge, and Personal Action: Providing Accommodations (Murray et al., 2008). Each factor had between 2-5 questions with Chronbach alpha values ranging between .65-.89. Further, the authors reported low to moderate correlations among the factors that were in line with anticipated relationships of the survey constructs.
Most recently, the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners (ExCEL) measurement was introduced by Lombardi and Murray (2011) to address the lack of instruments with demonstrated validity and reliability to assess faculty attitudes regarding students with disabilities as a whole rather than a subset of students with particular disabilities. The instrument developed by Murray, Wren, and Keys (2008) served as a primary source for the initial pool of questions that were later reviewed by select faculty and the director of services for students with disabilities. Included in this review were new questions related to Universal Design for Learning introduced by the authors to capture attitudes and practice related to the delivery of course content. The final ExCEL instrument is comprised of three sections: demographic and background information, prior training related to disability, and faculty perceptions. The third section measuring faculty perceptions consists of 39 items that utilize a 6-point Likert scale. Lombardi and Murray (2011) applied Exploratory Factor Analysis to the 39-item measure and concluded that eight distinct factors exist: “fairness in providing accommodations, knowledge of disability law, adjustment of course assignments and requirements, minimizing barriers, campus resources, willingness to invest time, accessibility of course materials, and performance expectations” (p.47). Lombardi and Murray reported Chronbach alpha values ranging from .65 to .85 with an overall Chronbach alpha of .88 for the instrument.

Conclusion

This chapter presented a review of literature pertinent to the research questions beginning with establishing people with disabilities as a group which has historically
been excluded from full participation in many facets of society (Castenada & Peters, 2000; Lowen & Pollard, 2010). One of the most significant and difficult to overcome barriers may be negative attitudes and faulty perceptions of disability (Reiser, 2006; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). Developing positive attitudes and fostering a commitment to personal action is an important aspect in achieving equity of opportunity and inclusion (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olsen, 2012).

Professionals who provide services for students with disabilities in postsecondary education come from various backgrounds to the profession. However a significant portion, approximately one third identify a counseling background (Kasnitz, 2011). Although the disability service profession is a specialized field, counselors have an obligation to both the professional standards of disability services and counseling. As the role of the counselor has extended to include advocacy not only for individual clients, but for social change (Goodman et al., 2004; Smith et al., 2009) it is paramount that disability service professionals seek to identify opportunities to affect the environment as well as the individual student. One such opportunity in higher education is to assist faculty in developing positive attitudes that contribute to the success of students with disabilities (Skinner, 2007).

While several studies have noted the need to provide professional development targeted at fostering an attitude of inclusiveness toward students with disabilities (Bento, 1996; Liaisidou, 2014; Rutherford, 2011; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009), less has been presented about how to accomplish this culture shift. Much of the literature over the past 30 years has indicated most faculty have a generally positive
attitude towards students with disabilities and willingness to implement accommodations, but when a positive attitude and willingness are limited, the impact to students’ progress and development can be significant (Baggett, 1994; Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). Some variation in willingness to provide certain types of accommodations may be connected to concerns regarding academic integrity or investment of time (Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Vogel et al., 1999). Faculty reluctance to provide certain accommodations may create a barrier for students through inconsistent application of accommodations or deterring students from seeking assistance from faculty.

In addition to connections between willingness and types of accommodations, the body of research has identified many factors related to attitude and willingness in different ways. Such factors include gender, age, experience with disability, academic discipline, academic rank, and employment status (Benham, 1997; Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Leyser, Vogel, Weiland, & Bruille, 1998; Lewis, 1998; Lombardi & Murray, 2011; Murray, Wren, & Keys, 2008; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Rao & Gartin, 2003; Schoen et al., 1987; Skinner, 2007; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999). While most of these variables are relatively fixed, additional malleable factors including prior experience with disability, knowledge of disability law, and prior professional development have also been documented (Leyser, Vogel, Weiland, & Bruille, 1998, Murray, Lombardi, Wren, & Keys, 2009, Rao & Gartin, 2003, Schoen, Uysal, & McDonald, 1987).
Chapter 3: Methodology

A thorough discussion of the background of a social justice view of disability and the context of faculty attitudes towards accommodating students with disabilities was presented in Chapter 2. While the framework provided a basis to understand the potential relationship among the variables, this chapter focuses on the methodological basis for the study. Specifically, the research questions will be presented in addition to discussion of the sampling plan, definition of participants, instrumentation, and the data analysis procedure.

The purpose of the current study was to investigate faculty attitudes related to disability in postsecondary education. The study specifically sought to understand to what extent social justice attitudes contribute to understanding faculty willingness to provide accommodations and attitude toward students with disabilities after controlling for several covariates. Prior research has established relationships between teaching experience, prior contact with students with disabilities, academic discipline, status, rank, and gender with attitude towards accommodating students with disabilities (Beilke & Yssel, 1999; Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). Although these factors have been identified as related to attitude and willingness to accommodate, they are relatively fixed and cannot be altered to change the attitude of individual faculty even if causality were established. This study sought to understand the relationship between social justice orientation and faculty attitude, knowledge, and willingness to accommodate when controlling for fixed demographic factors.
Research Design

The present study was exploratory and utilized a non-experimental, cross-sectional design to understand the predictive value of several variables in regards to faculty willingness to accommodate students with disabilities and faculty attitude toward students with disabilities. This study was designed to address the following research questions.

1. How much variation in faculty willingness to provide accommodations to college students with disabilities is explained by their social justice attitude as measured by the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012) after controlling for academic discipline, gender identity, years of experience, academic rank, knowledge of disability law, and prior experience with disability? Willingness to provide accommodations to college students was measured by the combined score of adjustment of course assignments and requirements and accessibility of course material factors of the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners instrument (Lombardi & Murray, 2011).

2. How much variation in faculty attitude toward college students with disabilities is explained by their social justice attitude as measured by the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012) after controlling for academic discipline, gender identity, years of experience, academic rank, knowledge of disability law, and prior experience with disability? Faculty attitude toward students with disabilities was measured by the fairness in providing accommodations, willingness to invest time, and performance expectations factors.
of the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners instrument (Lombardi & Murray, 2011).

3. Is there a relationship between faculty knowledge of disability law factor of the ExCEL (Lombardi & Murray, 2011) and social justice attitude as measured by the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012)?

**Outcome Variables**

The outcome variables in this study included:

*Faculty willingness to accommodate students with disabilities* as measured by the combined score of adjustment of course assignments and requirements and accessibility of course material factors of the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners instrument (Lombardi & Murray, 2011); and

*Faculty attitude toward students with disabilities* as measured by the fairness in providing accommodations, willingness to invest time, and performance expectations factors of the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners instrument (Lombardi & Murray, 2011).

**Predictor Variables**

The predictor variable in this study was social justice attitude as measured by the Social Justice Attitude Scale (SJS; Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012).

**Covariates**

The following served as covariates in the present study:

*Academic discipline* was self-reported by participants as the academic department in which their teaching appointment is located;
**Academic rank** was limited to the categories of adjunct faculty/instructor/lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor and will be self-reported;

**Faculty knowledge of disability law** is reported as the score on the faculty knowledge factor of the ExCEL (Lombardi & Murray, 2011);

**Gender identity** was limited to the categories of male, female, and transgender and participants will be asked to report the descriptions with which they most identify;

**Prior experience with students with disabilities** was reported by participants by selecting the category that best represents the approximate number of students with disabilities they have taught in a college or university setting; and

**Years of experience** is the participants’ self-report of the exact number of years they have taught in a college or university setting.

**Sampling Plan and Procedures**

Consistent association between academic discipline, faculty attitude, and willingness to accommodate have been substantiated in prior research (Benham, 1997; Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Leyser, Vogel, Weiland, & Bruille, 1998; Lewis, 1998; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Lombardi & Murray, 2011; Murray, Wren, & Keys, 2008; Schoen et al., 1987; Skinner, 2007); therefore, an initial stratified sample was selected to be proportional to the total faculty in each academic discipline. A sample representative of all disciplines was particularly important since prior research indicated significant overall differences between Education faculty and other disciplines and minor differences regarding Business, Engineering, and Arts and Sciences willingness to implement particular accommodations (Benham, 1997; Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Leyser,
Vogel, Weiland, & Bruille, 1998; Lewis, 1998; Lombardi & Murray, 2011; Murray, Wren, & Keys, 2008; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Rao & Gartin, 2003; Schoen et al., 1987; Skinner, 2007; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999). The primary investigator secured from the Office of Information Technology a list of faculty emails from each academic college. Initially, about 50% of the faculty in each academic college received the survey. Participants were electronically sent a description of the study as well as a link to participate in the survey via the Qualtrics online survey distribution and collection system. After approximately one week, a reminder email was sent to the initial participants via Qualtrics. One week after the reminder, an inadequate number of responses had been received so all remaining faculty from each college were invited to participate with a reminder sent after one week. One week after the final reminder was sent, the survey was closed.

**Sample Size**

Due to the exploratory nature of the study, a small to medium effect size (0.15), power requirement of .80, and alpha level of .05 were used to calculate the necessary sample size using G*Power 3.1.3 statistical software (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). In order to detect statistical significance, a sample size of N = 107 was required. Although Benham (1997) utilized regression analysis using many of the demographic variables in this study and reported an R value of .54, it was unknown if there might be larger effects from other variables explored in this study, therefore a medium effect size was used for sample size calculation.
Participants

Participants for this study were faculty members at a mid-sized university in the Midwest. The university is a high active research university under the Carnegie classifications and maintains a residential campus with about 45% of students residing on campus. A total of 29,217 students were enrolled Fall semester 2014 of which 25,571 were undergraduate students. Admission is selective with degree programs ranging from associate degree to doctoral programs. The office serving students with disabilities reported a total of 1046 students with disabilities during the Fall 2014 semester of which approximately 1012 were undergraduate. The categories of disabilities reported were diverse and include specific learning disabilities, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, chronic medical conditions, psychological conditions, low vision or blindness, Deaf and hard of hearing, mobility impairments, traumatic brain injury, autism spectrum disorder, and multiple disabilities. The university reported 1301 total faculty with 933 full-time and 368 part-time with a student to faculty ratio of 18:1 and average class size of 31.

Participants were tenured, pre-tenured, non-tenure track, full-time, part-time, or adjunct. As faculty, the participants had teaching as a primary function of their job. Faculty members who, at the time of the study, were not employed at least half-time were not included in the study. Prior research regarding the attitude of faculty towards accommodating students with disabilities found mixed results regarding the relationship between position type, status, and rank with faculty attitudes and have used inconsistent definitions of faculty position, status, and rank (Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Lombardi & Murray, 2011).
**Instrumentation**

Once permission was received to use the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners (see Appendix A) and the Social Justice Attitude Scale (see Appendix B), the instruments were adapted and combined with a brief set of demographic questions into one survey to be delivered online via Qualtrics online survey software. The total survey included 55 items that utilized a Likert scale response combined with 16 demographic questions. Although a pilot study was not conducted, several individuals who would not be in the potential sample were asked to complete the survey and report the time necessary to complete in order to offer participants a reasonable expectation of the time required. The survey, in total, took approximately 15 minutes to complete.

**Social Justice Attitude Scale.** The Social Justice Scale (SJS) was developed by Torres-Harding, Siers, and Olson (2012) to measure social justice-related values based on Ajzen’s human behavior decision theory. The instrument is intended to assist in identifying an individual’s likelihood to engage in social action in a broad sense. Torres-Harding et al. allow for a range of ways that one might engage in social action from political activism to individual contributions through work or volunteer positions. Although the SJS was developed specifically to measure social justice orientation in community psychologists, there is applicability to the university faculty member who may also have opportunity to engage in social justice action in a variety of ways collectively and individually. As originally constructed and administered, the questions
within each subscale were randomized and the SJS was delivered in combination with a second measure and demographic questions.

Initially a team of graduate students and other researchers developed a pool of items based upon literature reviews that discussed the theory and implementation of social justice. Instrument development also attempted to assure that individual items fit into the domains of Ajzen’s model of decision-making. Next, Torres-Harding et al. (2012) assembled a panel of graduate students in psychology as well as community psychologists who provided feedback both on the clarity and meaning of the items as well as the face validity in relation to the values of social justice. After reviewing for validity, 44 items were finalized and a 7-point Likert scale (strongly disagree – strongly agree) was applied to the items. Items were associated on four subscales that are listed below with sample questions from each as published by Torres-Harding et al.

- “I believe it is important to help individuals and groups to pursue their chosen goals in life.” (p.84)
- “I believe it is important to allow others to have meaningful input into decisions affecting their lives.” (p.84)
- “I believe it is important to talk to others about societal systems of power, privilege, and oppression.” (p.84)
- “I am confident that I can have a positive impact on others’ lives.” (p.84)
- “I am certain that if I try, I can have a positive impact on my community.” (p.84)
- “Other people around me are supportive of efforts that promote social justice.” (p.85)
• “Other people around me are aware of issues of social injustices and power inequalities in our society.” (p.85)

• “In the future, I intend to engage in activities that will promote social justice.” (p.85)

• “In the future, I intend to work collaboratively with others so that they can define their own problems and build their own capacity to solve problems.” (p.85)

Upon initial development, the SJS was administered to undergraduate and graduate students in two separate stages with 115 participants in the first instance and 276 in the second. The second stage of data was specifically collected to assist in order to evaluate factor structure of the items relative to the subscales and provide additional data to assist with reliability and validity testing. In both instances, the SJS was administered with several existing measures to assist with construct validity of specific subscales. Demographic information was also collected to examine group differences.

Torres-Harding et al. (2012) used the initial sample of 115 students to evaluate reliability and factor structure. They reported an overall alpha of .93 for the full 44-item scale with alpha scores for the subscales within acceptable limits and moderate correlations among the subscales. Confirmatory factor analysis was utilized to determine that a four-factor model was more effective than a single factor model. Next, items were dropped based upon factor loading values below .50 or items that loaded onto factors that were not considered theoretically correct. Once confirmatory factor analysis was performed on the revised model the four-factor model continued to be a good fit. However several more items were dropped that were not significantly contributing to the
factors. Upon eliminating these items, the final 24 items resulted in a slightly better fit of the four-factor model without these items. The internal consistency of the revised, 24-item measure was reassessed and alpha scores for the subscales were reported as follows: attitudes, .95; subjective norms, .82; perceived behavioral control, .84; and intentions, .88. The scores of subscales of the SJS were analyzed in relation to several previously established scales using bivariate correlation values with positive results.

In the present study, the SJS performed similarly in regard to reliability. Alpha values ranged from .87 to .93 for individual subscales with an overall alpha of .931 for the instrument. Specific subscale reliabilities were: attitudes, .91; subjective norms, .93; perceived behavioral control, .87; and intentions, .89.

**Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners.** Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners (ExCEL) was developed by Lombardi and Murray (2011) to provide a psychometrically sound measure of the perceptions and attitudes of faculty regarding students with disabilities, accommodations, and Universal Design for Learning. The instrument is specific to the postsecondary educational environment and is an expansive measure with eight subscales that combine attitudes and perceptions about disability and accommodations in a broad sense and is not focused on a specific subpopulation of disability. ExCEL was adapted to use only six of the subscales: fairness in providing accommodations, knowledge of disability law, adjustment of course assignments and requirements, willingness to invest time, accessibility of course materials, and performance expectations. The two remaining subscales were not relevant to the research questions of the present study and were not used: minimizing barriers and
campus resources. This adaptation also reduced the number of items from 42 to 34 to minimize the overall length of the survey delivered to participants to offset the chance the survey would be abandoned before completion. Individual factors from ExCEL used in this study are listed below with sample questions from each as published by Lombardi and Murray (2011).

Fairness in providing accommodations

- “I am willing to allow students with documented disabilities to use technology (e.g., laptop, calculator, spell checker) to complete tests even when such technologies are not permitted for use by students without disabilities” (p.53)
- “Providing teaching accommodations to students with documented disabilities is unfair to students without disabilities” (p.53)

Knowledge of disability law

- “I am confident in my understanding of the legal definition of disability “ (p.53)
- “Currently, I do not have sufficient knowledge to make adequate accommodations for students with disabilities in my course(s)” (p.53)

Adjustment of course assignments and requirements

- “I am willing to change the method of responding on exams (e.g., from written to oral) for students with documented disabilities” (p.53)
- “I am willing to extend the due dates of assignments to accommodate the needs of students with documented disabilities when necessary” (p.53)

Willingness to invest time
• “I am willing to spend extra time (i.e., in addition to normal office hours) helping any student prepare for an exam or review course material” (p.54)

• “At times, I feel burdened when students with disabilities approach me with accommodation requests” (p.54)

Accessibility of course materials

• “I am willing to provide copies of my lecture notes or outlines to students with documented disabilities” (p.54)

• “I am willing to allow students with documented disabilities to record class sessions when necessary” (p.54)

Performance expectations

• “Students with disabilities are able to compete academically at the university level” (p.54)

• “I believe that students with learning disabilities can be successful at the university level” (p.54)

Initial items for the ExCEL were taken from a previous faculty survey developed by Murray, Wren, and Keys (2008). Murray et al. described a process by which five themes from relevant literature served as the basis for item development. After review by a panel of disability services professionals and faculty, items were removed and revised, followed by data collection to conduct an exploratory factor analysis. After removing additional items not strongly associated with any one factor, the authors reported Chronbach alpha values ranging between .65-.89 for the 12 factors. Anticipated low to moderate correlations among factors were reported to be in line with the theoretical
constructs. In addition to items from Murray et al.’s previous survey, new items were written to assess aspects related to Universal Design for Learning. The pool of items was then reviewed by several faculty members and the director of services for students with disabilities in order to further refine, eliminate, and identify new items. The ExCEL instrument is divided into three sections: demographic and background information, prior training related to disability, and faculty perceptions. The third section that measures faculty perceptions consists of 39 items that utilize a 6-point Likert scale.

In order to further understand the psychometric properties, the ExCEL was distributed to 1,084 faculty members that were at least half-time employees with primary responsibilities related to teaching regardless of rank or title. A total of 289 responses were received and analyzed to understand reliability and validity. Lombardi and Murray (2011) applied Exploratory Factor Analysis to the 39-item measure and concluded that eight distinct factors exist: “fairness in providing accommodations, knowledge of disability law, adjustment of course assignments and requirements, minimizing barriers, campus resources, willingness to invest time, accessibility of course materials, and performance expectations” (p.47). Lombardi and Murray reported low to moderate correlations between factors that confirmed that they are related but also retain unique value. Chronbach alpha values ranging from .65 to .85 support the reliability of each factor with an overall Chronbach alpha of .88 for the instrument.

In the present study, the ExCEL yielded somewhat smaller reliability values for all subscales utilized. Specific subscale reliabilities were: knowledge of disability law, .84; performance expectations, .79; willingness to invest time, .70; fairness in providing
accommodations, .80; adjustment of course assignments, .77; accessibility of course materials, .79. Overall reliability was not evaluated due to the modified use to the instrument, but reliability for the construct of faculty attitude was .80 with willingness to accommodate having an alpha of .81.

**Demographics.** The final section of the survey focused on demographic characteristics of the respondent. Information regarding professional characteristics such as years of experience, number of years at current institution, rank, academic discipline, experience with students with disabilities, and status were collected to assist in understanding the participant population. The personal characteristics of gender, disability, ethnicity, and age were also gathered as self-reported demographic questions.

**Data Collection**

Once permission was granted by the Institutional Review Board, faculty email addresses were obtained through the Office of Information Technology. The initial sample of 750 randomly selected emails included a proportional number of faculty from each academic college to assure representation from all academic areas. The survey was distributed by creating a distribution panel in Qualtrics online survey software and sent via the Qualtrics distribution function. The invitation notified faculty of the purpose of the study, the eligibility criteria, and the opportunity to enter to win one of four $50 Amazon Gift Cards upon completion and the survey link (see Appendix F). Reminders were sent one week after the initial invitation. Approximately two weeks after the first email to randomly selected faculty, an initial invitation was sent to the remaining 842 faculty emails due to low response. Reminders were again sent one week after the initial
distribution. All responses were collected via Qualtrics. A total of 1,592 faculty who were employed at least half-time in a teaching capacity in a large public university in the mid-west received an invitation to complete the survey. A total of 279 individuals accessed the survey with a total of 227 submitting responses, yielding a response rate of 14.2%.

Of those participants who did not complete the survey, many ceased responding just prior to or after the first few items of the Social Justice Scale. No trends were noted in particular groups of participants who failed to submit complete responses. It is unknown whether participants chose to cease the survey due to the nature of the questions regarding social justice or if the decision was due to overall survey length.

**Data Analysis**

Upon completion of data collection, data was screened for any missing or invalid values and assessed for linearity of the relationships of variables and normality of data distribution, as well as identifying any outliers. After screening, descriptive statistics were calculated for each.

Multiple regression with dummy coded variables was used to examine the first two research questions. Since the analysis utilized categorical variables, data was examined to assure that sufficient responses from each subgroup were received to support the multiple regression analysis. Next, both the linearity of the data and the homogeneity of variance between levels of the dependent were established in order to assure statistical assumptions were met. The regression analysis was utilized to control for the covariates by entering them collectively in the first step followed by social justice attitude to identify the unique predictive value of social justice orientation in relation to both faculty
attitude and willingness to provide accommodations. The analysis provided an adjusted $R^2$ value that is typically accepted as effect size for regression (Warner, 2008). The final research question, the relationship between Social Justice Orientation and disability knowledge as measured by ExCEL, was addressed through correlation.

**Conclusion**

This chapter described the exploratory, non-experimental, cross-sectional research design that was utilized to understand the predictive value of social justice attitude in regard to faculty attitude toward students with disabilities and faculty willingness to accommodate. A stratified sample was used to assure representation from multiple academic disciplines and was drawn from faculty at a mid-sized public university in the Mid-west which is a residential campus. The survey combined the SJS key sections from the ExCEL as well as pertinent demographic questions. Ultimately the research questions were addressed through forward regression analysis and correlation.
Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate faculty attitudes related to disability in postsecondary education. The study specifically sought to understand to what extent social justice attitudes contribute to understanding faculty willingness to provide accommodations and attitude toward students with disabilities after controlling for several covariates. Additionally, the study evaluated the extent to which social justice attitudes were correlated with faculty knowledge of disability law. This chapter presents the results of the data collection and analysis.

Data Screening

Initial evaluation of the data was completed using Microsoft Excel version 14.49 for Macs to determine the completeness and usability of data before preliminary analysis. Upon examination, 21 individuals did not begin the survey after initially accessing and 31 stopped before submitting their responses. An additional 49 respondents omitted responses to either one of the covariates or a question within the scaled variables, which left a total of 178 complete sets of data. Since the calculated number of responses to reach necessary statistical power was 107 and no trends in non-response were observed, responses with missing data were excluded from analysis. Only one participant indicated a gender identity of transgender so this response was removed from analysis due to insufficient numbers to represent transgender in analysis. Similarly, only one participant responded to having never taught a student with a disability so the categories of “None” and “1-5” were combined.
Participants were asked to report their academic department that was then used to assign them to an overall discipline area. The categories of discipline were: Fine Arts, Business, Engineering and Science, Education, Health Sciences, Humanities and Social Science, and Communication. Prior to data analysis, the following categorical variables were “dummy coded” in order to be used in regression analysis: academic discipline, rank, gender, and experience teaching students with disabilities. Additionally, individual questions within the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners (ExCEL) and SJS were calculated into appropriate single scores. Knowledge of disability law was calculated as a single factor from the ExCEL. Willingness to provide accommodations was a total of all questions within the adjustment of course assignments and requirements and the accessibility of course material factors of the ExCEL. Faculty attitude toward disability was calculated as the total of responses to the fairness in providing accommodations, willingness to invest time, and performance expectation factors of the ExCEL. Finally, the social justice attitude was calculated as a single number based on all four sections of the SJS. For all scaled variables, a higher score represents a more positive attitude or willingness.

**Assumption Testing**

Once scaled score calculation and dummy coding was complete, assumption testing was conducted using IBM SPSS 22 software for statistical analysis. Analysis included examination of data for outliers, assessing the normalcy and linearity of data, and heteroscedasticity as well as collecting descriptive statistics. Boxplots were used to evaluate any potential outliers, see Appendix G. Although seven unique cases were noted
as extreme scores on one or more scaled variable, only one was beyond +/-3 standard deviations from the mean. After inspection of each response set, it was determined that all were valid and would be initially retained for analysis.

After the review for outliers, a histogram of each scaled variable was inspected and distribution of responses appeared relatively normally distributed for willingness to accommodate. (See Appendix H). Attitude toward disability was somewhat leptokurtic with a slight ceiling effect and negative skew. The distribution of knowledge of disability law was relatively normal although there were indications of slight negative skew. Visual inspection of the social justice attitude indicated negative skew with a ceiling effect. Distribution of total years of teaching experience indicated a somewhat normal distribution with a slight positive skew due to a larger number of respondents with fewer years of experience. Slight indications of skew among some variables may limit the generalizability of results outside the sample population. Additionally P-P Plots of the regression standardized residuals were inspected and are included in Appendix I. The P-P Plot for faculty attitude and willingness to accommodate confirmed a reasonably normal distribution of the dependent variables.

Scatterplots of quantitative variables were reviewed to assess linearity of relationships. (See Appendix J). Visual inspection supported linear relationship between faculty attitudes and knowledge of law, social justice attitude and years teaching experience. Likewise, linearity was supported between willingness to accommodate and knowledge of law, social justice attitude, and years teaching experience. Although
relationships appeared generally linear, a wide spread of data was observed in all relationships.

Heteroscedasticity was evaluated using visual inspection of residual scatterplots, as seen in Appendix K. In the case of both faculty attitude and willingness to accommodate, the plots did not present any visual pattern and were generally concentrated around the zero point which supports the conclusion that the assumption of homoscedasticity was not violated.

Independence of the residual terms was assessed using the Durbin-Watson test of the regression model. A generally acceptable value for the Durbin-Watson ranges from 1.50-2.50 (Field, 2009). The results of the Durbin-Watson yielded a value of 1.79 with willingness to accommodate as the dependent variable and 1.75 with faculty attitude as the dependent variable. This supports the conclusion that the assumption of uncorrelated, independent residual terms was not violated.

The final assumption tested was multicolinearity using the variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance statistic calculated during the regression analysis. The largest VIF observed was 4.97 which is less than the generally accepted level of 10 (Myers, 2006). Likewise, the lowest observed tolerance of .20 was also above the minimal acceptable level of .1 indicating that multicolinearity should not be problematic in the statistical analysis (Field, 2005).

**Demographics Descriptive Statistics**

Participants in this study were faculty employed at least half-time in a teaching capacity at the time of the study. The age of participants ranged from 22 to 69 with a
mean age of 47.6 years. Faculty reported total teaching experience in higher education ranging from 1 to 45 years with a mean of 16.6 years. Length of time taught at the current institution ranged between 1 and 34 years with average time of 11.5 years. Only 1 (.6%) participant indicated no prior experience teaching students with disabilities while 29 (16.3%) had taught between 1 and 5, 22 (12.4%) had taught between 6 and 10, 27 (15.2%) had taught between 11 and 15, and 99 (55.6%) reporting teaching more than 15 students with disabilities.

A total of 90 participants reported having tenure (50.6%) with the remaining 88 being non-tenured (49.4%) although 101 (56.7%) indicated their position as tenure track and only 72 (40.4%) not tenure track with five missing responses. Participants were from all academic ranks with 30 full professors (16.9%), 65 associate professors (36.5%), 29 assistant professors (16.3%), 43 adjunct faculty or instructors (24.1%), and 11 identified as other status (6.2%). Participants represented seven academic disciplines Fine Arts, Business, Humanities and Social Science, Health Professions, Education, Engineering and Science, and Communication. The most responses, 49 (27.5%) were received from Humanities and Social Science with the second highest from Engineering and Science with a total of 40 (22.5%). The same numbers of responses were received from Health Sciences and Communication with 24 (13.5%) from each. Somewhat smaller numbers of participants were from Education (18, 10.1%), Business (14, 7.9%), and Fine Arts (9, 5.1%).

Select personal attributes of participants were included in the survey and indicated a total of 103 (57.9%) females, 74 (41.6%) males included in the data used for analysis.
A total of 21 (11.8%) individuals identified as a person with a disability while three (1.7%) declined to answer. Additionally, 74 (41.6%) responded affirmatively to having a family member with a disability. Among all participants 155 (87.1%) indicated an ethnic identity of White with seven (4.0%) identifying American Indian or Native Alaskan, eight (4.5%) Black or African American, three (1.7%) Hispanic or Latino, six (3.4%) other, and none identifying as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islands.

Participants were asked to report about their professional development relative to students with disabilities and multiple selections could be made. Over half of participants (54.5%) reported conducting independent readings or research with just less than half (48.9%) having participated in a presentation made by the office serving students with disabilities. Just over a quarter (25.4%) had attended a professional conference presentation while far fewer (10.7%) had participated in a webinar. A total of 19.1% reported having engaged in other professional development which included personal experience with their own disability or that of a family member, conferring with colleagues, professional experience working with individuals with disabilities outside education, and formal education or coursework. There were 29 (16.3%) participants who reported no professional development related to students with disabilities.

**Knowledge of Law**

Knowledge of disability law was measured as the total score of the knowledge of disability law factor of the ExCEL. The highest possible score was 30 with a minimum potential score of five with a total of five items that utilized a 6-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). One item required reverse coding to accurately
calculate scores. Participant scores ranged from 8 to 29 with a mean score of 20.35 (SD = 4.84).

**Attitude Toward Disability**

Attitude was measured as the total score of three factors of the ExCEL: performance expectations, willingness to invest time, and fairness in providing accommodations. Total scores could potentially range from 17 to 102 while actual scores ranged from 46-102 with a mean score of 88.82 (SD = 8.16). Performance expectations was comprised of four questions of which one required reverse coding. Fairness in providing accommodations was comprised of nine items with four requiring reverse coding. Willingness to invest time included four items of which two required reverse coding. All factors utilized a 6-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6).

**Willingness to Accommodate**

Willingness was calculated as the score of the adjustment of course assignments and accessibility of course materials factors of the ExCEL. Possible scores ranged from 13-78 while actual scores ranged from 17 to 72 with a mean of 49.29 (SD = 9.48). Adjustment of course assignments was comprised of seven items and accessibility of course materials included five items. Both utilized a 6-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6) with no items requiring reverse coding.

**Social Justice Attitude**

Social justice attitude was calculated as the total score of the Social Justice Scale which included four sections. All items used a 6-point scale ranging from strongly
disagree (1) to strongly agree (6) and none required reverse coding. The first section of the SJS asked participants to state their believed importance of 11 statements relative to promoting and supporting social justice. The second section included five items describing perceived behavioral control around social justice. The third section asked participants to rate their level of agreement with four statements about perceived social norms around social justice. The final section included three questions around future intent to ask for justice. It should be noted that due to researcher error a fourth question from this section was omitted from the final survey delivered to participants. After adjusting for this, possible scores for the SJS ranged from 23-138 with actual scores between 83 and 132. The mean score was 115.92 (SD = 11.39).

**Correlation Coefficients**

Correlation of all quantitative and ordinal variables was assessed to understand their relationships. Variables for which correlation was assessed included: social justice attitude, willingness to accommodate, attitude toward disability, knowledge of disability law, years of experience teaching, number of students with disabilities taught, and academic rank. As was anticipated, years of teaching experience and rank were significantly correlated, \( r = -0.531 \) \((p < .001)\). Since higher faculty ranks were represented by lower numbers, this suggests that as years of experience increase rank increases. Similarly, faculty in higher ranked positions reported teaching more students with disabilities, \( r = -0.164 \) \((p = .029)\). As the number of years teaching increased, the number of students with disabilities taught also increased, \( r = 0.311 \) \((p < .001)\). The number of years taught was also found to be correlated with willingness to accommodate, \( r = -0.166 \)
(\(p = .027\)), in that those reporting higher numbers of years teaching had less willingness to accommodate students with disabilities. Willingness to accommodate and social justice attitude were positively correlated, \(r = .316\) (\(p < .001\)), indicating that as willingness to accommodate increases a more positive social justice attitude was reported. The final statistically significant correlation was between faculty rank and knowledge, \(r = .183\) (\(p = .014\)), suggesting that faculty reporting lower academic ranks reported greater knowledge of disability law. A full table of all correlations may be found in Table 1.
Table 1

Correlation of All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Attitude</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Willingness</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Justice</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.316**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Years Taught</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.166*</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rank</td>
<td>.183*</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gender</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.154*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. # Students with</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Discipline</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates statistical significance at the .05 level
** indicates statistical significance at the .001 level
Primary Analysis

Three separate research questions were explored during this study. The results of the statistical analysis utilized to address each question is described in the following sections.

**Research question 1.** How much variation in faculty willingness to provide accommodations to college students with disabilities is explained by their social justice attitude as measured by the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012) after controlling for academic discipline, gender identity, years of experience, academic rank, knowledge of disability law, and prior experience with disability?

To address this question, regression analysis with dummy coded variables was conducted. Covariates were force entered in the first step and included: knowledge of disability law, years of experience teaching in higher education, six dummy coded variables representing academic discipline, three dummy coded variables representing experience teaching students with disabilities, one dummy coded variable representing gender, and four dummy coded variables representing academic discipline. In the second step, total social justice attitude was entered as the predictor variable with faculty willingness to accommodate as the dependent variable. The covariates alone did not account for a statistically significant amount of variance, but when social justice attitude was added, the analysis was statistically significant $F(1,160) = 21.83$, $p < .001$. All covariates and social justice attitude combined accounted for 22.2% of variance in faculty willingness to accommodate with social justice attitude accounting for 10.6% of the
variance as indicated by the $R^2$ and $R^2$ change values. A summary of the regression model can be found in Table 2.

**Table 2**

*Regression Analysis for Willingness to Accommodate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R^2$ change</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables$^a$</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS Score</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $R^2$</strong></td>
<td>.221*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Control variables included academic discipline, academic rank, knowledge of disability law, gender identity, years of experience, and prior experience with disability

*p<.001

**Research question 2.** How much variation in faculty attitude toward college students with disabilities is explained by their social justice attitude as measured by the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012) after controlling for academic discipline, gender identity, years of experience, academic rank, knowledge of disability law, and prior experience with disability?

To address this question, regression analysis with dummy coded variables was conducted. Covariates were force entered in the first step and included: knowledge of disability law, years of experience teaching in higher education, six dummy coded
variables representing academic discipline, three dummy coded variables representing experience teaching students with disabilities, one dummy coded variable representing gender, and four dummy coded variables representing academic discipline. In the second step, total social justice attitude was entered as the predictor variable and faculty attitude toward disability as the dependent variable. Neither the covariates alone or with social justice attitude accounted for a statistically significant amount of variance, $F(1,160) = 2.41, p = .122$. All covariates and social justice attitude combined accounted for 12.2% of variance in faculty attitude toward disability with social justice attitude accounting for only 1.3% of the total variance as indicated by the $R^2$ and $R^2$ change values. A summary of the regression model can be found in Table 3.

Table 3

Regression Analysis for Faculty Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$R^2$ change</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables$^a$</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJS Score</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Control variables included academic discipline, academic rank, knowledge of disability law, gender identity, years of experience, and prior experience with disability
**Supplemental Analysis**

In addition to the primary analyses, a series of analysis were conducted to understand differences in faculty attitude, willingness to accommodate, and knowledge of disability law. Independent samples t-tests were used to identify differences in scores for participants who had reported participation in professional development activities. No differences in faculty attitude toward students with disabilities were found.

Statistically significant differences were found in knowledge of disability law for those who reported participating in independent professional development activities (M = 20.99, SD = 4.50) and those who had not engaged in other activities (M = 19.56, SD = 5.31), t (176) = 1.986, p = .049. Additional differences in knowledge were found for those who had received training from the office serving students with disabilities (M = 19.51, SD = 4.71) and those who had not (M = 21.13, SD = 4.85), t (176) = -2.26, p = .025.

Statistically significant differences were also found in faculty willingness to provide accommodations for those who reported conducting independent research (M = 51.01, SD = 9.01) and those who had not (M = 47.12, SD = 9.63), t (176) = 2.84, p = .005. Differences were also found in those who reported attending a professional conference session (M = 52.96, SD = 9.53) and those who had not (M = 48.05, SD = 9.17), t (176) = 3.07, p = .002.

ANOVA were conducted to assess differences in willingness, attitude, and knowledge based on gender, rank, years teaching experience, experience teaching students with disabilities, and academic discipline. Only one statistically significant
difference was found in that differences in knowledge of disability law were found for faculty rank, F (4, 173) = 2.62, p = .037. A post hoc Tukey test identified that differences existed specifically between full professor and other, p = .046, and assistant professor and other, p = .050.

ANOVA were also performed to understand differences in social justice attitudes based on the covariates. Statistically significant results overall were found academic discipline, F (6, 171) = 3.18, p = .006. Post hoc Tukey analysis revealed specific differences between Engineering and Sciences and both Communications, p = .008, and Humanities and Social Sciences, p = .032.

**Conclusion**

This chapter presented the data treatment and statistical analysis utilized to address three separate research questions. Analysis of social justice attitude as a significant predictor of faculty willingness to accommodate students was supported while social justice attitude as a significant predictor of faculty attitude toward disability was not supported. Additionally, there was no correlation found between social justice attitude and knowledge of disability law.
Chapter 5: Discussion

This study examined the contribution of social justice attitude to faculty attitude toward students with disabilities and willingness to accommodate. Additionally, it examined the relationship between social justice attitude and disability law. Faculty attitude toward students with disabilities was measured using the combined scores of fairness in providing accommodations, willingness to invest time, and performance expectations factors of the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners (ExCEL) instrument (Lombardi & Murray, 2011). Willingness to provide accommodations to college students was measured by the combined score of adjustment of course assignments and requirements and the accessibility of course material factors of the ExCEL. Social justice attitude was measured by the Social Justice Scale (Torres-Harding, Siers, & Olson, 2012). Covariates included in the study were the knowledge of disability law factor of the ExCEL, gender, years of teaching experience in higher education, numbers of students with disabilities taught, academic rank, and academic discipline. This chapter reviews significant findings, discusses practical implications and future research, and reviews limitations to the study.

Significance of the Study

Over the past several years the counseling profession has developed a significant commitment to social justice as a core value, particularly envisioning the counselor as an advocate for justice (Goodman, Liang, Helms, Latta, Sparks, & Weintraub, 2004; Smith, Reynolds, & Rovnak, 2009). The conceptualization of being a culturally competent counselor has expanded beyond understanding different cultures and how individual
interventions may or may not be sensitive to individual cultures. Current expectations regarding multicultural competence also necessitate that counselors consider the impact of social and political contexts and work to address systems and policies that perpetuate marginalization of oppressed groups (American Counseling Association, 2005). This stems from recognition that clients do not exist in a vacuum separate from social, economic, and political oppression and that limited progress can be achieved when only addressing change in the individual. While much of the social justice dialogue has addressed issues of race, gender and class, Adams (2000) and Wronka (2008) recognized that achievement of a just society relies upon assuring equity for all. Since people with disabilities experience oppression in both individual and systemic ways, it is essential that counselors expand the social justice dialogue to include people with disabilities (Barclay, 2011).

During the past 30 years, there have been significant legislative and cultural shifts that have resulted in greater numbers of students with disabilities pursuing higher education. Wolanin and Steele (2004) estimated the total population of students enrolled in postsecondary education in the United States to be approximately 9% of the total student population. Most recently this estimate has grown to 11.1% of postsecondary students reporting a disability (NCES, 2015). Additionally, Raue and Lewis (NCES, 2011) have more recently documented the diversification of complex disabilities students experience as they pursue their educational goals.

The decentralized nature of instruction in higher education places university faculty in a more central role to assuring access for students with disabilities. Negative
attitudes or faculty reluctance to accommodate students can have long term impacts on students’ ability to access accommodations necessary to assure they have an opportunity to succeed (Hartman-Hall & Haaga, 2002). Students may experience negative impacts from either subtle attitudes faculty communicate about negative beliefs about students with disabilities in higher education or actions that prevent students from consistently accessing accommodations (Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000; Skinner, 2007). Students with disabilities have also reported spending greater amounts of time and effort to reach their educational goals when they experience barriers caused by lack of faculty willingness to accommodate or negative beliefs about disability (Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005).

Many studies over the past decades have found connections between personal or professional attributes of faculty and their attitude toward students with disabilities or willingness to accommodate (Beilke & Yssel, 1999; Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta, 2005; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999; Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). However, Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, and Benz (2009) most recently posed that the key to assuring faculty implementation of accommodations is connected to improving faculty beliefs about educating students with disabilities. Since, at its core, social justice requires subscription to the belief that resources be equitably accessed by all, this study sought to better understand the connection between social justice attitudes, faculty attitudes, and willingness to accommodate students with disabilities.
Characteristics of Research Participants

Participants of this study consisted of 178 faculty employed at least half time in a teaching capacity at a four-year, large public institution in the Midwest with a high research activity classification under the Carnegie system. Most recently available data on the faculty at the university used for this study reported a total of 1301 faculty of which 933 were employed full-time. Most recent faculty data indicate that 78.4% of faculty identify as White, 3.0% Hispanic, 6.6 international, 4.2% African American, 7.0% Asian, and .5% Native American. Participants of the study reported somewhat similar proportions of race or ethnic identification: 87.1 White, 1.7% Hispanic or Latino, 4.5% Black or African American, 4.0% American Indian or Native Alaskan, and 3.4% other. This indicates some overrepresentation of White faculty and underrepresentation of Hispanic or Latino and Asian faculty. It is unknown how many participants may have identified as International since it was not a reporting option in the survey.

In regard to gender, among all faculty, the institution reports 55.8% identify as male with 45.2% female. Females were disproportionally represented in the participant group with 57.9% being female and 41.6% male. No institutional data was available regarding the percent of faculty who may have a disability. Likewise, it was difficult to assess representation from different categories of rank. The institution reports 29.6% of faculty are full professors with 44.4% associate professors and 25.9% assistant professors. Information on rank is only reported for those who were tenure-track faculty and does not include information on percent of employees in faculty positions who may be adjunct instructors or in visiting professor positions not eligible for tenure. Among
participants, 16.9% reported being full professors with 36.5% associate professors, and 16.3% assistant professors. Similar ratios exist among these three ranks in institutional data reports and participant self-report. Additionally, 30.3% of participants reported being adjunct/instructor or other rank.

Comparisons of representative responses from academic discipline are somewhat more difficult to make. The current study aligned faculty in Physical and Biological Sciences with Engineering under a category of Engineering and Science and faculty in Humanities and Social Sciences were a separate category of academic discipline. The institution reports only a total figure for Arts and Sciences that includes faculty from Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities and Engineering is a separate college. Most recent data reported that 42.6% of faculty teach in Arts and Sciences, 8.6% in Engineering, 9.7% Business, 8.9% Communications, 10.2% Health Sciences, 9.8% Education and 10.2% Fine Arts. Participants had the following representation within academic disciplines as constructed for this study: 27.5% Humanities and Social Sciences, 22.5% Engineering and Science, 7.9% Business, 13.5% Communications, 13.5% Health Sciences, 10.1% Education, and 5.1% Fine Arts. Although categories were reported differently, there appeared to be underrepresentation in Fine Arts and slight underrepresentation in Business. A somewhat over representative number of participants were from Communication.

The participants in the current study are more representative of the faculty than many prior studies (Matthes, Anderson, & Skolnick, 1987; Nelson, Dodd, & Smith, 1990; Rao & Gartin, Schoen, Uysal, & McDonald, 1987). In prior research, faculty from
Education were often overrepresented whereas responses from Engineering and Physical Sciences have been somewhat under-represented. As with several prior studies, participants were disproportionally female.

**Professional Development**

Examination of professional development of faculty around issues of disability was not a primary purpose of the present study. However, the study yielded a few noteworthy findings in this regard. First, over 16% of participants reported no professional development activities regarding disability and accessibility. This suggests that a significant number of faculty are operating without a basic understanding of either their obligations to accommodate or their rights in maintaining academic integrity. If faculty are unaware of either their responsibilities or rights, it could lead to unintentionally under or over-accommodating students which may cause faculty to have a negative view of student with disabilities or to be perceived by students as being unwilling to accommodate.

A little less than half of participants had attended a presentation made by the office that serves students with disabilities. For participants who had received such training, it is unknown whether it occurred at a prior or current institution. This suggests that faculty may not all have current information regarding the institutional values around accommodating students or understanding processes and procedures. It may be that some faculty have a less positive attitude due to faulty perceptions of the expectations to accommodate students (i.e. a belief that they will be required to alter course objectives; lack of awareness of resources to support implementation of accommodations; or lack of
understanding of the intersection between accommodations and academic integrity). Faculty who have not participated in such a presentation may have a view of the office exclusively as advocating for students rather than fulfilling the institution’s responsibilities under the pertinent laws or assisting faculty in navigating the nexus of accommodation and academic integrity. It is also important that faculty who had attended a presentation reported a significantly lower knowledge of disability law. This may be, in part, because the training merely introduces the underlying legislation and the framework for providing accommodation and faculty became more aware of the complexities thus feeling less knowledgeable rather than actually having less knowledge.

Additionally, faculty who reported attending an individual session at a professional conference were less willing to accommodate students at a statistically significant level. Although it is unknown the exact nature of such conferences it may be that faculty attend conferences within their academic discipline and sessions may be facilitated not by those with expertise related to disability, rather those with expertise in their discipline. These sessions may have a focus on academic integrity and the rights of faculty to maintain academic standards. While these topics are not unimportant, to discuss these without also developing an understanding the responsibility and reasons to accommodate could contribute to lower willingness.

**Faculty Attitude and Willingness to Accommodate**

The present study confirmed the results of much prior research in that faculty attitude toward students with disabilities and willingness to accommodate were generally positive among faculty as a whole (Baggett, 1994; Dowrick, Anderson, Heyer, & Acosta,
The mean score for attitude toward disability was 88.82 with a high possible score of 102. Although no absolute number equates to a positive or negative attitude, a range of 51-68 would be a relatively neutral attitude with scores above 68 requiring faculty to agree or strongly agree with most items. Mean scores on faculty willingness to accommodate were more neutral with the mean of 49.29. Scores above 52 required endorsing “agree” or “strongly agree” with most statements in the willingness components of the survey. Contrarily, a participant would need to endorse “disagree” or “strongly disagree” for most items to achieve a score below 39.

**Discipline.** The present study did not identify any statistically significant differences in faculty attitude or willingness to accommodate based on academic discipline. Although many prior studies found that faculty in Education were significantly more willing to provide accommodations than other faculty (Schoen et al., 1987; Nelson et al., 1990; Lewis, 1998; Rao & Gartin, 2003; Skinner, 2007; Murray, Wren, & Keys, 2008; Lombardi & Murray, 2011), the results of this study did not support such differences. Previous studies found less favorable attitudes and less willingness to accommodate in faculty from Science, Engineering, and Business (Schoen et al., 1987; Kennedy, 1996; Lewis, 1999; Rao & Gartin, 2003; Skinner, 2007) which were not supported by this study. Leyser et al. (1998) and Lombardi and Murray (2011) had previously identified Education faculty as having higher levels of experience teaching students with disabilities and a greater level of knowledge about the laws providing access to postsecondary education. It is possible that sufficient time has passed since
implementation of laws that resulted in greater numbers of students with disabilities enrolling in postsecondary education that faculty in disciplines outside education have developed greater experience and understanding which has aligned their attitudes and willingness with that of Education faculty. Additionally, Education at the institution where the study was conducted also includes human and consumer science fields, which may be different from previous studies.

**Gender.** Prior research regarding the effects of gender on attitude toward disability and willingness to accommodate has also been mixed although several studies supported female faculty as having more positive attitudes (Kennedy, 1996; Benham, 1997; Murray et al., 2008; Lombardi & Murray, 2011). The results of the present study did not reveal overall gender effects similar to Schoen et al. (1987), Vogel et al. (1999) and Rao and Gartin (2003). Leyser et al. (1998) found more favorable attitudes in male faculty and posited that differences between attitudes of female and male faculty were perhaps more related to greater experience in teaching students with disabilities due to greater length of time in their position. Many prior studies reported greater numbers of male faculty in science and engineering with higher numbers of females in education as well as substantially higher numbers of participants from Education. Studies in which gender effects were found also typically indicated effects from academic discipline (Benham, 1997; Murray et al., 2008; Lombardi & Murray, 2011). The present study had a more representative sample across disciplines although female participants were overrepresented which suggest that prior findings regarding gender may be more related
to discipline than gender. Murray et al. (2008) also suggested that gender effects in their study were perhaps related more to differences noted by academic discipline.

While gaps in gender representation still exist across disciplines and many female faculty have fewer overall years of experience teaching in postsecondary education, these gaps have reduced over the past three decades during which much of this research has occurred. As these gaps are reduced, current research may be more reflective of actual gender effects that are less confounded with discipline or experience.

**Prior experience with disability.** Only one prior study found effects of experience or contact with students with disabilities on faculty attitude and willingness (Leyser, Vogel, Wyland, & Brulle, 1998). The present study found no effects of experience teaching students with disabilities similar to the results of most prior research (Rao & Gartin, 2003; Schoen, Uysal, & McDonald, 1987; Vogel, Leyser, Wyland, & Brulle, 1999). Although no greater level of willingness to accommodate was found by Vogel et al., the authors did find that faculty who reported greater levels of experience also reported greater levels of knowledge about disability. The present study did not support this connection, but participants in this study reported overall greater levels of knowledge regardless of the level of experience with disability.

Although no overall effects were found based on faculty experience teaching students with disabilities, the correlation between the numbers of students with disabilities taught and both faculty attitude toward disability and faculty willingness to accommodate were inverse. This suggests that as the faculty experience with disabilities increased, the willingness to accommodate and attitude decreased which is
counterintuitive. Since there was a positive correlation between total years of teaching experience and numbers of students with disabilities taught, this inverse relationship may be related to the total length of time a faculty member has taught. It may be that faculty who have been in academia for substantially longer periods of time, possibly pre-dating legislation that provides access for students with disabilities, have an overall lower orientation toward inclusion of underrepresented groups. Additionally, faculty who have been teaching longer may be utilizing pedagogical approaches which they feel are more compromised by the implementation of accommodations. The inverse correlations between number of years taught and both willingness to accommodate and attitude toward disability lend support to this idea, particularly considering the correlation between total years taught and willingness to accommodate was statistically significant.

Academic rank. Prior research regarding rank has been mixed. Most research has failed to identify effects of rank on attitude or willingness (Benham, 1997; Leyser et al., 1998; Skinner, 2007). However Murray, Wren, and Keys (2008) found that rank was related in that faculty reporting greater willingness to accommodate also reported lower ranks. The present study found no effects of rank on attitude or willingness although higher levels of rank were associated with greater levels of experience teaching students with disabilities similar to the findings of Leyser et al. Although no impacts from rank were found, rank was negatively correlated to attitude toward disability. This suggests that higher ranking faculty had a less favorable attitude toward disability. While this may be related to associate and full professors having greater total teaching experience, it is also possible that tenured faculty feel less compelled to conform to outside expectations.
Conversely, faculty who are pre-tenure or non-tenure track may be less willing to push back against the policies of an institution or upset students who may then poorly evaluate faculty teaching. Non-tenured faculty are in a more vulnerable position and also may have a greater orientation to teaching which includes accommodating students with disabilities.

**Social Justice Attitude**

A significant contribution of this study was to begin to understand social justice attitudes of faculty as there is a lack of research in this area related specifically to disability. The results of this study indicate that overall, faculty endorse a high level of social justice orientation with a mean score of 115.92 (SD = 11.39) out of a possible total score of 138. Although no specific numerical score represents a positive or negative attitude regarding social justice, to achieve a score above 92 requires participants to answer that they agree or strongly agree with nearly all items on the SJS. While 115.92 was the mean, individual scores ranged as low as 83 which would be reflective of neutrality toward social justice. Further, the distribution of all scores had negative skew indicating more faculty than anticipated may have endorsed highly favorable attitudes toward social justice.

Overall scores on the SJS suggest that faculty generally view themselves as just in their beliefs about the importance of and actions regarding inclusion of oppressed groups. Although the SJS is susceptible to effects of social desirability due to reliance on self-report, it is supports the concept that faculty generally believe in the concept of social justice. Since the SJS inquired only about beliefs and actions in general rather than in the
context of their professional role it is possible that faculty have a general personal orientation to social justice that may not be congruent with their everyday work. This suggests that faculty who generally believe in social justice may struggle with how to integrate this into the culture of academia where fairness and consistency has traditionally been valued more than equity and opportunity.

Supplemental analysis was conducted to understand the relationship between social justice attitude and demographic covariates. No differences were noted in reported social justice attitudes and gender, rank and experience teaching students with disabilities. Although significant differences were note found in regard to gender, there was a significant correlation between gender and social justice attitude suggesting that females generally had a more positive social justice attitude.

Analysis revealed minor differences were noted with regard to social justice attitude and academic discipline in that both Communications faculty and Humanities and Social Sciences had more positive attitudes than faculty from Engineering and Sciences. It is important to note that training and professional development that fosters social justice orientation may be more naturally inherent in the subject matter of Communication and Humanities and Social Sciences as compared to Engineering and Social Sciences. While the cause is unknown, it may be that individual fields within Communications and Humanities and Social Sciences are more often affiliated with interdisciplinary disability studies. Further, research within Engineering and Sciences is often less connected to issues of teaching, learning, social engagement, and personal development whereas other fields may be more naturally inclined to exam issues which
may lead to greater understanding of, or interest in, laws and policies impacting people with disabilities.

Additionally, there was an inverse correlation found between total years taught and social justice attitude. Since faculty with greater levels of teaching experience were also generally older, this may be a reflection of shifting generational beliefs regarding inclusion and equity. Faculty with more teaching experience may have largely participated in educational systems both as a student and a professor that were not attentive to issues of justice. This would require shifting both the personal and professional values that were instilled in more experienced faculty to become open and accepting of social justice as a matter of course. Conversely, less experienced faculty may have participated as a student in educational systems that emphasized the inclusion and success of students with disabilities and may not question the value of working towards a just society and educational system.

It is also important to consider that faculty overall endorsed much more positive scores regarding social justice attitude versus attitude toward disability and willingness to accommodate. Although the general attitude toward disability and willingness to accommodate were positive, examining the scores collectively indicates disconnect between faculty perceptions of their social justice orientation and their professional actions. It is unlikely that faculty are reluctant to implement accommodations because they are unjust. Rather they may struggling with issues of academic integrity and do not have the necessary tools or support to navigate or resolve the complex interactions of accommodations and academic integrity. This may also be related to the view of some
faculty as preparing students for future careers and making decisions about educational accommodations based on their perceptions about what will best prepare a student for the workplace or lack of awareness regarding the future rights of students with disabilities in the workplace. Faculty may also lack sufficient knowledge regarding an individual student’s disability and their rights in the workplace that leads to an assumption that the same educational accommodations would be required or requested in a professional setting.

**Discussion of Analysis**

Statistical analysis indicated that social justice attitude did not significantly contribute to faculty attitude toward students with disabilities. Social justice attitude did not contribute significantly to understanding the variance as a unique predictor when controlling for covariates. Additionally, the full model including all covariate and social justice attitude did not significantly account for variance in attitude.

In the case of the second research question, statistical analysis supported that social justice attitude accounts for a significant portion of faculty willingness to accommodate students with disabilities. Inclusion of the covariates alone did not account for a statistically significant portion of variances. However the addition of social justice attitude increased resulted in a statistically significant model accounting for a total of 22.2% of variance in willingness. Social justice attitude uniquely accounted for 10.6% of the variance in willingness. The effect of social justice attitude had small to medium effect size with a reported $R^2$ of .106 (Cohen, 1998). The total effects of all covariates and social justice attitude are significantly less than the proportion of variance (54%) found in
Benham’s (1997) study when investigating impacts of many of these covariates on faculty willingness. Benham specifically utilized academic rank, academic discipline, years teaching in higher education, prior instructional training before teaching in higher education, prior experience with students with disabilities, and faculty age as predictors of attitude. The sample size for this study was limited (N = 91) for such analysis so the current study may have found reduced variances accounted for due to a more representative sample. Additionally, the difference in the results of the two studies 18 years apart suggests that the role of the covariates in accounting for attitudinal differences has been mitigated over time.

The final research question posited a relationship between social justice orientation and knowledge of disability law. Statistical testing did not support the presence of correlation between the two variables with \( r = .003, p = .972 \).

**Implications for Faculty Development**

The results of the study indicate that social justice attitude significantly impacts faculty willingness to accommodate students with disabilities in postsecondary education. Demographic factors including academic rank, academic discipline, gender, years of experience teaching at the postsecondary level, and number of students with disabilities taught contribute to overall understanding of faculty willingness to accommodate, but group comparisons did not yield significant differences in willingness or attitude among specific demographic groups. Further, this study revealed independence in measures of social justice attitude and knowledge of disability law. These results offer several
implications for faculty development by counselors serving students with disabilities at the postsecondary level.

Disability services professionals must acknowledge the importance of providing support to faculty to foster a positive attitude and willingness to accommodate students with disabilities. Further, it is essential that disability services offices recognize the need for faculty to have adequate support in understanding and managing issues of disability and accessibility (Bourke, Strehorn, & Silver, 2000). Not only do faculty require this support, they look to the disability services office to provide this knowledge, expertise and support (Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). Offices serving students with disabilities need take a more proactive role in developing and delivering effective professional development opportunities as a primary part of their mission. Further, professional development opportunities should be used to establish an ongoing relationship with faculty in order to create the interdependence that underlies a just society (Rutherford, 2011). Often professional development is approached as a singular opportunity to provide overwhelming amounts of information (Bento, 1996) rather than being used as the starting point of the professional development process by providing sufficient information to assist faculty in navigating general issues of accessibility and instill a sense of shared responsibility.

In addition to large scale development opportunities, disability services professionals should work with teaching and learning centers on campus to explore the development of faculty as disability allies and to create faculty networks that foster a social justice orientation. Evans, Assadi, and Herriot (2005) highlight the importance of
developing allies to support students with disabilities and address systemic issues. The authors propose that allies should engage in self-education, raising awareness, and taking direct action to support accessibility proactively. Faculty development opportunities can highlight specific ways faculty may become allies within the scope of their responsibilities. The creation of faculty learning communities may serve as an effective way for faculty to connect across academic disciplines and develop a greater understanding of social justice and establish a safe space to assess one’s own beliefs and practices regarding disability and accessibility and provide support for solving faculty challenges regarding working with students with disabilities (Ness, George, Turner, & Bolgatz, 2010). Similarly, Ritchie (2012) suggests that such networks are essential for establishing lasting change.

Disability services professionals need to recognize that even when faculty feel they are generally knowledgeable about disabilities and disability law, they often seek additional support and resources from the disability service office (Vasek, 2005). In addition to providing traditional information about disability and pertinent legislation, professional development opportunities must seek to change the individual beliefs of faculty regarding disability (Zhang, Landmark, Reber, Hsu, Kwok, & Benz, 2009). Discussion of issues such as the importance of inviting disability disclosure and taking action to reduce the stigma experienced by students with disabilities are practices that have been shown to support students’ access to accommodations (Liasidou, 2014; Murray, Wren, & Keys, 2008) and may begin to foster more positive attitudes among faculty. Future professional development may also focus on particular policies and
practices that faculty may perceive as being non-problematic but may be perceived negatively by students with disabilities (Pincus, 2000). Some examples of such policies may include course syllabi statements, attendance and deadline policies, and expectations regarding classroom participation. One strategy that ought to be considered is working with faculty to review policy guidelines recommended by the faculty governing body in creating a handbook that will be useful and of interest to a variety of faculty (Cox & Mayorga, 2010).

In addition to revising the methods and topics of professional development for all faculty, it is important to consider the need for differentiated training. If faculty in particular academic disciplines have lower overall attitudes or willingness it may be most effective to customize and deliver a training that is targeted to the concerns that lead to the differences in attitude. The present model of professional development may fail to resolve the basic concerns of faculty before attempting to address more nuanced issues such as the connection between accommodation and retention or graduation. If faculty are concerned that providing accommodations are unfair to others, it is unlikely that this belief will be changed without being directly addressed. Additionally, if a particular discipline has a stronger view as preparing students for a particular career it may be important to also include information about workplace accommodations as well as the fact that a students disability may not have the same impact or need for accommodations in a professional setting as it does in an educational setting.

Beyond expanding the traditional topics and approach to faculty development, disability services professionals must seek to include students with disabilities in the
development and delivery of professional development. Particularly if professionals are not persons with disabilities, it is important to assure that a full understanding of the experience of being a student with a disability is developed and communicated to faculty in order to foster greater social justice orientation (Chang, Crethar, & Ratts, 2010). This approach also stands to further the faculty view that provision of equitable opportunities is an interdependent system involving faculty, students with disabilities, and disability services professionals (Lopez-Baez & Paylo, 2009). Rutherford (2011) highlights the importance of relationship in developing a deep understanding and appreciation of differences. Involving students with disabilities in faculty development stands to achieve this in a way that may be difficult when a student is enrolled in a course and no relationship exists prior to a request for accommodations and in the absence of a power differential between faculty and student. While faculty may develop a necessary moral imperative at the time a student enrolls in a particular course, it is likely that a more sustainable impact may be made by developing a greater understanding of students with disabilities as a whole (Harley, Alston, & Middleton, 2007).

Faculty development research supports the idea that faculty need increased training and resources to effectively meet the needs of diverse groups of learners (Sorcinelli, 2007). Although it is imperative that disability services professionals take a leadership role in making faculty development a priority, it is important to also develop partnerships with other offices or departments who have an interest in social justice and/or disability. Since a just society requires the elimination of all oppression (Adams, 2000; Wronka, 2008) those who are positional leaders in working with underrepresented
populations may experience significant shift in the attitudes of faculty by working
together to deliver messages that foster a social justice orientation and are inclusive of
multiple populations. Examples of offices with which disability services professionals
may choose to coordinate are diversity officers, lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender offices,
multicultural student centers, women’s centers, and offices serving first generation
students. Delivery of a unified message of social justice when talking about specialized
populations may serve to create greater readiness for faculty to change and adapt more
favorable attitudes toward students with disabilities (Strickland in Shullman, Celeste, &
Strickland, 2006). Similarly, locating campus partners who may provide specialized
services to students with disabilities such as counseling, transportation, hearing and
speech services, physical therapy, and medical services may create a network across the
institution that may better advance change at a systemic level (Toperek et al., 2006).
Such diverse offices may have different reporting lines, institutional relationships, access
to resources, and spheres of influence that can serve to expand the reach of faculty
development.

Community partnerships could also be formed with organizations and agencies
that promote similar messages or serve individuals with disabilities. Since many
community agencies bring specialized knowledge and work closely with specific
populations of individuals with disabilities, such as developmental disabilities or mental
illness, the expertise of clients and professional staff may contribute to developing a
holistic message. Additionally, faculty members are also members of the community and
may be reached in a different way through community connections that will in turn
support their readiness to adopt a greater orientation toward social justice in their personal and professional roles.

**Implications for Academic Leaders**

Faculty at the postsecondary level each have an individual responsibility for the implementation of accommodations for students with disabilities. However, academic leaders (i.e. department chairs, directors) have an additional obligation to assure that faculty within the program are prepared to meet these obligations. As such, faculty leaders should actively engage program faculty and the office serving students with disabilities to examine issues which present barriers to implementation of accommodations.

Specifically, academic leaders must seek to understand the intersection of academic integrity and accommodations specific to their program. This may require academic leaders to challenge faculty to think critically regarding the fundamental educational outcomes of specific courses and majors and separate objectives from teaching methodology. Academic leaders should facilitate conversations with programs faculty to develop a common understanding of the core knowledge or skills to be demonstrated by any student. Such conversations then form a foundation by which the impact of accommodations on academic integrity can be assessed. These efforts may ultimately help faculty and disability services professionals to separate what it is a student is to be assessed on from how it is being assessed. While individual faculty may feel a requested accommodation (i.e. using a calculator or reader for exams) presents an alteration to their course, having clarity regarding course objectives will allow a better
understanding of how such requests may or may not impact the underlying constructs all students must demonstrate.

Additionally, academic leaders should partner with the office serving students with disabilities to increase faculty knowledge and understanding of the impact of various disabilities to address faculty concerns about fairness to other enrolled students. Some faculty believe that the provision of accommodations for one student may be unfair to others who would likely benefit from similar arrangements. Faculty may lack an appreciation for the impacts a student with a disability experiences as well as the notion that accommodations are not for the benefit of a singular student. Academic leaders should be proactive in fostering an understanding that accommodations are implemented to mitigate significant impacts that a student with a disability experiences that other students in the class likely do not experience. Faculty who emphasize fairness and treating all students the same may begin to demonstrate greater willingness to accommodate if academic leaders promote a greater importance on equity and facilitate faculty awareness that accommodations are designed to provide an equal opportunity and not guarantee success.

**Implications for Counselor Educators**

While many recent strides have been taken to promote social justice advocacy and understanding of how ability interacts with the counseling process, counselor educators must do more to assure that all counselors are prepared to address issues of disability. Historically, working with individuals with disabilities has been viewed as the role of rehabilitation counselors. While rehabilitation counselors may provide some specialized
services to support the independent living and vocational attainment of individuals with significant disabilities, there is a larger population of individuals with disabilities who may not require such services. The ability to understand disability as a cultural context and social justice issue is paramount in supporting those who may seek counseling as a means to address specific issues in their personal development without the need for intense rehabilitation services. This requires counselor educators to more fully incorporate into the basic identity of all counselors the importance of being effective counselors for people with disabilities and an ownership of advocacy within the arena of disability and accessibility.

In order to effectively prepare counselors to serve people with disabilities, counselor educators need to expand the current curriculum to provide a greater foundation of knowledge. Specifically, counselor educators should seek ways to infuse key standards from the CACREP Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling Standards into the base curriculum for all students. In order to serve people with disabilities in counseling capacity, it is necessary to understand the “effects of the onset, progression, and expected duration of disability on clients’ holistic functioning (Standard 5.2.m, CACREP, 2014). Additionally, all counselors should demonstrate an understanding of the role of others (i.e. community support, family) in the process of receiving community-based services (Standard 5.2.o, CACREP, 2014). Such understanding will assist counselors in better responding to individual client concerns regarding their personal development and mental health by increasing the understanding of the client’s personal context. Since the American Counseling Association standards for social justice and cultural competency
emphasize a need for counselors to have awareness of privilege and marginalization (Ratts, Singh, Nassar-McMillan, Butler, & McCullough, 2015) it would be difficult for counselors to demonstrate cultural competence in regard to disability without this depth of understanding.

The increasing role of counselor as an advocate also necessitates a better understanding of the impact of external factors on clients with disabilities. As such, counselor educators should strive to assure that all counselors demonstrate understanding of “environmental, attitudinal, and individual barriers for people with disabilities” (Standard 5.2.p, CACREP, 2014)). A deeper understanding of these barriers will assist counselors in advocating for the removal of such barriers at a systemic level as well as on an personal level for clients. This may be important in instances where people with disabilities who are engaged in counseling experience difficulties in participation in social and community activities due to barriers presented by the physical, electronic, or political environment. Similarly, counselors must develop an appropriate appreciation for the effects of discrimination and marginalization on the basis of ability in order to be culturally component in service delivery (Standard 5.2.k, CACREP, 2014).

Limitations

This study had several limitations that may reduce the generalizability of these conclusions to other populations of faculty. Limitations include sampling techniques, instrumentation, social desirability effects, and potential violations of assumptions for statistical analysis.
Although efforts were made to assure broad representation from across various categories of covariates, participants were all faculty at a single institution. There exists the possibility that circumstances at this institution create unique results regarding attitude toward disability, willingness to accommodate, knowledge of disability law, and social justice attitudes. It is important to understand that in the three years prior to the completion of this study, the institution had taken significant steps toward strategic planning to address issues of accessibility and inclusion of people with disabilities. These efforts included outreach and receiving input from broad constituents across the whole institution in order to develop the plan. Additionally, once the strategic plan was complete and accepted by the President of the institution it was communicated to the university community as a priority to work toward a more inclusive environment. Although implementation of the plan was just beginning as the study was concluded, engagement in the plan development may have created heightened awareness of issues of disability or encouraged greater willingness to accommodate. Finally, the high number of faculty completing the survey who indicated that they or a family member are a person with a disability suggests that a considerable portion of participants may have chosen to complete the survey due to their personal interest or commitment to providing access for students with disabilities. This possibility is corroborated by the number of faculty who began the survey but terminated participation at the beginning of, or a few questions into, the SJS which suggests that they may have been disinterested in thinking about social justice.
The use of the ExCEL instrument also posed some limitations. The knowledge of disability factor relied on participant self-report of their perceived knowledge rather than assessing specific understanding of the laws and their applicability to higher education. Additionally, the adjustment to course assignments and accessibility to course materials factors of this instrument inquired about faculty willingness to make particular modifications or provide access to materials for all students. These items may not have discriminated between faculty willingness or unwillingness to provide a particular accommodation or access to a student with a disability and may have resulted in larger total scores that were not inherently reflective of greater willingness to accommodate. Similarly, the SJS relied on self-report of beliefs and expected future behavior rather than reporting on past behaviors. The results of the SJS are vulnerable to effects of social desirability. The ceiling effects and negative skew of the distribution of responses suggest that social desirability may have been at play.

Finally, there were potential threats to the underlying assumptions required for regression analysis. These include the negative skew on the SJS scores and knowledge of disability factor of the ExCEL as well as weak linear relationships between social justice attitude and attitude and knowledge as well as knowledge and both attitude and willingness. While scatterplots suggest a general linear relationship, the skew of the knowledge and social justice attitude distributions make it difficult to conclude with certainty that a linear relationship exists.
Future Research

The present study provided an initial examination of faculty orientation toward social justice as well as a necessary update to potential changes in faculty attitudes and willingness to accommodate students with disabilities. As such, it also provides a foundation for the continuation of research to better understand faculty attitude and willingness as well as exploring effective methods to foster the requisite attitude and willingness to assure students with disabilities receive equal access to attain postsecondary educational goals.

Future efforts should be undertaken to develop more robust measures of faculty knowledge of disability law and willingness to accommodate students with disabilities. While measures utilized in this study were sufficient for exploratory study, more precise measures will assure that future research may have greater generalization outside the specific sample. These precise measures will also assure that the constructs being researched are what is actually being measured and should rely less on faculty perceptions of their knowledge. Additionally, future studies should seek to randomize questions regarding social justice with questions regarding willingness to accommodate students with disabilities.

Once more robust measures are developed, they should be utilized to replicate similar studies with a more representative sample of faculty across various institutions. Such studies would be less susceptible to the impacts of institutional culture and values around disability and accessibility. Additionally, it may allow greater understanding of faculty attitudes and willingness across a variety of postsecondary institutions.
The present study does provide sufficient reason to begin investigation into the
effectiveness of trainings that may be aimed, in part, to foster greater social justice
orientation among faculty. Results of this study support that social justice attitude may
contribute to greater willingness to accommodate students so designing and evaluating
effective ways to accomplish this should be undertaken.

In addition to future quantitative studies, qualitative efforts must also be taken to
better understand faculty orientation to social justice and willingness to accommodate
students with disabilities. During the course of this study, several individual faculty
emailed the author or the chair of the dissertation committee directly to share thoughts
and reactions to the survey. Feedback from faculty ranged widely and touched on several
areas. Some faculty were pleased at the topic of the study and expressed their belief that
understanding issues related to students with disabilities and accommodations was
important. Additional faculty offered extended thoughts on the connection between social
justice and accommodating students with disabilities and offered criticism of a current
system that places limitations on supports to students or requires students to complete a
potentially burdensome process. A few emails were critical of the study indicating that
they felt the research was biased to demonstrate faculty need for additional training to be
sensitive to issues of disability. Other emails offered thoughts as to the difficulty in
answering questions when considering “disabilities” collectively versus differentiating
types of disabilities as well as noting some potential ambiguity about what “justice”
meant to different individuals. The receipt of such emails lends support to the notion that
faculty attitude and willingness to accommodate are a complex subject about which faculty would welcome the opportunity to elaborate.

**Conclusion**

The results of this study suggest that social justice attitude accounts for a significant portion of faculty willingness to accommodate students with disabilities when controlling for a variety of known covariates. These results highlight the need for counselors working in an office that serves students with disabilities in higher education setting to find ways to promote a social justice orientation within faculty. In addition it highlights the need to further identify other factors that may contribute to a more positive attitude toward disability and greater willingness to accommodate students with disabilities. Considering these findings and the central role of faculty in implementing accommodations in the postsecondary setting, continuing to develop understanding of these constructs, and promoting positive attitudes is essential to create equitable opportunities for students with disabilities to attain postsecondary educational goals.
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Appendix A: Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners (ExCEL)

Strongly disagree = 1  Strongly agree = 6

F1: Fairness in providing accommodations

I am willing to allow students with documented disabilities to use technology (e.g., laptop, calculator, spell checker) to complete tests even when such technologies are not permitted for use by students without disabilities

I am willing to arrange extended time on exams for students who have documented disabilities

I am willing to allow students with documented disabilities to take proctored exams in a supervised location outside of the normal exam location

Providing testing accommodations (such as extended exam time) to students with documented disabilities is unfair to students without disabilities

I am willing to extend the due dates of assignments to accommodate the needs of students with documented disabilities when necessary

Providing teaching accommodations to students with documented disabilities is unfair to students without disabilities

Providing accommodations to students with disabilities is a way to ensure equal opportunity and access to learning in higher education settings

I believe that students with disabilities use the disability as an excuse when they are not doing well in my class

I make individual accommodations for students who have disclosed their disability to me

F2: Knowledge of disability law

I am confident in my understanding of the legal definition of disability

I am confident in my understanding of the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990)

I am confident in my understanding of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

Currently, I do not have sufficient knowledge to make adequate accommodations for students with disabilities in my course(s)
I am aware of assistive technology that students with disabilities can use to aid their understanding of course material

F3: Adjustment of course assignments and requirements

I am willing to allow a student with a documented disability to complete extra credit assignments for academic success even when this option is not stated on the course syllabus

I am willing to allow any student to complete extra credit assignments in my course(s)

I am willing to reduce the overall course reading load for a student with a documented disability even when I would not allow a reduced reading load for other students

I am willing to extend the due dates of assignments to accommodate the needs of students with documented disabilities when necessary

I am willing to change the method of responding on exams (e.g., from written to oral) for students with documented disabilities

I would like to modify curricular aspects of my course(s) in order to create a more inclusive learning environment for all students

I am willing to provide additional time to complete assignments in my course(s) to any student who expresses a need

F4: Minimizing barriers

I make a statement in class inviting students with disabilities to discuss their needs with me

I include a statement in my syllabus inviting students with disabilities to discuss their needs with me

I am willing to use technology so that my course material can be available in a variety of formats (e.g. podcast of lecture available for download, course readings available as mp3 files)

I prefer to use a variety of instructional formats in my class, including small group and hands on activities

I would like to modify curricular aspects of my course(s) in order to create a more inclusive learning environment for all students
F5: Campus resources

I receive adequate support from Disability Services to make appropriate accommodations for students with documented disabilities

Students with documented disabilities who request support from Disability Services receive adequate services from that office

When students with disabilities are having difficulties in my course(s), I am uncertain about where I can find additional support at the University of Oregon

F6: Willingness to invest time

I am willing to spend extra time (i.e., in addition to normal office hours) helping any student prepare for an exam or review course material

I am willing to spend extra time (i.e., in addition to typical office hours) meeting with students with documented disabilities to clarify and/or review course related content or prepare for an upcoming exam

At times, I feel burdened when students with disabilities approach me with accommodation requests

Making adequate accommodations for students with documented disabilities in my courses is unrealistic given time constraints and other job demands

F7: Accessibility of course materials

I am willing to provide copies of my lecture notes or outlines to students with documented disabilities

I am willing to provide copies of my overheads and/or PowerPoint presentations to students with documented disabilities

I am willing to use technology so that my course material can be available in a variety of formats (e.g. podcast of lecture available for download, course readings available as mp3 files)

I am willing to allow students with documented disabilities to record class sessions when necessary

I put my lecture notes online for all students (on Blackboard or another website)
**F8: Performance expectations**

Students with disabilities are able to compete academically at the university level.

I believe that students with learning disabilities can be successful at the university level.

Typically, students with disabilities do not perform as well as the rest of the students in my course(s).

Students with disabilities should be able to perform just as well as students without disabilities in my course(s).
Appendix B: Social Justice Attitudes Scale

This following statements ask you to indicate how important or how much you value the following activities. Please answer these questions based, not on whether you actually engage in these activities, but whether you feel that these activities are important and worthwhile. Please indicate the degree to which you either agree to disagree with the following value statements on a 7-point scale, with 1 = strongly disagree, and 7 = strongly agree.

Social Justice Attitudes subscale

*I believe that it is important to*....

Make sure that all individuals and groups have a chance to speak and be heard, especially those from traditionally ignored or marginalized groups.

Allow individuals and groups to define and describe their problems, experiences, and goals in their own terms.

Talk to others about societal systems of power, privilege, and oppression.

Try to change larger social conditions that cause individual suffering and impede well-being.

Help individuals and groups to pursue their chosen goals in life.

Promote the physical and emotional well-being of individuals and groups.

Respect and appreciate people’s diverse social identities.

Allow others to have meaningful input into decisions affecting their lives.

Support community organizations and institutions that help individuals and groups achieve their aims.
Promote fair and equitable allocation of bargaining powers, obligations, and resources in our society.

Act for social justice.

*Perceived Behavioral Control around Social Justice*

I am confident that I can have a positive impact on others’ lives.

I am certain that I possess an ability to work with individuals and groups in ways that are empowering.

If I choose to do so, I am capable of influencing others to promote fairness and equality.

I feel confident in my ability to talk to others about social injustices and the impact of social conditions on health and well-being.

I am certain that if I try, I can have a positive impact on my community.

*Subjective Norms around Social Justice*

Other people around me are engaged in activities that address social justice issues.

Other people around me feel that it is important to engage in dialogue around societal injustices.

Other people around me are supportive of efforts that promote social justice.

Other people around me are aware of issues of social injustices and power inequalities in our society.

*Intentions to Engage in Social Justice*

In the future, I will do my best to ensure that all individuals and groups in my community have a chance to speak and be heard.
In the future, I intend to talk with others about social power inequalities, social injustices, and the impact of social forces on health and well-being.

In the future, I intend to engage in activities that will promote social justice.

In the future, I intend to work collaboratively with others so that they can define their own problems and build their own capacity to solve problems.
Appendix C: Permission to Use ExCEL

Subject: RE: ExCEL
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2015 7:00:26 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Lombardi, Allison
To: Busch, Carey

Hi Carey,

Thank you for your interest in the ExCEL survey, which has been renamed the Inclusive Teaching Practices Inventory (ITSI). My colleagues and I developed the measure over several phases. I attached two articles that include some further information on the development and use in research studies.

You have my permission to use the measure, either the earlier form of the ExCEL survey or the revised ITSI. Also, you have my permission to use certain subscales that align with your research study, and discard others. I ask that you delete whole subscales, as opposed to specific items, simply to maintain the integrity of the measure. Also, please cite the relevant article depending on which version you use.

Kind regards,
Allison

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
Allison Lombardi, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Psychology
Neag School of Education
University of Connecticut
249 Glenbrook Road Unit 3964
Storrs, CT 06269-3064
(860) 486-2213
allison.lombardi@uconn.edu
http://education.uconn.edu/allison-lombardi/
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

From: Busch, Carey [buschc@ohio.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 4:06 PM
To: Lombardi, Allison
Subject: ExCEL

Dear Dr. Lombardi,

My name is Carey Busch and I am a doctoral student in the Counselor Education department at Ohio University. Presently I am developing my dissertation proposal and am interested in using the Expanding Cultural Awareness of Exceptional Learners. My dissertation is focused on understanding the attitudes of university faculty members toward students with disabilities and implementing accommodations. One aspect I am interested in is the relationship of faculty attitude with social justice orientation.

I would like to ask your permission to use ExCEL. I hope to use the ExCEL as well as a second scale which measures social justice orientation and deliver both electronically. Depending upon the total length of the combined scales I might want to explore delivering the ExCEL without the factors that assess Universal Design since that does not directly relate to my research questions.

I appreciate your consideration and look forward to your response.

Carey Busch
Doctoral Student
Counselor Education
Appendix D: Permission to Use SJS

Subject: RE: Social Justice Scale
Date: Thursday, April 2, 2015 3:36:39 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Susan Torres-Harding
To: Busch, Carey

What a great topic for a dissertation! I hope that you find some interesting information and eventually publish it—this seems really important for us educators in terms of understanding how good a job we as faculty and the university at large are able to support students with disabilities.

There is no permission needed to use the scale. Just consider it as public domain and use as you see fit.

Here is a copy of the original article describing the psychometric development and a copy of the scale itself.

Good luck with your study!

Susan

From: Busch, Carey [mailto:buschc@ohio.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 2:23 PM
To: Susan Torres-Harding
Subject: Social Justice Scale

Dear Dr. Torres-Harding,

My name is Carey Busch and I am a doctoral student in the Counselor Education department at Ohio University. Presently I am developing my dissertation proposal and am interested in using the Social Justice Scale. My dissertation is focused on understanding the attitudes of university faculty members toward students with disabilities and implementing accommodations. One aspect I am interested in is the relationship of faculty attitude with social justice orientation.

I would like to ask your permission to use the SJS. I hope to use the SJS as well as a second scale which measures faculty attitudes towards students with disabilities and deliver both electronically.

I appreciate your consideration and look forward to your response.

Carey Busch
Doctoral Student
Counselor Education
Ohio University
Appendix E: Survey of Faculty

Default Question Block

You are being asked to participate in research. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected. Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to participate in this study. You may print a copy of this document to take with you.

Explanation of Study
- This study is being done to better understand factors that contribute to faculty attitude toward students with disabilities and willingness to accommodate in postsecondary educational environments.
- If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a survey that will ask a series of questions regarding attitude and knowledge related to disability and accommodations, some questions about orientation to social justice, and some demographic information about yourself.

You should not participate in this study if
- you are not employed by Ohio University
- you are not employed at least half-time in a teaching capacity
- you are employed full-time, but less than half your position is teaching
- you are under the age of 18 years

Your participation in the study will take approximately 15 minutes and no longer than 20 minutes.

Risks and Discomforts

No risks or discomforts are anticipated

Benefits

This study is important to science/society because understanding how to foster positive faculty attitudes toward students with disabilities and willingness to accommodate will improve post-secondary educational attainment for students with disabilities. This increased educational access will result in improved lifetime outcomes such as increased employability, greater salary potential and reduced levels of poverty for some people with disabilities.

You may not benefit, personally by participating in this study.

Compensation
Those who complete the survey will have the opportunity to enter their email to win one of four $50 gift cards to Amazon. The odds of winning will be about 1 in 50. Those who do not complete the survey will receive no compensation.

Confidentiality and Records

Your study information will be kept confidential by anonymous data collection. For maximum confidentiality, please clear your browser history and close the browser before leaving the computer.

Additionally, while every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:

* Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility is to protect human subjects in research;
* Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU;

Contact Information

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact the investigator Carey Busch, cb958493@ohio.edu, 614-204-5254 or the advisor Dr. Christine Suniti Bhat, bhatc@ohio.edu, 740-593-4425.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Dr. Chris Hayhow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664 or hayhow@ohio.edu.

By agreeing to participate in this study, you are agreeing that:
- you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered;
- you have been informed of potential risks and they have been explained to your satisfaction;
- you understand Ohio University has no funds set aside for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this study;
- you are 18 years of age or older;
- your participation in this research is completely voluntary;
- you may leave the study at any time; if you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Faculty attitude, willingness, and knowledge

The following sections will touch on your beliefs, practices, and knowledge related to students with disabilities and accommodations in post-secondary education. Please select the option that best represents your response to the statements.
I am willing to allow students with documented disabilities to use technology (e.g., laptop, calculator, spell checker) to complete tests even when such technologies are not permitted for use by students without disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am willing to arrange extended time on exams for students who have documented disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am willing to allow students with documented disabilities to take proctored exams in a supervised location outside of the normal exam location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Providing testing accommodations (such as extended exam time) to students with documented disabilities is unfair to students without disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am willing to extend the due dates of assignments to accommodate the needs of students with documented disabilities when necessary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Providing teaching accommodations to students with documented disabilities is unfair to students without disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Providing accommodations to students with disabilities is a way to ensure equal opportunity and access to learning in higher education settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe that students with disabilities use the disability as an excuse when they are not doing well in my class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I make individual accommodations for students who have disclosed their disability to me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Block 2**

I am confident in my understanding of the legal definition of disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I am confident in my understanding of the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am confident in my understanding of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Currently, I do not have sufficient knowledge to make adequate accommodations for students with disabilities in my course(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am aware of assistive technology that students with disabilities can use to aid their understanding of course material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Block 3

I am willing to allow a student with a documented disability to complete extra credit assignments for academic success even when this option is not stated on the course syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I am willing to allow any student to complete extra credit assignments in my course(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am willing to reduce the overall course reading load for a student with a documented disability even when I would not allow a reduced reading load for other students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am willing to extend the due dates of assignments to accommodate the needs of students with documented disabilities when necessary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am willing to change the method of responding on exams (e.g., from written to oral) for students with documented disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I would like to modify curricular aspects of my course(s) in order to create a more inclusive learning environment for all students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I am willing to provide additional time to complete assignments in my course(s) to any student who expresses a need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Block 4

I am willing to spend extra time (i.e., in addition to normal office hours) helping any student prepare for an exam or review course material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am willing to spend extra time (i.e., in addition to typical office hours) meeting with students with documented disabilities to clarify and/or review course related content or prepare for an upcoming exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At times, I feel burdened when students with disabilities approach me with accommodation requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Making adequate accommodations for students with documented disabilities in my courses is unrealistic given time constraints and other job demands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Block 5
I am willing to provide copies of my lecture notes or outlines to students with documented disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am willing to provide copies of my overheads and/or PowerPoint presentations to students with documented disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am willing to use technology so that my course material can be available in a variety of formats (e.g. podcast of lecture available for download, course readings available as mp3 files)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I am willing to allow students with documented disabilities to record class sessions when necessary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I put my lecture notes online for all students (on Blackboard or another website)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Block 6
Students with disabilities are able to compete academically at the university level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe that students with learning disabilities can be successful at the university level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Typically, students with disabilities do not perform as well as the rest of the students in my course(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Students with disabilities should be able to perform just as well as students without disabilities in my course(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Block 7**

The following statements ask you to indicate how important or how much you value the following activities. Please answer these questions based, not on whether you actually engage in these activities, but whether you feel that these activities are important and worthwhile. Please indicate the degree to which you either agree to disagree with the following value statements.
I believe it is important to make sure that all individuals and groups have a chance to speak and be heard, especially those from traditionally ignored or marginalized groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe it is important to allow individuals and groups to define and describe their problems, experiences, and goals in their own terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe it is important to talk to others about societal systems of power, privilege, and oppression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe it is important to try to change larger social conditions that cause individual suffering and impede well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe it is important to help individuals and groups to pursue their chosen goals in life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I believe it is important to promote the physical and emotional well-being of individuals and groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe it is important to respect and appreciate people’s diverse social identities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe it is important to allow others to have meaningful input into decisions affecting their lives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe it is important to support community organizations and institutions that help individuals and groups achieve their aims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe it is important to promote fair and equitable allocation of bargaining powers, obligations, and resources in our society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I believe it is important to act for social justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In the following set of questions, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am confident that I can have a positive impact on others’ lives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am certain that I possess an ability to work with individuals and groups in ways that are empowering.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If I choose to do so, I am capable of influencing others to promote fairness and equality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel confident in my ability to talk to others about social injustices and the impact of social conditions on health and well-being.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other people around me are engaged in activities that address social justice issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other people around me feel that it is important to engage in dialogue around societal injustices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other people around me are supportive of efforts that promote social justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other people around me are aware of issues of social injustices and power inequalities in our society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the future, I intend to talk with others about social power inequalities, social injustices, and the impact of social forces on health and well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the future, I intend to engage in activities that will promote social justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the future, I intend to work collaboratively with others so that they can define their own problems and build their own capacity to solve problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Block 9

This final section will ask you a few questions about yourself and your position at Ohio University. Upon completion you will be given the opportunity to enter your email address for a chance to win one of four $50 Amazon gift cards.

How many years have you taught in a college or university setting including your experience at Ohio University?

How many years have you taught at Ohio University?

Please select your academic rank.
- Full Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor/Adjunct Faculty
- Other

Are you employed at least half-time in a teaching capacity at Ohio University?
- Yes
- No
Are you tenured faculty?
- Yes
- No

Is your position tenure track?
- Yes
- No

Please indicate your academic department.

Select the category best describes the total number of students with disabilities that you have taught in any college or university setting?
- None
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 10-15
- More than 15

About what percentage of students you teach are undergraduate students?

Please select all professional development activities related to disability/accessibility in which you have engaged.

- Presentation by disability services staff at the university
- Professional conference sessions
- Webinars
- Independent reading or research
- Other: Please describe

Select the gender with which you most identify.

- Male
- Female
- Transgender
- None of the above.

Do you consider yourself to be a person with a disability?

- Yes
- No

Do you have a family member who is a person with a disability?

- Yes
- No
Please select the ethnicity or ethnicities with which you most identify.

- American Indian or Native Alaskan
- Asian
- Black/African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Island
- Other
- White

What is your age?

For which campus do you primarily teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>Chillicothe</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Ecampus</th>
<th>Lancaster (including Pickerington Center)</th>
<th>Southern (including Proctorville Center)</th>
<th>Zanesville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix F: Recruitment Invitation

Dear Faculty,

You are invited to participate in a study regarding faculty attitude toward students with disabilities and willingness to accommodate students. This study is being done specifically to better understand factors that contribute to faculty attitude and willingness in postsecondary educational environments.

If you are a member of the faculty who is employed at least half-time with a primary responsibility of teaching, you are eligible to participate. Upon completion of the survey you will have the opportunity to enter your email address to win one of four $50 Amazon gift cards.

To take the survey, please click on the link below:

LINK

The information that you provide will be used for research purposes only and will be kept strictly confidential. Questions regarding the research may be directed to Carey Busch at cb958493@ohio.edu or by phone at 614-204-5254 or the faculty advisor, Dr. Christine Suniti Bhat at bhatc@ohio.edu or 740-593-4425.

Thank you for your time in completing this survey.

Carey Busch  
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education 
Department of Counseling and Higher Education 
Ohio University
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