The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)
Volume 14, Issue 4, October- December, 2026
DIP: 18.01.055.20261404, DOI: 10.25215/1404.055
https://www.ijip.in

Research Paper

Exploring Young Adults' Knowledge and Ethical Views on Modern Eugenics

Bibuti Rajbhandari[1]*

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between attitudes towards persons with disabilities and acceptance of modern eugenic beliefs among young adults in India. It focuses on the complexity of Attitudes towards emerging genetic technologies with an understanding of ethical perceptions surrounding disability and reproduction. A quantitative cross-sectional design was employed using anonymous participants of the age range 18 to 25, with varying educational levels. The attitude towards disability was measured using the Attitudes towards Disabled Persons (ATDP) scale, Yuker, Block, and Young (1970). Acceptance of eugenic beliefs was recovered using 15 item Modern Eugenics Acceptance Scale Cheung, B. Y., Schmalor, A., & Heine, S. J., 2021). Pearson correlation analysis revealed a significant negative relationship between attitudes towards disabled persons and eugenic acceptance ($r = -.388$, $p < .001$), indicating that more positive attitudes towards disability were associated with lower acceptance of eugenic ideologies. A two-way ANOVA indicated that the gender difference was not significant ($p = .392$), whereas education level significantly influenced eugenic acceptance; the interaction between gender and education level was not significant *($p = .110$)*. These findings suggest that attitudes towards disability and educational background play an important role in shaping ethical perspectives towards modern eugenic beliefs and genetic decision making.

Keywords: *Disability, Eugenics, Social acceptance, Ethical beliefs, Education, Young adults*

The introduction of the theory of eugenics during the 20th century led to it being split into two aspects: positive (the creation/ promotion of fit genes) and negative (discouraging and prohibiting the procreation of unfit genes). The negative turn of eugenics led the way to compulsory sterilization in many countries, which birthed the process of racial hygiene and genocide, the most prominent being the nazi government. Eugenics throughout history has had a bad reputation. What was once an idea for the advancement of the human genetic makeup was defamed and used to justify racial profiling. These attitudes are closely linked to a broader system of prejudice, which Allport (1954) described as learned negative evaluations directed towards particular social groups.

One widely used measure of disability attitudes is the attitude towards disabled persons (ATDP) scale (Yuker et al., 1970), which assesses what assessors generally believe about the

[1]Student, AIPS Amity institute of psychology and allied sciences Amity University Noida
*Corresponding Author

Received: October 17, 2026; Revision Received: November 02, 2026; Accepted: November 08, 2026

© 2026, Rajbhandari, B.; licensee IJIP. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

capabilities, social roles, and perceived normality of individuals with experiences of disabilities. Research demonstrated that negative attitudes towards disabilities are associated with increased social distance and discriminatory beliefs. (Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005).

Understanding these attitudes is important because they may extend beyond individual perception and influence broader ethical viewpoints. One of the examples on the significations of learning about the source of disability is understanding the important role it plays in the beliefs related to eugenics. Eugenics, defined as the attempt to improve the genetic quality of the population through selective reproduction and sterilization, has a highly controversial and ethically troubling history. (Kevles, 1985) In recent times there have been complex ethical questions as the discussions around genetic screening and reproductive decision-making rise. The beliefs of value, normality and desirability of certain traits, particularly the exclusion of disability, may reflect an underlying support for eugenic ideas.

Significance of the study

The present study contributes to the growing body of research examining ethical attitudes towards modernity eugenics by exploring their psychological foundations. While it is true that historically speaking eugenics has primarily focused on politics and racial analysis fewer studies in recent times have investigated in individual attitudes that maybe influenced from temporary acceptance of eugenic ideas. The study provides an insight into examining how everyday social perceptions may shape ethical judgments about reproduction genetics, and human differences by looking into the relationship between attitudes towards disability and acceptance of eugenic beliefs. With the rapid advancement in genetic technologies, understanding the relationship is particularly important. As scientific developments increasingly allow individuals to make productive decisions based on genetic information, public attitudes towards disability may play a significant role in shaping more reasoned policy support.

Theoretical significance

From a theoretical perspective, this study aims to extend the existing psychological research on prejudice and social acceptance by examining how attitude towards disability relate to ethical beliefs about modern eugenics. Previous studies of stigma and prejudice suggest that negative perceptions towards marginalized social groups influence broader social judgment and moral decision making. This study focuses on the relationship between disability and acceptance of eugenic beliefs, which supposes the idea that ethical viewpoints are not formed in isolation but are shaped by underlying social attitudes and values.

Additionally, this study focuses on two fields of literature that are often studied separately: disability attitudes and bioethical decision making. While research has extensively examined stigma towards disability and historical discussions of eugenics, not many studies have simultaneously tested how everyday practices or reproductive control ideas. The findings of this study, therefore, provide theoretical support for arguments that the societal definition of normality and desirability influences moral reasoning about reproduction and human diversity.

1.2.2 Practical significance

The study highlights why attitudes towards disability matter beyond interpersonal behavior. With the genetic technologies being more accessible, like prenatal testing and genetic editing, the results suggest that beliefs about disability may influence how individuals evaluate real-world ethical issues. Understanding these Influences can help educators and policymakers

recognize the importance of psychological importance of promoting disability awareness and inclusive attitudes when discussing genetic decision making and public health policies.

The findings of this study also have implications for Educational and Awareness Programs for reducing stigma against the disabled and differently abled. Theoretically, if the acceptance of eugenic ideas is partly rooted in a negative perception of disability, then improving social understanding and representation of disability may encourage a more ethically present attitude.

By focusing on a young adult population, the study provides an insight into the attitudes of individuals who will increasingly participate in future social norms, medical, and political decision making. Focusing on societal response can help research and interventions aim at a more inclusive and ethically informed societal attitude.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Antonak and Livneh (2000) reviewed major theoretical and methodological approaches used to study attitudes toward persons with disabilities. They emphasized that disability attitudes include cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components influenced by social learning and cultural norms. The authors highlighted the importance of standardized measurement tools such as the ATDP scale for producing reliable findings.

Stone-MacDonald and Butera (2014) Stone-MacDonald and Butera (2014) examined cultural perceptions of disability and found that societal beliefs strongly influence acceptance levels. Traditional explanations of disability often contributed to stigma, while education and exposure promoted more inclusive attitudes. The study demonstrated that attitudes toward disability are shaped largely by social environments.

Scior (2011) conducted a review of public attitudes toward individuals with intellectual disabilities across different countries. The findings indicated that a lack of knowledge and limited interaction contribute to negative stereotypes. Increased familiarity and social contact were associated with more positive and accepting attitudes. Wilson and Scior (2015) performed a systematic review investigating factors influencing public attitudes toward intellectual disability. Results showed that education, awareness programs, and direct interpersonal contact significantly improve acceptance. The study supported the idea that attitudes can change through social exposure.

Greenwald and Banaji (1995) introduced the concept of implicit social cognition, suggesting that individuals may hold unconscious biases despite expressing positive explicit attitudes. Their work explains why stigma toward disability may persist even when people consciously endorse equality. This framework is important for understanding hidden prejudice. Nowicki and Sandieson (2002) investigated children's attitudes toward peers with disabilities. The study found that children who had prior interaction with disabled classmates demonstrated greater acceptance and willingness for social inclusion. The results supported the role of early social contact in reducing prejudice.

Yuker (1994) analyzed cross-cultural research on disability attitudes and concluded that cultural expectations and societal norms significantly influence perceptions of disability. Differences were observed across countries regarding acceptance and inclusion. The study emphasized that attitudes toward disability are socially constructed. Symons et al. (2014) explored medical students' attitudes toward individuals with intellectual disabilities. Findings

indicated that clinical exposure and professional education improved empathy and acceptance. However, some negative stereotypes persisted, suggesting the need for improved disability-focused training. Iezzoni et al. (2021) reviewed healthcare professionals' attitudes toward persons with disabilities and identified ongoing biases affecting quality of care. Despite medical training, some professionals demonstrated assumptions about the reduced quality of life among disabled individuals. The study highlighted the importance of attitude-based interventions in healthcare education. Findler et al. (2007) evaluated psychological scales used to measure disability attitudes and emphasized the need for reliable and valid instruments. Their research supported multidimensional assessment approaches to better capture social perceptions of disability.

Yuker, Block, and Campbell (1960) developed the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons (ATDP) scale to measure generalized attitudes toward individuals with disabilities. The scale was designed to assess perceptions of similarity between disabled and non-disabled individuals. It has since become one of the most widely used tools in disability attitude research due to its strong psychometric properties. Gething (1994) introduced the Interaction with Disabled Persons Scale to measure emotional discomfort experienced during social interactions with disabled individuals. The study demonstrated that anxiety and uncertainty often influence social behavior toward disabled persons. The scale provided insight into the emotional components of disability attitudes. Antonak and Harth (1994) developed the Mental Retardation Attitude Inventory to assess beliefs regarding intellectual disability and community inclusion. Their findings suggested that attitudes are influenced by education, familiarity, and societal norms. The instrument contributed to improved measurement of social acceptance.

Henry et al. (1996) validated the Community Living Attitudes Scale, which measures public support for integrating individuals with intellectual disabilities into community settings. The study found that empowerment and perceived similarity predicted positive attitudes toward inclusion. Rosenbaum et al. (1986) developed the PATHS scale to evaluate peer attitudes toward children with disabilities. Their research demonstrated that school environments and peer interaction significantly influence acceptance levels among students. Antonak, Fiedler, and Mulick (1993) created a scale measuring attitudes toward eugenic practices related to disability. The study examined ethical beliefs regarding reproduction, sterilization, and genetic selection. Results supported the reliability of the scale in assessing modern eugenic attitudes. Kobe and Mulick (1995) investigated relationships between education and attitudes toward eugenics. Their findings showed that individuals with greater knowledge and contact with disabled persons expressed lower support for restrictive reproductive policies. The study highlighted education as a protective factor against eugenic thinking.

Dar-Nimrod and Heine (2011) examined genetic essentialism and found that strong beliefs in genetic determinism increased acceptance of inequality and eugenic ideas. The study suggested that biological explanations of behavior can unintentionally reinforce social bias. Phelan (2005) explored how perceptions of genetic responsibility influence social attitudes.

The study showed that individuals were more supportive of reproductive restrictions when conditions were viewed as hereditary, linking stigma with genetic explanations. Conrad and Barker (2010) analyzed the social construction of illness and stigma, demonstrating how societal beliefs shape moral judgments about health conditions. Their work explained how stigma contributes to discriminatory social policies. Oliver (1990) introduced the social model of disability, arguing that disability results primarily from societal barriers rather than

individual impairments. This perspective shifted research focus toward accessibility, inclusion, and social responsibility. Shakespeare (2006) expanded disability theory by integrating both medical and social perspectives. He argued that disability should be understood through a balanced approach, acknowledging biological realities and social influences.

Campbell (2009) discussed the concept of ableism, describing systemic discrimination that privileges non-disabled individuals. The study emphasized how cultural norms shape perceptions of normality and difference. Barnes (1991) analyzed historical representations of disability and demonstrated how negative portrayals contributed to long-standing social exclusion. The research highlighted the role of media and cultural narratives in shaping attitudes. Corrigan and Watson (2002) examined stigma processes and explained how stereotypes lead to prejudice and discrimination. Their framework helped explain negative social responses toward marginalized populations, including disabled individuals. Link and Phelan (2001) conceptualized stigma as a social process involving labeling, stereotyping, separation, and discrimination. Their model provided a theoretical basis for understanding disability-related prejudice. Allport (1954) proposed the contact hypothesis, suggesting that interaction between groups reduces prejudice under appropriate conditions. This theory supports research showing that familiarity improves attitudes toward disabled persons.

Kevles (1995) examined the historical development of the eugenics movement and its influence on public policy and science. The work highlighted how scientific ideas were used to justify social inequality. Paul (1995) analyzed ethical debates surrounding eugenics and emphasized the dangers of applying biological determinism to social policy. The study underscored the importance of ethical safeguards in genetic research. Stern (2005) documented compulsory sterilization programs and their roots in early twentieth-century eugenic ideology. The research demonstrated how scientific authority was used to legitimize discrimination.

Gould (1981) critiqued biological determinism and exposed methodological flaws in intelligence testing used to support eugenic claims. His work challenged assumptions about hereditary superiority. Black (2003) provided a historical account of global eugenics movements, illustrating how genetic theories influenced discriminatory policies. The study emphasized the ethical consequences of misusing science. Selden (1999) explored connections between eugenics and immigration policy, showing how genetic assumptions shaped racial exclusion. The research demonstrated the political impact of scientific ideology. Gyngell, Douglas, and Savulescu (2017) discussed ethical debates surrounding modern genetic technologies and reproductive selection. The authors argued that contemporary genetic interventions raise concerns similar to historical eugenics.

Ajzen (1991) proposed the Theory of Planned Behavior, explaining how attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control influence intentions and behaviors. The theory has been widely applied to understand social attitudes and ethical decision-making. It provides a useful framework for examining acceptance of eugenic practices based on personal beliefs. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) developed the Theory of Reasoned Action, suggesting that attitudes directly influence behavioral intentions. Their work explains how beliefs about disability or genetics may shape support for reproductive policies and social judgments.

Fiske et al. (2002) introduced the Stereotype Content Model, proposing that social groups are evaluated based on warmth and competence. Disabled individuals are often stereotyped as

warm but incompetent, contributing to paternalistic prejudice. Goffman (1963) conceptualized stigma as a socially constructed attribute that discredits individuals within society. His work remains foundational in understanding discrimination toward marginalized populations, including persons with disabilities. Weiner (1995) developed attribution theory explaining how perceptions of responsibility influence emotional and behavioral responses. Disabilities perceived as uncontrollable tend to evoke sympathy, whereas controllable conditions may lead to blame and rejection.

Haslam (2006) examined psychological essentialism and showed that beliefs about biological determinism increase stereotyping and social exclusion. Such beliefs are closely linked to support for eugenic thinking. Dar-Nimrod et al. (2013) demonstrated that genetic explanations for behavior can increase fatalistic thinking and reduce perceived personal agency. Their findings suggest that genetic framing influences ethical judgments about reproduction.

Lantz et al. (2005) investigated social determinants of health and found that socioeconomic inequality strongly shapes public health outcomes. Their research challenges biological determinism by emphasizing environmental influences. Parens and Asch (2000) discussed ethical concerns surrounding prenatal genetic testing and disability rights. They argued that selective reproduction decisions may reinforce negative societal views toward disability.

Asch (2003) critically examined prenatal screening practices and emphasized the ethical tension between reproductive autonomy and disability acceptance. The study highlighted concerns about implicit modern eugenics. Shakespeare (1998) explored disability identity and argued that social exclusion, rather than impairment itself, creates disadvantage. The study reinforced the importance of societal attitudes in shaping lived experiences.

Bogdan and Biklen (1977) analyzed historical perspectives on disability and demonstrated how institutionalization reinforced stigma and segregation. Their work contributed to deinstitutionalization movements. Hahn (1988) examined political and social barriers faced by disabled individuals and argued that discrimination arises from environmental limitations rather than physical impairment alone. Nussbaum (2006) proposed the Capability Approach, emphasizing equal opportunities and dignity for individuals regardless of ability. Her framework supports ethical arguments against discriminatory reproductive policies. Savulescu (2001) introduced the principle of procreative beneficence, arguing that parents may have moral reasons to select genetically advantaged traits. The theory sparked debates about modern forms of eugenics. Habermas (2003) discussed the ethical implications of genetic enhancement and warned that genetic selection could threaten human equality and autonomy. His work remains influential in bioethical discussions of eugenics.

Research gap

There has been limited research that has examined the direct relationship between attitudes towards disability and acceptance of beliefs of eugenics, despite the historical and ethical relevance of these issues. It is plausible that individuals who portray negative attitudes towards disability may be more likely to endorse eugenic principles, given that both involve judgments about social hierarchy and human difference. The previous studies focus on bioethical conundrums from a medical perspective and public acceptance of genetic technologies without considering how underlying social attitudes towards disability may influence.

Additionally, much of the research has been conducted in the Western population leaving a major gap in research among the non-western Cultural context, especially among young

Indian adults. Different criteria, such as cultural values, societal norms, and educational exposure, shape ethical judgment differently; these factors are underexplored. Furthermore, prior studies emphasize the understanding of technological Awareness and genetic knowledge rather than psychological variables such as personal belief, social attitude, and value system. There is also a limited qualitative Research on using standardized attitude measures to examine how the perception of a disability relates to acceptance or rejection of modern eugenic practices statistically.

This study attempts to bridge the gap by investigating the relationship between attitudes towards persons with disabilities and acceptance of modern eugenics among young adults, while also considering demographic factors such as gender, education, and employment status.

Hypothesis of the study

- Null hypothesis H01- There is no significant relationship between attitudes towards Persons with disabilities and acceptance of modern eugenics practices among young adults.
- Alternative hypothesis H1- There is a significant relationship between attitude towards persons with disabilities and acceptance of modern eugenic practices among young adults.
- Null hypothesis H02A- There are no significant discrepancies in the result or the outcome between the genders.
- Alternative hypothesis H2A: There is a significant discrepancy in the result or the outcome between the genders.
- Null hypothesis H02B: There's no significant difference in acceptance of Modern eugenics across different education levels.
- Alternative hypothesis H2B: There is a significant difference in acceptance of modern eugenics across education levels.
- Null hypothesis H02C: There is no interaction effect between gender and education level on acceptance of modern eugenics.
- Alternative hypothesis H2C: There is a significant interaction effect between gender and education level on acceptance of modern eugenics.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

The present study adopts a quantitative correlation research design to examine relationships among Attitudes towards disabled persons and acceptance of eugenic beliefs.

Variables of the study

- Independent variable- Total attitude towards disabled person score
- Dependent variable- Eugenics Acceptance
- Relationship tested- correlation and association

Operational definition

Attitudes towards disability- General beliefs and perceptions about individuals with disabilities as measured by the Attitudes Towards Disabled Persons (ATDP) Scale.
Eugenics acceptance- And debuted, which individuals support policies or beliefs aligned with eugenic ideas as measured by the Eugenics Acceptance Questionnaire.

Objectives of the study

1. To examine the relationship between attitudes towards disability and acceptance of eugenic beliefs.
2. To determine whether attitudes toward disability predict eugenic acceptance.
3. To explore differences in Eugenics acceptance based on gender, education level, and employment status.
4. To understand psychological factors associated with ethical attitudes toward modern eugenics.

Sample

The study included 159 participants recruited through online survey distribution. Participants consisted primarily of young adults who voluntarily completed the questionnaire via a Google Forms link shared through social media and academic networks. Participation was anonymous, and no identifying information was collected. The sample included individuals of different genders, educational levels, and employment statuses. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 25, with gender categorized as female, male, or other.

Tools used

Attitude towards disabled persons scale

Attitudes towards the differently abled were measured using the Attitudes Towards Disabled Persons scale developed by Yuker, Block, and Young(1970). The scale assesses general perception and beliefs about individuals with disabilities and evaluates the extent to which respondents perceive persons with disabilities as similar to or different from non disabled individual.

The questionnaire consists of multiple statements rated in a Likert-type scale ranging from 1=Strongly disagree to 6= strongly agree. Several items were reversed in order to analyze to ensure a consistent interpretation of responses. Higher total scores indicated more positive attitudes towards individuals with disabilities Whereas low scores could be interpreted as having a negative attitude towards the acceptance of disabled people.

Eugenics Acceptance Measure

For the Assessment of acceptance of eugenic beliefs, the shortened version of the questionnaire of 15 items was used, Cheung, B. Y., Schmalor, A., & Heine, S. J. (2021), which measured attitudes towards genetic selection, reproductive control, and policies related to population improvement. Participants responded to different statements, which included government intervention in reproductive decision making and genetic regulation, using a Likert-type response scale ranging from 1= Strongly Disagree, and 5= Strongly Disagree. A higher score reflected greater acceptance of eugenic beliefs. A composite score was calculated summarizing responses across all items.

Procedure of data collection

Data was collected using an online survey format. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study and provided informed consent before participation. Sentinel identifying information was collected; the participation was anonymous. The questionnaires were administered in a fixed order. Participants were allowed to withdraw at any stage without penalty.

Ethical considerations

Ethical participations were strictly adhered to. Participation was voluntary, confidentiality was maintained, and no identifying information was collected. The study involved no physical or psychological risk to the participant.

Assumption of the study

Participants responded honestly to the questionnaires.
Online data collection accurately reflects participants' experiences.
The instruments used are valid and reliable for the young adult population.

Limitations

- Restricted age groups - The results may not reflect the knowledge or the ethical viewpoints of adolescents, older adults, or professionals in the related field since the research focuses on young adults.
- Conceptual complexity- Modern eugenics is a nuanced and sensitive topic. Some participants may not have fully understood all the concepts despite explanations affecting response accuracy.
- Culture and social influence- Ethical opinions are shaped by culture, religion, and societal norms and values, which are not controlled for in their study.
- Online/structured questionnaire limitation- The format restricted deeper exploration of participants' responses pertaining to emotions or moral conflict that qualitative interviews might have otherwise revealed.
- Self-report bias- Data were collected through self reported response, meaning participants may have answered based on social desirability or personal perception rather than their own true beliefs.
- Time constraints of the Capstone project limited the study to a cross sectional design rather than a longitudinal investigation.

Delimitations

- The study specifically focused on young adults, intentionally excluding adolescents and older age groups to maintain a clear developmental factor.
- Participants were selected from a limited geographical and educational context, which helps maintain consistency and restricts diversity in perspective.
- Only general awareness and ethical attitudes were the study did not assess participants' actual behavior or decision making in real-life genetic situations.
- The research emphasized perception and opinions, not scientific accuracy or depth of genetic knowledge.

Statistical analysis plan

The statistical analysis for the present study was conducted using the statistical analysis package for the Social Sciences (IBM SPSS Statistics 21). Before the hypothesis testing, there was a pilot study conducted of 30 Participants to check for accuracy, completeness, and suitability for paramedic analysis. Data cleaning procedure included checking for missing values, identifying potential appliers and verifying correct data entry. For attitudes towards disabled persons, it required some of the Items be reversed according to the scoring manual before computing the total scores. Pearson's moment correlation analysis was conducted to examine the bivariate relationship between attitude towards a disabled person acceptance, and eugenic beliefs. The level of statistical significance was set at $P<.05$.

RESULTS

Table 1 Correlations

		ATDPTOT	EUGTOT
ATDPTOT	Pearson Correlation	1	-.388**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	159	159
EUGTOT	Pearson Correlation	-.388**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	159	159

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

Table 2 Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
gender	1	female	87
	2	male	72
education	1	undergraduate	102
	2	postgraduate	41
	3	highschool	16

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: EUGTOT

Gender	Education	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
female	undergraduate	2.8041	.71782	49
	postgraduate	2.4129	.86742	31
	highschool	3.4952	.34610	7
	Total	2.7203	.80334	87
male	undergraduate	2.4428	.75267	53
	postgraduate	2.7000	1.01556	10
	highschool	2.9333	.89505	9
	Total	2.5398	.81620	72
Total	undergraduate	2.6163	.75462	102
	postgraduate	2.4829	.90108	41
	highschool	3.1792	.74703	16
	Total	2.6386	.81164	159

Table 4 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: EUGTOT

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	10.910[a]	5	2.182	3.583	.004	.105
Intercept	662.388	1	662.388	1087.705	.000	.877
gender	.951	1	.951	1.562	.213	.010
education	5.276	2	2.638	4.332	.015	.054
gender * education	2.880	2	1.440	2.364	.097	.030
Error	93.174	153	.609			
Total	1211.053	159				
Corrected Total	104.083	158				

a. R Squared = .105 (Adjusted R Squared = .076)

DISCUSSION

Overview of the study

The present study aims to examine the impact of social norms and values regarding the attitude towards disabled persons and the acceptance of eugenics beliefs in young adults of India. This study also investigated whether demographic variables such as gender and education level influence the acceptance of modern eugenic practices. The study examined whether acceptance of modern eugenics differed across demographic groups using factorial ANOVA.

Hypothesis 1

The null hypothesis stated that there would be no significant relationship between attitudes toward persons with disabilities and acceptance of modern eugenics among young adults whereas alternative hypothesis propose that significant relationship exists between these two variables The result of Pearson correlation analysis revealed a significant negative relationship between attitudes to a persons with disability and acceptance of modern eugenics ($r = -.388$, $p < .001$)Hence the null hypothesis was rejected and alternative hypothesis was accepted which indicated that individuals with more positive attitude towards the individuals with disabilities showed low acceptance of modern eugenic practices.

Hypothesis 2A

Null hypothesis H02A stated that there would be no significant difference in acceptance of eugenics between male and female participants, while the alternative hypothesis H2A proposed that significant gender differences would exist. The ANOVA indicated no significant effect of gender on acceptance score ($p = .392$). Thus, the null hypothesis was retained, and the alternative hypothesis was not supported, suggesting that the genders did not differ significantly in the acceptance of eugenics.

Hypothesis 2B

The null hypothesis H02B proposed that there would be no significant difference in acceptance of Eugenics across education levels whereas the alternative hypothesis H2B stated that significant differences would be present the analysis revealed that statistical significance affected the education levels on acceptance score That is why the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted which meant that the acceptance of eugenics varies according to the participants' educational background.

Hypothesis 2C

The null hypothesis H02C Stated that there would be no interaction effect between the gender and the education level on the scale of acceptance of eugenics while the alternative hypothesis H2C suggested a significant interaction effect the result showed the interaction between gender and education level was not statistically significant ($p = .110$) therefore the null hypothesis was adopted indicating that influence of education level on acceptance of modern eugenics was similar across genders.

Theoretical implications

The present study contributes to the fields of social and ethical psychology by conducting a study on theoretical understanding of attitudes towards persons with disabilities and acceptance of modern eugenics the negative relationship observed supports to the theories emphasizing the role of social attitudes empathy and acceptance alongside inclusivity in shaping judgments an ethical decision making. The result suggests that perception of disability is not isolated with social attributes but are closely connected to broader ideological positions regarding genetic selection and human diversity. The significant role of education highlights

the importance of cognitive and socio-cultural learning processes in influencing ethical reasoning, understanding, and reinforcing theoretical Perceptions of education, which promotes critical thinking and informs moral social evolution.

Practical implications

This study shows several practical implications of social awareness education policy development. The findings in this study suggests that promoting positive attitudes towards personnel with disabilities through educational awareness campaigns and inclusive curriculums may reduce acceptance of discriminatory ideologies and exclusion. It also suggests that education plays an important role in integrating disability studies and ethical education when discussing the topic of biotechnology to integrate empathetic perspectives among young adults who are the future. This may encourage policymakers and mental health professionals to encourage inclusivity and ethical practices regarding advancement in genetic technologies.

Summary of discussion

The study shows a direct relation between the attitude that is portrayed towards disabled people and the acceptance of eugenics practices. The findings highlight the psychological and educational influence underlying contemporary attitudes towards disability and genetic intervention. The study also emphasizes the importance of fostering inclusive attitudes and critical ethical awareness in understanding public response to emerging biotechnological practices.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the association between attitudes towards persons with disability and the acceptance of eugenic ideologies among young adults. Participants' perspectives reflected varying levels of acceptance and concern, suggesting the beliefs about disability and genetic interventions are shaped by culture and social beliefs.

The study shows the complexity of attitudes towards emerging genetic technologies rather than establishing a definitive moral judgment. With rapid advancement in genetic technologies and an increasing ethical debate surrounding reproductive choices, the need for understanding how social attitudes influence moral perspective has become increasingly important. This study aims to examine the relationship between young adults' attitudes towards persons with disabilities and their acceptance of modern eugenic ideologies. This is important to realize whether more positive and inclusive attitudes toward disability are associated with low acceptance of eugenics beliefs.

The data of these young adult participants were collected using standardized psychological scales measuring both attitude towards disability and acceptance of eugenic concepts. After which statistical analysis was conducted to identify the strength and the nature of the relationship between the two standing variables. According to the results above, the findings indicated a meaningful relationship between the two, suggesting that individuals who demonstrate a more accepting attitude towards people with disabilities tend to show less support for eugenic ideologies.

The study highlights that genetic selection is not solely formed through scientific understandings but also social attitudes, empathy, and perception of human diversity. As genetic technologies continue to evolve, understanding these psychological factors that influence public acceptance becomes increasingly necessary. For one demographic of society,

it started to segregate. It becomes increasingly easier to find differences in all groups that are different from oneself. These findings contribute to ongoing discussions about disability rights, bioethics, and the social implications of modern genetic technologies.

REFERENCES

Antonak, R. F. (1981). Psychometric analysis of the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 26*(3), 169–176.

Antonak, R. F., & Livneh, H. (1988). *The measurement of attitudes toward people with disabilities: Methods, psychometrics, and scales.* Charles C Thomas.

Asch, A. (2003). Disability equality and prenatal testing: Contradictory or compatible? *Florida State University Law Review, 30*, 315–342.

Cheung, B. Y., Schmalor, A., & Heine, S. J. (2021). The role of genetic essentialism and genetics knowledge in support for eugenics and genetically modified foods. *PLoS ONE, 16*(9), e0257954.

Conrad, P. (2005). The shifting engines of medicalization. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 46*(1), 3–14.

Dar-Nimrod, I., & Heine, S. J. (2006). Exposure to scientific theories affects women's math performance. *Science, 314*(5798), 435.

Dar-Nimrod, I., & Heine, S. J. (2011). Genetic essentialism: On the deceptive determinism of DNA. *Psychological Bulletin, 137*(5), 800–818.

Daruwalla, P., & Darcy, S. (2005). Personal and societal attitudes to disability. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(3), 549–570.

Dovidio, J. F., Major, B., & Crocker, J. (2000). Stigma: Introduction and overview. In T. F. Heatherton, R. E. Kleck, M. R. Hebl, & J. G. Hull (Eds.), *The social psychology of stigma* (pp. 1–28). Guilford Press.

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes.* Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Ferrante, J. M., & Zola, I. K. (1987). Disability and social policy. *Social Science & Medicine, 25*(6), 683–690.

Furnham, A., & Pendred, J. (1983). Attitudes toward the mentally and physically disabled. *Journal of Social Psychology, 119*(2), 277–284.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity.* Prentice-Hall.

Heine, S. J., Dar-Nimrod, I., Cheung, B. Y., & Proulx, T. (2017). Essentially biased: Why people are fatalistic about genes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 55*, 137–192.

Keller, J. (2005). In genes we trust: The biological component of psychological essentialism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(4), 686–702.

Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology, 27*, 363–385.

Livneh, H. (1982). On the origins of negative attitudes toward people with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Literature, 43*, 338–347.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). *Frontiers of justice: Disability, nationality, species membership.* Harvard University Press.

Oliver, M. (1990). *The politics of disablement.* Macmillan.

Parens, E., & Asch, A. (2000). *Prenatal testing and disability rights.* Georgetown University Press.

Phelan, J. C., Link, B. G., & Dovidio, J. F. (2008). Stigma and prejudice: One animal or two? *Social Science & Medicine, 67*(3), 358–367.

Sandel, M. J. (2007). *The case against perfection: Ethics in the age of genetic engineering.* Harvard University Press.

Shakespeare, T. (2006). *Disability rights and wrongs.* Routledge.

Stern, A. M. (2005). *Eugenic nation: Faults and frontiers of better breeding in modern America.* University of California Press.
Vehmas, S. (2002). Is there a morally justifiable concept of disability? *Journal of Medical Ethics, 28*(3), 209–213.
Wertz, D. C., & Fletcher, J. C. (2004). Genetics and ethics in global perspective. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 30*(5), 504–507.
Wolbring, G. (2008). The politics of ableism. *Development, 51*(2), 252–258.
World Health Organization. (2011). *World report on disability.* WHO Press.
Yudell, M. (2014). *Race unmasked: Biology and race in the twentieth century.* Columbia University Press.
Zola, I. K. (1982). *Missing pieces: A chronicle of living with a disability.* Temple University Press.

Acknowledgment
The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest
The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Rajbhandari, B. (2026). Exploring Young Adults' Knowledge and Ethical Views on Modern Eugenics. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *14*(4)*,* 625-638. DIP:18.01.055.20261404, DOI:10.25215/1404.055