DISABILITY AND DATING: EXPLORING THE TWITTERSPHERE

Corresponding Author:

Kelly B. Kearney, EdD, BCBA-D

kbrown65@fau.edu

Florida Atlantic University

Department of Exceptional Student Education

777 Glades Road, Building 47

Boca Raton, Florida 33134

Sharon M. Darling, PhD

sdarlin4@fau.edu

Florida Atlantic University

Department of Exceptional Student Education

777 Glades Road, Building 47

Boca Raton, Florida 33134

Charles Dukes, EdD, PhD

cdukes@fau.edu

Florida Atlantic University

Department of Exceptional Student Education

777 Glades Road, Building 47

Boca Raton, Florida 33134

Disability and Dating: Exploring the Twittersphere

Abstract

To better understand how dating for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities might be described and explained on social media, a content analysis of tweets was conducted. Fifteen hashtags (#) about dating and disability were used to search Twitter® for the time frame, February 2010 to May 2015, generating 781 tweets. These tweets were classified using eight categories. The findings indicate that there is limited content related to dating for people with disabilities, paling in comparison to content around dating with no reference to disability. Content about disability contained several advertisements and offers of advice, absent of opportunities for connections with the potential of leading to actual dates. Essentially, the tweets around disability seemed to be a marketplace of services rather than a genuine social conversation around dating. Implications for future research are discussed. While the emerging work about relationship development in the online environment continues to grow, much remains to be investigated.

Keywords: dating, disability, Twitter®, relationships

Disability and Dating: Exploring the Twittersphere

Relationships are essential to interpersonal well-being (Morris, 1996; Christakis & Fowler, 2011). Difficulties associated with developing relationships are not inherent to disability, as friendships and intimate romantic relationships are not necessarily easy for those without disabilities (Ansari, & Klinenberg, 2015). The very nature of relationships requires maintained contact over time. Thus, the formation of a relationship requires a connection between individuals, preceded by attempts to form initial contact with another individual. People are motivated to connect with others for different reasons, based on personal desires, needs, and the like (Griskevicus et al., 2015). For example, the intent to connect with another individual may be sexual in nature without the intent of maintaining a relationship, while in another case the intent may be platonic with no intent of progression to a romantic relationship. There are many more permutations possible, but the point here is to simply illustrate the diverse and broad array of human to human connection.

There is evidence detailing some exceptional challenges for people with disabilities making connections with others as well as forming relationships (Linton & Rueda, 2015; Saltes, 2013; Ward et al., 2013). While it is difficult and perhaps inappropriate to hold disability as the sole factor moderating relationship formation, there are indications that 'disability' and associated conditions may be at least in part responsible. Clearly, individuals are unique, with different experiences, mediated by a number of factors, including the manifestation of disability. For example, disability may not always be the most salient factor in the development of relationships. For example, Pinquart and Pfieiffer (2012) report results from the Marburg Study on Vision Loss (MARVIL) indicating that adolescents with vision loss fall in love, date, and experience romantic relationships not much later in life than their sighted peers, age 14 and 13,

respectively.

Yet, individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities (IDD) have historically been perceived different, essentially 'less able,' than even other people with disabilities. In spite of a trend indicating that people without disabilities in the United States espouse more positive attitudes about people with disabilities than ever before, those with IDD are still perceived less favorably than other people with disabilities, particularly in regard to intimate relationships (Huskin et al., 2018; Seewooruttun & Scior, 2014; Miller et al., 2009). Seemingly, people without disabilities hold different perceptions about people with IDD, based on (mis)understanding of cognitive functioning (Phillips, et al., 2019; Wehmeyer, 2013). There is much too be learned from investigations involving people with disabilities as well. For instance, Bates, Terry, and Popple (2017) identified several factors that moderated partner selection by people with IDD. Some individuals selected partners based on proximity, simply because of geographic constraints on their movement. Little to no employment, as well as segregation from facets of society, where people often meet potential partners (such as a place of employment) impacted partner selection. Environmental conditions also played a significant role in the likelihood of intimate relationship development in a sample of people with disabilities, in which 92% were individuals with IDD. Specifically, those living with more individuals with disabilities were less likely to develop intimate relationships (Freidman, 2019). Each of the previous studies highlight how critical the environment may be in determining not only the opportunities those with IDD have to develop an intimate relationship, but the availability of actual potential partners as well. More needs to be learned about how exactly 'disability' may mediate relationship development, but based on what is currently known, IDD does have some impact on perceptions about prospects for relationships.

Relationship Formation in the Digital Age

The mechanisms for forming relationships have changed significantly. The exchange of information and the ease with which people can communicate with others in spite of vast distances, different work schedules, dissimilar social networks, and other constraints have been altered to a large degree (Sanri & Goodwin, 2014). The Internet and social media have introduced different types and levels of access. As more and more people utilize social media, it is now possible for people around the world to make contact with others and develop different relationships, including friendships and/or intimate romantic relationships. It is not clear if the Internet (online experiences) in general and social media in particular may remove some or perhaps a great deal of the stigma and constraining challenges facing people with IDD seeking different kinds of social relationships (Keith et al., 2015; Scior, 2011).

The knowledge base regarding the perceptions of people with IDD about social media or their online experiences is rapidly expanding (Hall, 2018; Roth & Gillis, 2014; Seymour & Lupton, 2004). For example, Saltes (2013) investigated the discourse on disability, identity, and disclosure online and suggests that online dating and interactions force people with disabilities to "confront their impairment and self-identity that is atypical in offline interaction" (p. 107). The development of an online profile and the resulting social exchanges may require people with IDD to develop a new personal stance when developing and maintaining a relationship. In a survey of individuals on the autism spectrum, it was reported that while many used online dating, there were concerns about developing a profile that may include descriptions of social deficits as well as conducting interactions that maintained safety from potentially unsavory individuals preying on vulnerable people (Roth & Gillis, 2014). Decisions about an 'identity-first' versus 'person-first' stance are not new for people with disabilities, but the online platform may present

new dimensions to the process by which relationships are formed. Shpigelman and Gill (2014)

surveyed 58 adults with IDD about their use of Facebook and identified that their use was similar

to non-disabled peers, often using it to connect with family members and non-disabled peers.

But, these respondents also reported difficulty with effectively using privacy settings and

challenges with literacy demands. White and Forrester-Jones (2018) found that adolescents with

IDD maintained a smaller social network than there non-disabled peers, but still expressed use of

Facebook and twitter as a means to engage in informal social relationship contact. In short,

technology has impacted people in several different ways, including how social connections are

made.

     Social media is a diverse platform that can offer some insight into individuals' behavior.

For example, Bruns and Stieglitz (2012) examined communication on Twitter® to better

understand communication patterns associated with tweeting or microblogging. These authors

concluded that communication via social media may serve as an authentic communication tool to

share real time opinions on a host of topics. In another study, Gabarron, Serrano, Wynn, and Lau

(2014) analyzed Twitter® to understand conversations around sexually transmitted diseases and

posited that the social media site may serve as a source of information for people about disease.

There is much to understand about the experiences of people with IDD and their experiences

forming social relationships. Online experiences may offer some insight into an aspect of the

social world that is only beginning to be understood. A great deal may be learned from social

media about when, how, and perhaps even why social relationships form for people with IDD.

The vastness and diversity of social media poses an especially interesting challenge, as deciding

how to understand any one platform can be difficult. The social media outlet, Twitter® provides

an interesting opportunity. Twitter® is an online social networking service that enables users to

send and read short 140 character messages called 'tweets.' Within this character limit, it is

possible to tweet links, images and/or text based messages. Information on Twitter® is

commonly accompanied by *hashtags*, a word or phrase preceded by a hash or pound sign (#),

used to identify messages on a specific topic. These hashtags also serve as a mechanism for

searching and collecting information on the platform.

To better understand the experiences related to social connections and dating for people

with IDD, we conducted a historical content analysis of tweets posted on Twitter® from 2010 to

2015 using specific hashtags about dating and disability. The aim of this study was to gain

insight into how disability is described and explained by those attempting to connect with

another individual for dating purposes. The research question we aimed to answer is: how is the

social connection and dating world of individuals with IDD described and explained through

tweets?

Method

Design and Data Analysis

Content analysis or "the systematic, objective, quantitative analysis of message

characteristics" (Neuendorf, 2002, p. 1), is a long-standing method used to analyze the 'content'

of communication via written documents and now messages on the Internet (Hewson, 2014).

Twitter® provides archival content on a broad array of topics. In contrast to subscription-based

online dating services (e.g., eHarmony) or other social media platforms (e.g., Facebook),

Twitter® is open, allowing access to the content people post in hopes of connecting with others.

Unit of analysis. Eight thematic content categories were identified, based on a search of

specific hashtags within Twitter®. The categories identified were: advertisement, advice,

invitation, general information, proclamation, self-concept, storytelling, and inquiry. See Table 1 for more definitions of the content categories. The development process is described below.

Prior to beginning the study, the authors familiarized themselves with five popular dating web sites, including: match.com, plentyoffish.com, eharmony.com, okcupid.com, and disabilitydating.com, the last site being the only site reporting to be exclusively for people with disabilities. Each site requires membership to access all areas of the site and service. It was not our intent to investigate the services, but rather to obtain information to guide the search terms or hashtags to be used when searching Twitter®. Therefore, only the freely accessible portions of the web sites were explored. The authors reviewed these sites prior to the Twitter® search as a means to become familiar with the language used in online dating discourse in general, before delving into the online conversation around dating and disability. The dating sites search provided ideas on the initial hashtags used to search Twitter®.

For the current study, the tweets generated from select hashtags (deductive process used to generate hashtags), were downloaded and searched. Initially three hashtags (based on the review of dating sites as described above) were chosen to test the viability of the terms. These hashtags included: [#dating4disabled], [#dating #disability] and [#dating #handicapped]. After an initial search of Twitter® using these three hashtags, additional hashtags were generated: [#disabilitydating], [#dating #handicap], and [#dating #wheelchair]. Considering colloquial terms that might be used to refer to people with disabilities (e.g., Aspie), an additional nine hashtags were added to the list, yielding a total of 15 hashtags. The authors tried to incorporate various descriptors that might be used by individuals with IDD who may not be comfortable self-identifying their specific disability to an online community. See Table 2 for a listing of all hashtags used as part of the study.

Coding. Two authors used one hashtag, [#disabilitydating] as a means to develop a system to classify each hashtag (n=15) into similar themes or content categories. The categories were intended to provide a system of classification for the information captured with each hashtag, thus providing a way of understanding the information conveyed with the hashtag. This process served to develop the category monikers. Six categories resulted from the initial process. These two authors met and agreed upon the six categories. These six categories were introduced to the second author. Then, all three authors conducted an initial search of an additional hashtag (i.e., [#dating4disabled]) classifying each tweet into one of the six categories (from the initial attempt to develop categories). These results yielded abysmal inter-rater reliability results (i.e., less than 50%). The three authors discussed the meaning of each category and why/how particular hashtags 'fit' into particular categories. The hashtags were then classified again, using the information gleaned from the clarification process. After this discussion and subsequent re-classification of the 15 hashtags, two additional categories were added to the already existing categories. Ultimately, eight categories were generated: (1) advertisement, (2) advice, (3) invitation, (4) general information, (5) proclamation, (6) self-concept, (7) story-telling, and (8) inquiry. See Table 1 for category definitions. This re-coding process yielded 97% inter-rater reliability when classifying hashtags into categories.

Nature of search. Twitter® launched in 2006 with the intent of allowing users to post or blog, introducing a slightly different platform in comparison to other social media available at the time. The introduction of the 140 character limit, became known as 'microblogging,' This caused an eruption of online communication. A different way to express thoughts, feelings, opinions, and the like in the social media world was now at the fingertips of millions. Using the Twitter® platform is commonly referred to as 'tweeting', resulting in 'tweets.' As previously

mentioned, these tweets generally include hashtags. Twitter® also offers access to historical tweets, making it possible to search large numbers of tweets, using hashtags. There is also the possibility to delimit searches to particular periods of time. For this study, a distinct historical point was chosen, the first noted occurrence of #disabilitydating on Twitter®. Based on this first occurrence, a five-year period moving forward was searched. The time frame February 2010 to May 2015 was searched using the previously described 15 hashtags and eight categories. Five years was thought to provide an adequate, yet rich landscape of exchanges related to dating.

Results

This study was a content analysis of Twitter® to explore the dating world of individuals with IDD as described and explained through tweets. All tweets (N=781) generated from the 15 hashtags were coded using the eight categories. Of those 781 tweets, 26% were comprised of [#autism #dating], 19% of the tweets used [#disabilitydating], 17% of the tweets used [#dating #disability], 11% of the tweets used [#dating #disabled], 7% of the tweets used [#dating #handicap], 5% of the tweets used [#dating #wheelchair], 4% of the tweets used [#dating #handicapped] and [#asperger #dating], 2% of the tweets used [#ASD #dating] and [#aspie #dating], and 1% of the tweets used [#dating4disabled]. Less than 1% of the tweets used [#gimp #dating], [#spectrum #dating], and [#downsyndrome #dating]. No tweets were found to use the hashtags [#intellectualdisability #dating] in conjunction. See Table 2 for a complete presentation of results.

For four of the hashtags searched (i.e., [#dating4disabled], [#dating #disabled], [#dating #handicap], and [#dating #handicapped]), advertisements comprised the largest percentage of the tweets. Further, for three of these hashtags, (i.e., [#dating4disabled], [#dating #disabled] and [#dating #handicap]), advertisements made up more than 80% of the total tweets. Often the

tweets were advertising the same website, but using different usernames. Some examples of advertisements using these hashtags were:

"Find love with your fingertips. Try online dating at www.DisabledDatingNetwork.com #dating #wheelchair."

"Best #dating sites" http://ping.fm/dGDQL…dating #disabled."

Advice was the largest category in the [#dating #disability] search. Much of the advice came disguised as an advertisement. For example, the tweet ""Love, #Dating, Relationships and #Disability. Get advice from the experts" was actually advertising a website that was soliciting for subscriptions.

Story telling was the dominating category for [#disabilitydating], with nearly 40% of the tweets relating a story. Some examples of story telling is this category are:

"Happy V day everyone – the story of my life 4 the 35th [year] of no cards, flowers or chocolates!! #disabilitydating."

"#disabilitydating using 'disability' in online profile, when the word only means parking places or govt status to many…"

"Never been on a date. #disabilitydating."

The majority of the tweets for [#asperger #dating], [#aspie #dating], and [#ASD #dating] were categorized as general information. Being categorized as general information meant they did not meet the criteria for any other category, and they tended to be links to external news articles. For example, "Dating on the #ASD theatlantic.com/health/archive… #Autism #neurodiversity."

The most tweeted hashtag was [#autism #dating], with over 200 tweets during the specified period of time. The largest category for this hashtag was advice. People utilizing this

hashtag were both asking for advice and offering advice. This hashtag also had one of the

smallest percentage of advertisements, at 15%. An example of someone asking for advice was:

"I have a friend with #autism who is having a problem with her love life – could anybody help?

#dating #datingadvice #relationships." An example of someone offering advice was: "How to

know if he's taking advantage of you #aspergers #autism #dating #tips for women."

The remaining hashtags, [#gimp #dating], [#spectrum #dating], [#downsyndrome

#dating], and [#intellectualdisability #dating] did not yield substantial information. There was

not a single tweet in the sampled time span that used the hashtags [#intellectualdisability

#dating]. The hashtag [#ID #dating] was searched, but the few tweets that used those particular

hashtags were referring to identity fraud, and therefore not included in this analysis.

The most frequent hashtag, [#autism #dating] accounted for 26% (n=206) of the total that

was coded as advice. Similarly, the hashtag [#dating #disability] accounted for 17% (n=133) that

was also coded as advice. Thus, 43% of the sample was coded as advice. The hashtags: [#dating

#disabled], [#dating #handicap], [#dating #handicapped], [#dating4disabled] all coded as

advertisement accounted for 23% of the total number of tweets identified, resulting in a majority

(66%) of the sample coded as advice or advertisement. See Table 2 for the frequency of each

category within each hashtag.

Discussion

This study attempted to better understand the conversation on Twitter® about dating and

individuals with IDD. The fifteen hashtags used for the analysis were derived in order to get a

sampling of the conversation centered around individuals with IDD and their dating lives. Much

of the content discovered was comprised of advertisements and advice, with very little

conversation generated from human connection. Many of the tweets described indirect contact, such as through the use of dating websites and other social media platforms.

The volume is also distinctly different when compared to the conversation around [#dating]. Specifically, the type and frequency of these conversations pales in comparison to conversations around dating with no reference to disability. To demonstrate the magnitude of this, the authors counted the number of tweets posted using the single hashtag #dating from March 30 to March 31, 2015. Within this 48-hour time span, 932 tweets were posted. The 781 tweets collected over a five-year period for the current analysis demonstrates a huge lack of social media conversation regarding individuals with IDD and their dating lives. However, there is some presence, although limited, indicating that dating with a disability is a consideration on the Twittersphere. Therefore, we may assume this is a part of the social consciousness in general. With the limited amount of material, it was difficult to gain a rich understanding of how dating is described on Twitter® for people with IDD.

A great deal of advertising targeted toward individuals dating specifically around the topic of disability may indicate the presence of a marketplace of services rather than a genuine social conversation around dating. It seemed that some advertisements were disguised as advice, meaning that the advertisements were included as a means to solicit business for a service, enticing individuals to click on an external link and provide personal information, in contrast to information about a mechanism for making a genuine social connection. The corpus of tweets did not reflect a great deal of conversation by individuals about personal dating experiences. For example, phrases like, "get advice on dating" were common, in contrast to authentic opportunities to make a connection with another individual through a group social experience or indication of how one might arrange an individual connection.

Interestingly, where story telling occurred, it generally seemed to be a recount of a negative experience around the topic of dating and disability. However, social media is now often used for emotional regulation (Vermeulen, Vandebosch, & Heirman, 2018), so these tweets could be interpreted as a way to "blow off steam" while providing an outlet to vent frustrations about negative dating experiences. This may explain why we see mostly negative experiences and stories on the Twittersphere.

Finally, only minimal conversation appeared around the remaining content categories: invitation, general information, proclamation, self-concept, and inquiry, further indicating that the conversation is limited. The limited conversation on Twitter®, particularly around IDD may have something to do with the 'visibility' of a disability. Porter and colleagues (2017) used a 20 open-ended question survey to investigate the discourse 91 people with and without disabilities used in online dating communities. The 'visibility' and 'severity' of disability was discussed quite often as factors to consider when deciding to disclose or not. If a condition of any sort was more visible (recognizable on sight, in the absence of verbal communication), then most of the non-disabled participants reported the "necessity" to disclose. Similarly, a majority of those with disabilities reported the same. Severity of disability seemed to be a bit different, in that those without disabilities also reported the necessity to report a 'severe condition,' while those with disabilities did not report the same. Those with disabilities did not conceived of 'severity' in the same manner and did not use the same language as those without disabilities to describe a so-called severe condition. For example, people without disabilities discuss 'cognitive deficits,' while those with disabilities did not use the same language.

This content analysis of Twitter® yields two possible implications. First, perhaps people with disabilities continue to be marginalized. The limited amount of conversation may indicate

some isolation from dating conversations and subsequent opportunities for personal connection.

Conversations on the Twittersphere about dating may be happening while excluding folks with

IDD, further isolating them from social networks. Second, the conversation about dating and

disability may be limited because persons with IDD may not assume a disability identity in the

realm of Twitter®. Perhaps Twitter® provides an example where 'visibility' also plays a critical

role in disclosure. IDD is not necessarily recognizable in the absence of verbal communication,

inspiring people to avoid disclosure via social media. Instead individuals may choose to tweet in

the general Twittersphere about life happenings along with persons without disabilities.

Disclosing disability online may be discouraged by trusted individuals due to various concerns

(Roth & Gillis, 2014). These well-meaning people may be concerned that using the hashtags

[#intellectualdisability #dating] could result in convenient targets for people looking for

exploitative relationships. Some researchers have suggested that choosing to not self-identify

enables individuals with disabilities to escape the isolation they experience offline (Dobransky &

Hargittai, 2006). However, Shpigelman and Gill (2014) found that many individuals with

disabilities feel safer self-disclosing on Twitter®, under a username, rather than on other social

media platforms connected to their offline identity. It is important to note that not all

individuals on the autism spectrum have an intellectual disability. This could play a factor in

choosing whether to self-disclose.

Limitations

The findings for this study should be understood in the context of some facts. First,

hashtags drive the search procedures for social media such as Twitter®, but these terms can also

delimit the search process. For example, the hashtags we used dictated the search and ultimately

limited the content generated. Second, users can set personal privacy settings, therefore these

settings may limit what others, such as researchers or persons not in the users' immediate social network, can see. Also, not knowing an individual's disability status is a limitation. It should be acknowledged that the tweets the authors have access to are not necessarily the only tweets written by individuals with IDD, but they are however the only tweets that someone self-identified with. The authors have no way of determining if individuals who used some of the broader hashtags, such as [#wheelchair] or [#disabilitydating] have an intellectual disability, a developmental disability, or some other type of disability.

Implications for Practice and Policy

Social media platforms, such as Twitter®, can be utilized to create social connections for establishing and maintaining relationships. Although this study found limited genuine interactions occurring on Twitter® centered around dating and disability, the possibility of using Twitter® to promote inclusive relationships exists. Social media is inclusive by providing increased access to a dating pool and opportunities to connect with others that one may not find offline. This is true for persons with and without disabilities, thus one may argue that these platforms provide equitable access for all. Thus, one implication for practice may be that institutions of learning may need to consider teaching students with IDD the nature of communication on social media. Incorporating Internet safety skills and critical thinking skills to deduce between legitimate social interaction and catphishing/spam/ads should become a part of the curriculum to truly promote inclusion on social media platforms. This is particularly significant given large amount of advertising the authors found targeted at individuals with IDD. Illegitimate businesses and individuals may wish to exploit folks with IDD and educators need to arm students with the skills needed to participate safely in online communities.

Another implication for practice calls for a reexamination of self-advocacy training. There are numerous examples of successful self-advocacy training (e.g., Anderson & Bigby, 2017) as well as demonstrations of successful outcomes for those who received the training (e.g., Zhang et al., 2019). Perhaps it is time to think about teaching and refining online identities as a part of self-advocacy instruction. It is necessary to be aware of personal off- and online identity and how to effectively advocate within and between both environments. This addition to self-advocacy training must take into account the accessibility of the online platform. Some sites may generally be more accessible than others. The purpose of the site will also have implications for training. Joining a Twitter® conversation or seeking a subscription to an online dating site both have implications for establishing an online identity and require decisions to be made about how that identity can/should be established. The stakes in the previous examples are certainly quite different, but both illustrate a need to consider one's personal online presence and how that presence will be established. This final implication for practice has an implication for policy. The underlying assumption of self-advocacy training that includes online identity awareness could be reduced to safety awareness and focused on a suite of 'avoidance behaviors.' For example, the training might be solely focused on how to protect personal information or how to avoid encounters with unknown individuals. In contrast, the focus could promote the development of self-advocacy behaviors intended to help individuals formulate relationships. But, this almost certainly will have to be conceived through policy first, allowing those responsible for training to embrace a philosophy that promotes relationship development in contrast to safety and avoidance only.

Implications for Future Research

The formation of friendships and intimate romantic relationships for people with IDD remains a critical topic for educators, service providers, and those interested in disability studies. While the emerging work about relationship development continues to grow, much remains to be investigated. Technology, and social media in particular, present a golden opportunity for investigators to understand the experiences of people with IDD. Our current work uncovered a piece of the conversation around dating, but there are other realms that may be of interest to explore related to personal identity and use of websites to find people for the purpose of developing a friendship or intimate romantic relationship. It is not clear how people with disabilities, particularly those with IDD, use and benefit from dating websites or how folks with IDD can use social media sites to find more opportunities for inclusion offline. We believe there is still much to be learned to the benefit of people with disabilities and those who support them.

References

Anderson, S., & Bigby, C. (2017). Self-advocacy as a means to positive identities for people

    with intellectual disability: 'We just help them, be them really' *Journal of Applied*

    Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 30, 109-120. doi: 10.111/jar.12223

Ansari, A., & Klinenberg, E. (2015). *Modern romance*. New York: Penguin Press.

Bates, C., Terry, L., & Popple, K. (2017). Partner selection for people with intellectual

    disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 30*, 602-611.

Bruns, A., & Stieglitz, S. (2012). Quantitative approaches to comparing communication patterns

    on Twitter. *Journal of Technology in Human Services, 30*, 160-185.

Christakis, N. A., & Fowler, J. H. (2011). *Connected: The surprising power of our social*

    networks and how they shape our lives. New York: Little, Brown and Co.

Dobransky, K. & Hargittai, E. (2006). The disability divide in Internet access and

    use. *Information, Communication and Society, 9,* 313–334.

Friedman, C. (2019). Intimate relationships of people with disabilities. *Inclusion, 7*(1), 41-56.

    doi: 10.1352/2326.6988-7.1.41

Gabarron, E., Serrano J. A., Wynn, R., & Lau, A. Y. S. (2014). Tweet content related to

    sexually transmitted diseases: No joking matter. *Journal of Medical Internet Research,*

    16(10). Retrieved from http://www.jmir.org

Griskevicus, V., Haselton, M. G., & Ackerman, J. M. (2015). Evolution and close relationships.

    In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shriver (Eds). *APA Handbook of Personality and Social*

    Psychology: Vol. 3, Interpersonal Relationships. Washington, DC: American

    psychological Association. doi.org/10.1037/14344-001

Hall, M. (2018). Disability, discourse and desire: Analyzing online talk by people with

disabilities. *Sexualities, 21*(3), 379-392. doi: 10.1177/1363460716688675

Hewson, C. (2014). Qualitative approaches in Internet-mediated research: Opportunities, issues, and possibilities. *Oxford Handbooks Online*. Retrieved 5 May 2015, from doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.013.020.

Huskin, P. R., Reiser-Robbins, C., & Kwon, S. (2018). Attitudes of undergraduate students toward persons with disabilities: Exploring effects of contact experience on social distance across ten disability types. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 62*(1), 53-63. doi: 10.1177/0034355217727600.

Keith, J. M., Bennetto, L., & Rogge, R. D. (2015). The relationship between contact and attitudes: Reducing prejudice toward individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 47*, 14-26.

Linton, K. F., & Rueda, H. A. (2015). Dating and sexuality among minority adolescents with disabilities: An application of sociocultural theory. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 25*, 77-89.

Miller, E., Chen, R., Glover-Graf, N. M., & Kranz, P. (2009). Willingness to engage in personal relationships with persons with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 52*(4), 211-224. doi: 10.1177/0034355209332719

Morris, D. (1996). *The human zoo: A zoologist's classic study of the urban animal*. New York: Kodansha International.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Phillips, B., A., Fortney, S., & Swafford, L. (2019). College students' social perceptions toward individuals with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 30*(1), 3-10.

Porter, J. R., Sobel, K., Fox, S. E., Bennett, C. L., & Kientz, J. A. (2017). Filtered out: Disability

disclosure practices in online dating communities. *Proceedings of the ACM: Human computer interaction 1, CSCW*, Article 87. doi.org/10.1145/3134722

Pinquart, M., & Pfeiffer, J.P. (2012). What is essential is invisible to the eye: Intimate relationships of adolescents with visual impairment. *Sexuality and Disability, 30*(2), 139-147.

Roth, M. E., & Gillis, J. M. (2014). "Convenience with the click of a mouse": A survey of adults with Autism Spectrum Disorder on online dating. *Sexuality and Disability, 33*, 133-150.

Saltes, N. (2013). Disability, identity, and disclosure in the online dating environment. *Disability & Society, 28*(1), 96-109.

Sanri, C., & Goodwin, R. (2014). The influence of globalization and technological development on intimate relationships. In Agnew, C. R. (Ed.), *Social influences on romantic relationships: Beyond the dyad*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Seewooruttun, L., & Scior, K. (2014). Interventions aimed at increasing knowledge and improving attitudes towards people with intellectual disabilities among lay people. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 35*(12), 3482-3495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.07.028

Seymour, W., & Lupton, D. (2004). Holding the line online: exploring wired relationships for people with disabilities. *Disability and Society, 19*(4), 1-15.

Scior, K. (2011). Public awareness, attitudes, and beliefs regarding intellectual disability: A systematic review. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 32*, 2164-2182.

Shpigelman, C. N., & Gill, C. J. (2014). How do adults with intellectual disabilities use Facebook? *Disability and Society, 29*(10), 1601-1616. doi: 10.1080/09687599.2014.966186

Vermeulen, A., Vandebosch, H., & Heirman, W. (2018). #Smiling, #venting, or both?

Adolescents' social sharing of emotions on social media. *Computers in Human Behavior, 84*, 211-219.

Ward, K. M., Atkinson, J. P., Smith, C. A., & Windsor, R. (2013). A friendship and dating

program for adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities: A formative

evaluation. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, *51*(1), 22-

32.

Wehmeyer, M. (2013). *The story of intellectual disability*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

White, P., & Forrester-Jones, R. (2018). Valuing e-inclusion: Social media and the social

networks of adolescents with intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities*, 1-

17. doi: 10.1177/1744629518821240

Zhang, D., Roberts, E., Landmark, L., & Ju, S. (2019). Effect of self-advocacy training on

students with disabilities: Adult outcomes and advocacy involvement after participation.

Journal of Vocational rehabilitation, *50*(2), 207-218.

Table 1

Definition of categories and example tweets

Category	Definition	Example Tweet
Advertisement	Points to agency, site, or product; aimed at selling or enticing you	"Find love with your fingertips. Try online dating at www.DisabledDatingNetwork.com #dating #wheelchair"
Advice	Offers information, tips, or strategies	"Love, #Dating, Relationships and #Disability. Get advice from the experts"
Invitation	Invites user to a specific event	"Last minute slots available at tonight's #Disability Speed #Dating event"
General Information	Presents non-specific information, unrelated to any other category	"Very interesting article on the challenges of online dating for those with a disability #dating #disability"
Proclamation	Proclaiming a broad idea/concept (not including self-description), usually opinion based	"#Dating in a #wheelchair – Your problem, not mine"
Self-concept	Discussing self or self esteem	"Being seen as a man #disability #relationships #dating"
Story Telling	Sharing of an experience	"Laughing at my nightmare: Strangers assume my girlfriend is my nurse #disability #wheelchair #dating #relationships"
Inquiry	Asking for information from users	"Doc looking for #wheelchair users that find #dating tricky"

Table 2
Total frequency of hashtags

Hashtags	% of Total	Frequency	Predominant category (%)
#autism #dating	26%	206	Advice (27%)
#disabilitydating	19%	149	Storytelling (39%)
#dating #disability	17%	133	Advice (33%)
#dating #disabled	11%*	85	Advertisement (88%)
#dating #handicap	7%	56	Advertisement (81%)
#dating #wheelchair	5%*	39	Proclamation (24%)
#dating #handicapped	4%	32	Advertisement (38%)
#asperger #dating	4%*	31	General Information (35%)
#aspie #dating:	2%	17	General Information (35%)
#ASD #dating:	2%*	14	General Information (50%)
#dating4disabled	1%	8	Advertisement (88%)
#gimp #dating:	0.6%	5	*5 tweets, but two are in a different language – the three tweets coded were coded as Story telling, proclamation, and general info
#spectrum #dating	0.4%*	3	1 Advice 1 Proclamation 1 General Information

#downsyndrome #dating	0.4%*	3	General information (66%)
#intellectualdisability #dating	0%	0	NONE
Grand Total		**781**	

*indicates figure was rounded up