THE ANALYSIS OF PARENTS AND PEDAGOGUES' SOCIAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS EDUCABILITY OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Ineta Ruškuvienė
Kolping college, Lithuania
E-mail: ruskuviene@yahoo.fr

Dalia Augienė
Siauliai University, Lithuania
E-mail: augiene@gmail.com

Domas Auga
Siauliai College, Lithuania
E-mail: da@inbox.lt

Abstract

The article analyses structural and intensity features identifying parents and pedagogues' social attitudes towards education of disabled children. The performed research allows to assert that the structure of attitudes towards educability of disabled people contains the following components: recognition of personality and social value of a disabled person, recognition of their abilities, pedagogical pessimism, fatalism, humanistic pedagogics, segregation, inferiority of a disabled personality and their family, orientation to social – every day education priorities, the underestimation of special education needs, archetypical fears of socializing with a disabled person, pedagogue's function as a family substitute. In fact, all these components integrate into two main educability construct dimensions, pedagogic pessimism and pedagogic optimism. Features of commonness and individuality identify parents and pedagogues' social attitudes towards educability of mentally disabled people. Commonness lies in the educability model, its structure. Individuality means that parents' social attitudes towards educability of their disabled children are oriented (with respect to attitude intensity) to a person, whilst pedagogues' – into education and integration process. The intensity of parents and pedagogues' social attitudes changes depending on social –demographic factors. The attitude's intensity (positive and negative evaluation range) to their disabled child's educability is conditioned mostly by parents' psychological state. Professional motivation, age, professional activity place, the type of educational institution condition pedagogue attitude's intensity the most.
Key words*: social attitudes, a disabled person, education process.*

Introduction

Human social development history shows that education and position in the society of the disabled have always been conditioned by dominating man's social conception of that time, in other words, social images.

In the social psychology images are defined as a certain cognition forming in the process of collective interpretation whose emotional, cognitive and symbolic elements make influence on the way of thinking and everyday activities (Deschamps, Beauvois, 1996).The peculiarity of social images is that they create common social group's social reality"(Jodelet, 1989), in other words, social attitudes. Social attitude is more or less crystallized character's (individual and collective) position with respect to object (person, group, situation, value); it more or less openly manifests itself by different symptoms or indicators (words, tone, gestures, actions or absence of them); its function is cognitive, energetic and regulating actions at the same time. Through attitudes man takes position in respect of other people and events, depending on attitudes man feels, valuates, chooses to act in one or another way (Maisonneuve, 1973).

The main determinants of man's behaviour and action are a concrete need and its fulfillment situation. The content of need and situation make up attitude's psychology object (Jovaiša, 2001) Social attitude's conception according to G.Allport (1935), is one of the essential dimensions in social psychology when investigating personality's as a group member's relation with some or the other social objects, also predicting possible personality behavioural ways in certain situations. L.L. Thurstone asserted that attitude is a complex thing which can't be crammed into one number index (Thurstone, 1959). Thus, attitudes cover personality experience of unequal complexity: from physiological preparedness state in the process of perception to complex personality evaluation, behaviour stereotipes and orientations of value.

Social attitudes is a part of education reality which plays a great role for the education process (Jakavičius, 1944). The peculiarity of attitudes is that people having formed certain expectations in respect of object behave in the way to fulfill these expectations (Thurstone, 1929; Maisonneuve, 1973; Jakavičius, 1994; Lepeškienė, 1996). Social attitudes are marked by certain individuality, manifesting by belief in their children's skills and capabilities, attitude towards their child as a full of value personality.This statement can be illustrated by many researches, which revealed that pedagogues' attitudes towards educability of children determined children's achievements at school (Rosental and Jakobson, 1971;Leliugienė, 1997; Vaitkevičius, 1995). Educability is education reality's component. Introduced in the fourth decade of the 20th century by S. Šalkauskis (Šalkauskis, 1991) and systematized by B.Bitinas (Bitinas, 1990, 1998), L. Jovaiša (Jovaiša, 1993, 2001), pedagogical category of educability is defined as learner's ability to learn, educational capability to change under pedagogical influence. Unfortunately, educability construct hasn't been sufficiently analysed in dissability sphere yet.

Research is urgent due to common attitudes towards the disabled having individualistic characteristics because of the fact of dissability (Morvan, 1993; Gudonis, Novogrodskienė, 2000; Ruškus, 2000). In the education of the disabled where dissability reveals itself as a complicating factor, social attitudes have special meaning (Ališauskas, 1998; Kavaliūnaitė, Pūras, 1998). If a pedagogue doesn't believe that a child can achieve good learning results, the child actually, will not achieve, if special pedagogues theoretics and practicians do not believe in the ability of the disabled to socialize, their professional activity will acquire segregation aspect in respect of a disabled person. It is believable that participants of education process, children's parents and pedagogues have different attitudes towards the learning capabilities of the disabled, in other words, to educability.

Problem of Research

Referring to earlier mentioned arguments, we can assert that the following questions reflect the research problem: 1) What structural and intensity features determine parent's social attitudes towards their disabled child's educability? 2) What structural and intensity features

determine pedagogues' social attitudes to disabled person's educability? 3) What common and individual features determine parents and pedagogues' attitudes to disabled child's educability?

Research was based on the following hypothesis: 1) the structure of attitude towards the disabled child's educability contains pedagogical pessimism and pedagogical optimism reflecting constructs; 2) parents' social attitudes towards their disabled child's educability are oriented to person, whilst pedagogues' to education and integration process; 3) parents and pedagogues' social attitude intensity changes depending on social-demographic factors.

Object of research. Parents and pedagogues' social attitudes towards mentally disabled people's educability.

Aim of research. To reveal and evaluate parents and pedagogues' social attitudes' to mentally disabled people's educability commonness and individuality.

Tasks of Research

- To actualize education conception by presenting theoretical definitions of educability construct.
- To form a model of social attitudes towards educability of mentally disabled people empirically, referring to attitude peculiarities of parents and teachers' working with these people.
- To reveal feature of commonness and individuality of parents and pedagogue attitudes' towards the educability of mentally disabled people assessing attitudes' intensity and influence of social – demographic factors.
- To present potential parents and pedagogues' cooperation guidelines for educating a mentally disabled person.

Methodology of Research

Sample of Research

141 pedagogues working with mentally disabled people participated in the survey (Lithuanian special and basic school special pedagogues, pedagogues from professional – rehabilitation centre, care institutions' pedagogues and social workers) and 152 parents bringing up children with intellect disorders. Sample is random.

Instrument and Procedures

L.L. Thurstone and R.Likert social attitude research methodics was applied to investigate social attitudes in which qualitative (first stage) and quantitative (second stage) research methodological elements are combined. Standardized quantitative type of questionnaire on social attitudes towards mentally disabled person's educability was compiled for parents and pedagogues in a qualitative way (half standardized interviews, analysis of the documents, content analysis). Data of the research have been processed by statistic methods using software SPSS 11.0. The following statistic analysis methods have been applied: descriptive statistics, factor and correlation (Spearmen) analyses, non- parametric tests (Kruskal-Wallis test). Social attitudes are a latent psychological variable; therefore they are investigated by measuring their potential expression (verbal, behavioural and other). Verbal reactions are a manifest social at-

titudes' variable (a latent and manifest variable (Merkys, Ruškus, 1999). Research metodics has been constructed in several stages. Referring to L.L. Thurstone methodics, stimulating material (lexical units (statements) characteristic to parents and pedagogues' sub-cultures, reflecting social attitudes to children with disordered intellect educability) has been gathered for creation of the questionnaire. Statements are lexical units gathered from special pedagogics textbooks, scientific and publicist articles, disabled organizations' publications, special pedagogues and parents' answers to open questions about educability of these children and so on. It was attempted to select such lexical units, which would have negative and positive connotation. Having been selected, statements reflecting social attitudes have been presented to specialists as well as to parents.

A list of 242statements was formed. Efforts were made to include the contrastive statements for assessment purposes into the statement list. They reflected positive attitudes: "disabled children are very bright", "very often a healthy child has what to learn from a disabled" as well as negative: "the disabled are a burden to society", "I think that miracles don't exist, "he will remain the same as he was born".

All statements, gathered by applying content analysis, were grouped into lexical-semantic categories. A name - found and named logical and semantic relation was given to grouped statements (categories). Fifteen of such categories were distinguished:

- Special pedagogue's subjective professional identity reflection (What am I like? What is my role?): "The best teachers are the ones who bring up disabled children themselves";
- Argumentation of integration – segregation: "A place for a disabled is only among the disabled";
- Hopelessness determinism of disability: "Why to educate a disabled - he doesn't have future anyway";
- Educability limits of a disabled: "These children can't do much. They are not healthy, are they";
- Social image of parents bringing up a disabled child: "Only those parents who are rich care about disabled child's education";
- Special pedagogues' social image: "There are a lot of teachers who, even though have got university diplomas, do not know such children, they are not familiar with new teaching methods";
- School's role: "School needs all: both disabled and healthy";
- Personality of a disabled (What is he like?): "The disabled are more sensitive and responsive to environment";
- Full value of educational interaction (feedback): "A lot more is given to a disabled than received from him";
- Value priorities: "Educability of the disabled doesn't depend on money";
- State support: "Too much of attention and expenses is allotted to the disabled";
- Secondariness of the disabled problem (in the context of other problems): "First of all, problems of healthy people (unemployment, crimes) have to be solved and only then the disabled taken care of";
- Pedagogical optimism (the disabled can be good at something, they can achieve something, they can give something): "The disabled can do a lot";
- Education preferences of social abilities: "Self-servicing skills should be formed first but not reading and writing ones";
- Standards of behaviour and socializing: "It is scary to communicate with the disabled".

Referring to homogeneity (monosemantic, having one meaning) criterion, three-four statements were selected from each category. Polysemantic or semantically very similar statements condemning parents or teachers work were rejected. Out of 242 statements, 50 attitudes reflecting formulae were selected, taking into account that there was proportionality – positive, negative and neutral statements. A statement scale was formed in such a statistically based way where interval rates in the range of favour –unfavour were presented. It was used while interrogating special pedagogues and parents bringing up disabled children.

Thurstone methodics enables to construct interval scale however, the usage of interval scale to discover research goals can be problematic. This assumption is based on the following arguments: 1) to reach reliability of interval scale a very big number of experts (~300) and respondents (~300) is necessary, while estimated research population is not big at all, (special pedagogues and disordered intellect children's parents). Thus, when applying interval scale methodics, inevitably a question of not only experts and respondents' selection will arise but also a problem of research data reliability. 2) It has been noticed that the statements, which are given of a middle scale value, are often diagnostically indifferent.

On the basis of mentioned arguments, it was switched from L.L Thurstone to R.Likert methodics in the research process. It means that for statements, which were assessed and later selected, rank scale rates were allotted in the attitude favour- unfavour range. Selected, social attitudes reflecting statements were presented both to specialists and to parents.

Psychometric blocks included in the questionnaire for parents were as follows: social-demographic (sex, age, size of the family, parents and grandparents' education level and professional status, social status, financial-economic possibilities),fatigue, stress, social stigmatism, human development determinism, educational experience, attitude towards special educational institutions, the width of social circle.

Psychometric blocks included in the questionnaire for pedagogues were as follows: social-demographic (sex, age, pedagogical work experience, subject, type of school), fatigue, social image of disability, human development determinism, attitude towards new educational ideas, authoritarian/humanistic activity direction, attitude towards families bringing up such children. Respondents were given 4-5 statements to reveal each psychometric block.

Factor analysis was applied to process research data. Traditionally, in the practice of psychometry (Thurstone, 1959) data gathered using attitude scale, are processed by factor analysis. Reliability Analysis and Factor Analysis were carried out applying SPSS software. Scale validity and data reliability were attempted to be ground in this way. Validity shows what the test measures and how well it measures it. Test validation procedure is a necessary and most important part of test application and data interpretation, it shows validity of test results and their interpretation, test incentive material adequacy, relativity of subscales (Бурлачук, Морозов, 1999). Reliability measuring concept means consistency of measuring units. Test inner consistency coefficient Cronbach-α shows scale validity degree.

Factor analysis not only shows (by correlation coefficient) the strength of statistic relation between some features, but also allows to emphasize hidden latent features, their reasons as well, interdependence regularities, gives the structure of the being analyzed psychosocial phenomenon. Factor analysis method allows to contract test rates and to exclude factors necessary for test result interpretation (Бурлачук, Морозов, 1999). Both high correlation coefficients and interpretation of formed factors confirm the scale validity as well.

Results of Research

Statements, chosen by described selection method, using factor analysis, formed independent subscales (factors). It has been stated, that special pedagogue's attitude scale corre-

sponds to scale's inner, i.e. content, validity requirements. Thus, research result interpretation is valid, reliable. Statistic relations between features are sufficiently strong (see Table 1).

Table 1.   **Parents (N=152) and pedagogues' (N=142) attitudes to educability of disabled children factor structure.**

Statements and subscales	Cron-bach-α	KMO	L	r/itt	Dissemi-nation %
Recognition of social value and personality of a disabled					
Very often a healthy person has what to learn from a disabled person			,78	,56	
The disabled are more sensitive and responsive to the environment			,74	,54	
A disabled also can become useful for the society			,73	,52	
People with mental disabilities have not only special needs but also skills and capabilities	,68	,68	,66	,43	62,72
A disabled child is only trouble for parents (-)			,66	,44	
Teachers working with the disabled work more but experience bigger joy			,42	,28	
RECOGNITION OF ABILITIES OF THE DISABLED					
The disabled have a lot of abilities			,80	,52	
These children are able to do a lot, only this has to be discerned and developed	,69	,76	,79	,52	45,38
Disabled children are very bright			,78	,51	
Pedagogical pessimism, fatalism					
It is better to take care of the disabled, to look after them than teach			,75	,62	
Child's development is determined by inborn features, therefore teachers and parents can't change anything			,73	,58	
It is easy for them to live, they perceive very little			,67	,52	
First of all, problems of healthy people (unemployment, crimes) have to be solved and only then the disabled taken care of	,73	,83	,68	,50	39,70
Disability is determined by genes - you can't change anything			,65	,50	
Art clubs are not necessary – there will be no artists of them, anyway			,56	,41	
Most of these children have inborn inclination to bad, not to good			,55	,41	
Sometimes I feel disappointment – you work and teach those children and they learn almost nothing			,38	,26	
HUMANISTIC PEDAGOGICS					
Though parents know their child best, most teachers reach the child's heart, understand the family			,74	,38	
School needs all – both disabled and healthy children			,64	,29	
It suits better for the disabled to clean the board at school, to tidy the environment (-)	,47	,65	,56	,23	34,51
It doesn't matter if you teach a disabled or a healthy child -children are all the same			,48	,23	
Only owing to teacher, these children can develop little by little			,47	,21	
Segregation					

A place for a disabled is only among the disabled			,79	,41	
The disabled start feeling their troubles even more and get more frustrated when they are integrated into comprehensive school	,54	,58	,78	,40	52,33
Mentally disabled don't have future			,58	,25	
DISABLED PERSONALITY AND HIS FAMILY'S INFERIORITY					
More it is given to the disabled than it is received from him			,64	,39	
Only parents, who are rich care about their disabled child's education			,65	,37	
Such children are usually from asocial families. Such families don't know anything about science	,60	,73	,61	,36	33,97
Only half of the children would remain in schools if they were not fed for free			,60	,35	
Parents overestimate mental abilities of such children			,57	,32	
The disabled are a burden for the society			,42	,23	
Orientation to social-every day education priorities					
It would be more necessary to form self- servicing skills but not writing and reading			,80	,51	
It should not be required from them to read and write. It is important for them to learn what they will need in future	,58	,63	,71	,38	45,71
It is necessary to teach so that they can read and write (-)			,66	,35	
It is important to teach a disabled every day skills			,51	,25	
UNDERESTIMATION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION NEEDS					
Too much attention and expenses is allotted to the disabled	,62	,57	,87	,62	60,25
Too little attention and expenses is allotted to the disabled (-)			,80	,43	

We encourage the disabled children teaching too much.			,64	,32	
ARCHETYPICAL FEARS IN THE COMMUNICATION WITH THE DISABLED					
I feel uncomfortable while communicating with the disabled person	,66	,50	,78	,52	76,25
It is scary to communicate with the disabled			,87	,52	
PEDAGOGUE'S AS FAMILY SUBSTITUTE'S FUNCTION					
Best teachers are the ones who bring up disabled children themselves			,78	,34	
Teachers would teach more if they worked according to mothers' given methodics	,49	,58	,70	,34	50,37

Seeking to get even more abstract and generalized theoretical educability model's factor structure, second-rate factor analysis was carried out, i.e. one more time fact analysis is being carried out with 10 factors already received analogically. Factors formed theoretically and statistically sensible three -dimensional educability structure of the disabled (see Table 2).

Ineta RUŠKUVIENĖ, Dalia AUGIENĖ, Domas AUGA. The Analysis of Parents and Pedagogues' Social Attitudes towards
Educability of Disabled People

PROBLEMS
OF EDUCATION
IN THE 21ˢᵗ CENTURY
Volume 23, 2010

173

Table 2.   Educability structure of the disabled.

Statements and subscales	Cronbach-α	KMO	L scales	r/itt	Dissemina-tion %
PEDAGOGICAL PESSIMISM AND SEGREGATION					
Pedagogical pessimism, fatalism			,77	,52	
Inferiority of the disabled personality and his family	,67	,70	,76	,57	52,63
Segregation			,63	,69	
Underestimation of special education needs			,53	,65	
HUMANISTIC PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITY ORIGIN					
Recognition of social value and personality of a disabled			,78	,66	
Humanistic pedagogics	,66	,61	,75	,37	50,76
Archetypical fears in the communication with the disabled (-)			,60	,41	
Disabled ability recognition			,54	,37	
SOCIAL – EVERY –DAY EDUCATION PURPOSEFULLNESS					
Pedagogue's as family substitute's function	,34	,50	,75	,21	60,63
Orientation to social-every day educability priorities			,60	,21	

Parents and Pedagogues Attitudes' towards Disordered Intellect Children's Educability
Divergence and Convergence Peculiarities

Hypothesis checking non-parametric tests were carried out to check parents and peda-gogues attitudes' divergence and convergence. Non-parametric two-sided Kruskal-Wallis[1] test was applied. Table 1 presents parents and pedagogues' educability scale rates and their statisti-cal comparison results. From the point of view of research goals, sensible tendencies emerged (see Table 3):

- Parents express recognition of the disabled personality and social value more than pedagogues do;
- Parents more than teachers recognize the disabled abilities;
- Pedagogic pessimism, fatalism reflects more vividly in parents' population attitudes than in teachers;
- Humanistic pedagogics reveals itself more in teachers' attitudes than in parents;
- Segregation is more expressed in parents' than in teachers' population;
- Teachers distinguish the inferiority of disabled personality and his family more than parents do;
- Underestimation of special educability needs is equally expressed in parents' as well as in teachers' population;
- Parents and teachers equally acknowledge orientation to social-every day education priorities;
- Parents feel fears of communication with the disabled more than teachers do;
- Parents distinguish pedagogues as family substitute's function more than teachers do;

---

[1] Kruskal-Wallis criterion is meant for checking hypothesis about the equality of two or more population distribu-tives (Čekanauskas, Murauskas 2002). It is counted by software SPSS 11-1.

Pedagogical pessimism and segregation as well as humanistic pedagogical origin in parents as well as in teachers' regulations reflects equally. However, parents distinguish social-every day education purposefulness more than teachers do.

Table 3. **Parents and teachers attitudes' to disordered intellect children's educability divergence and convergence: statistical data** (difference significance p checked by non-parametric Mann-With ney test, M-arithmetical mean, SD- standard deviation).

Attitudes' to educability components (factors)	Parents N=153		Teachers N=141		p
	M	SD	M	SD	
Recognition of social value and personality of a disabled	3,41	0,63	3,25	0,54	0,07
Recognition of disabled abilities	3,12	0,63	2,72	0,65	0,001
Pedagogical pessimism, fatalism	1,96	0,63	1,74	0,51	0,001
Humanistic pedagogics	3,20	0,57	3,37	0,47	0,02
Segregation	2,34	0,77	2,17	0,80	0,03
Inferiority of a disabled personality and his family	1,99	0,62	2,16	0,55	0,02
Orientation to social-every day education priorities	2,47	0,68	2,44	0,75	No difference
Underestimation of special education needs	1,50	0,61	1,61	0,65	No difference
Archetypical fears in the communication with the disabled	1,44	0,65	1,26	0,52	0,002
Pedagogues as family substitute's function	2,13	0,88	1,55	0,82	0,001
Attitudes to educability model's essential components					
Pedagogical pessimism and segregation	1,95	0,48	1,92	0,44	No difference
Humanistic pedagogical activity origin	2,07	0,44	2,02	0,40	No difference
Social-every day education purposefulness	2,30	0,60	2,00	0,62	0,001

The research revealed ambiguous educability model's approaches. We can discern not only occurrence but also reasons of latent (or maybe real?) conflict between parents and teachers. Parents more positively than teachers tend to value their disabled children's personality and their abilities, social value. Parents ascribe to their disabled children peculiar stereotypical "more human" role, asserting that healthy people also have what to learn from the disabled, that the disabled are more sensitive and receptive to the environment, ascribing to them special abilities. Teachers in their turn tend to notice children's personality and inferiority of their abilities and social inferiority. Parents' low critics having valuation of their children can be interpreted as some kind of compensation, keeping their positive image. Such compensation should be treated as natural consequence of what parents had gone through in their personal and professional life when they found out about their child's disability. Whilst teachers' poor valuation of personality and abilities of the disabled can be interpreted as a result of professional consciousness, formed by corrective pedagogics' ideas, - first of all, the disabled education was looked at through disorder, not personality prism, in this way constructing and keeping "disabled as inferior human" stereotype.

The validity of interpretations about parents' defensive compensative mechanisms and pedagogues' corrective professional purposefulness are explained by data from other educability dimension comparison between parents and teachers populations. In spite of their children's

positive valuation, parents more than teachers tend, not believing in their children's future, to distract them from normal surroundings, isolate them, hide them from society. Parents, in the context of some kind of reticence, are not surprised by their declared pedagogical pessimism with respect to their children: parents do not believe in their children's disability, in their education possibilities. Parents' reticence dimension found in the research also confirm that parents (in other words, the closest people to the child) more than teachers (people not so close to the child) feel archetypical disability fears. We would valuate such paradoxical parents' situation when, on the one hand, they appreciate their disabled child's personality, abilities and social role very much or even too much positively, on the other hand, psychologically and physically close from social and educational surroundings, as a result of several cultural and educational phenomena: 1) changes in family life structure after becoming clear about child's disability; 2) soviet period, when families bringing up a disabled child were isolated from social system; 3) methodological attitudes of exaggerated disorder elimination accentuation in corrective pedagogics (defectology); 4) social disability stagnation, negative social images of disability. Parents, conditioned by reticence as consciousness dimension, tend to choose social –every day their children's education direction.

Teachers, in spite of poor disabled personality recognition, tend to express strong educational attitudes, being certain encouragers, developers of intellectual capacities and social integrity of a disabled ("It is necessary to teach in order they could read and write"). Teachers, more than parents, tend to orientate the disabled into normal social – educational environment.

Divergence (in parents and teachers' populations) spheres of the disabled educability model testify about potential and real conflict of special education participants, parents and teachers. It might be that, namely, in the ideological, educability paradigm level, parents and teachers' different positions clash. Such ideological – valuable misunderstandings are the reason of real conflicts and poor partnership relations. The research results show that real partnership between parents and teachers, school society creation is possible only after coordinating educability paradigm questions, i.e., a dimension of the disabled education aims, methods and activities is touched.

Depending on a type of educational institution, the child attends, parents' attitudes towards pedagogue functions and role also vary. It is not trivial that parents, whose children learn in foster home, ascribe to pedagogues family "replacement", substitute's (more care taking than educational) role. This attitude is probably defined by the fact that foster home children have considerable and very considerable body, psyche and (or) intellect disorders. It is surprising that such pedagogue's function is also ascribed to professional training pedagogues. Mostly educational, but not care taking pedagogue's role is ascribed to special boarding school and comprehensive school pedagogues. It is believable that this is related to the fact that pupils of mentioned schools are marked with the least considerable body, psyche and (or) intellect disorders.

It has been determined, that younger (up to 35 years of age) pedagogues tend to recognize the abilities of the disabled more (p=0.002 according to Kruskal-Wallis) than senior. So, another received result is not trivial either, that senior more than younger tend to social separation (segregation) (p=0.008 according to Kruskal-Wallis).

Child's invalidity degree has also influence on parents' attitudes towards their children educability. Parents bringing up a child having considerable disabilities, experience controversial condition when, on one hand, child's abilities are emphasized, on the other hand, they experience archetypical fears in the communication with the disabled. Parents of children having the first invalidity group more than those of not having invalidity group or having the second group are oriented to social-every day-emotional disabled child's education.

Depending on the type of educational institution, the child attends, parents' attitudes towards pedagogue functions and role also vary. It is not trivial that parents, whose children learn

in foster home, ascribe to pedagogues family "replacement", substitute's (more care taking than educational) role. This attitude is probably defined by the fact that foster home children have considerable and very considerable body, psyche and (or) intellect disorders. It is surprising that such pedagogue's function is also ascribed to professional training pedagogues. Mostly educational, but not care taking pedagogue's role is ascribed to special boarding school and comprehensive school pedagogues. It is believable that this is related with the fact that pupils of mentioned schools are marked with the least considerable body, psyche and (or) intellect disorders. Mostly oriented into humanistic educational origin are pedagogues of biggest Lithuanian cities. This might be explained by the fact that in the biggest Lithuanian cities modern educational theories of the disabled are spreading most rapidly, different West Europe countries are visited, their practice models are being taken over. Whilst in small places of our country more traditional principles based on directive pedagogics are still strong.

Conclusions

The structure of attitudes towards educability of a disabled contains the following components: recognition of personality and social value of a disabled, recognition of his abilities, pedagogical pessimism, fatalism, humanistic pedagogics, segregation, inferiority of personality of the disabled and his family, orientation to social - every day educational priorities, underestimation of special education needs, archetypical fears in the communication with the disabled, pedagogue's as family substitute's function. Two main educability construct dimensions are: pedagogical pessimism and pedagogical optimism.

Parents and pedagogues' social attitudes to mentally disabled people's educability are marked by features of commonness and individuality. Commonness lies in the educability model, in the structure. Individuality means, that parents' social attitudes to their disabled children's educability are oriented to a person, while pedagogues' – to education and integration process.

Parents and pedagogues' social attitudes' intensity varies depending on social- demographic factors. The intensity of attitudes to their disabled child's educability is conditioned mostly by parents' psychological state. Pedagogue attitudes' intensity is conditioned by professional motivation, age, professional activity place, type of educational institution.

References

Ališauskas, A. (1999).Vienodos galimybės ugdytis? *Mokykla,* 3, 1-4.

Ambrukaitis, J. (1998).Specialiųjų mokyklų raidos tendencijos. *Specialioji mokykla: praeitis, dabartis, ateitis. Mokslinės - praktinės konferencijos medžiaga (p.6-15).* Šiauliai: ŠU

Allport, G.W. (1935). Attitudes. In Murchison C. (ed). *Handbook of Social Psychology (*788-844). Worcester: Clark University Press

Bitinas, B. (1990). *Bendrosios pedagogikos pagrindai.* Vilnius

Bitinas, B. (1998). *Ugdymo tyrimų metodologija.* Vilnius: Jošara.

Butkevičienė, R. (2000). *Šeimų, auginančių vaikus su klausos negalia, socialinė charakteristika.* Socialinių mokslų daktaro disertacija. Kauno technologijos universitetas.

Čekanauskas, V., Murauskas, G. (2002). Statistika ir jos taikymai. Vilnius: TEV

Deschamps, J.C., Beauvois, J.L. (1996). *Des attitudes aux attributions. Sur la construction sociale de la réalité.* Paris: Presses universitaires de Grenoble.

Jakavičius, V. (1994).Pedagoginės sąveikos veiksniai. *Socialiniai mokslai. Edukologija, 1, 58-65.*

Jodelet D. (1984). Presentations sociales: un domaine en expansion. In Jodelet D. (sous la dir.) *Les representations sociales.* Paris:PUF.

Jovaiša, L. (1993). *Pedagogikos terminai*. Kaunas: Šviesa.

Jovaiša, L. (2001). *Ugdymo mokslas ir praktika*. Vilnius: Agora.

Gudonis, V. (1990). *Aklųjų reabilitacija ir integracija*. Šiauliai: ŠPI.

Gudonis, V., Novogrodskienė, E. (2000). Visuomenės požiūris į neįgaliuosius suaugusius ir specialiųjų poreikių vaikus. *Specialusis ugdymas,* 3, 50-62.

Leliugienė, I. (1997*) Žmogus ir socialinė aplinka*. Kaunas: Technologija.

Lepeškienė, V. (1996). *Humanistinis ugdymas mokykloje.* Vilnius: Valstybinis leidybos centras.

Kavaliūnaitė, E., Pūras, D. (1998). Specialiosios mokyklos vaidmuo neįgaliųjų vaikų ugdymo ir integracijos procese. *Specialioji mokykla: praeitis, dabartis, ateitis. Mokslinės – praktinės konferencijos medžiaga (p.82-84)*. Šiauliai: ŠU

Maisonneuve, J. (1973). *Introduction à la psychosociologie*. Paris: Presse universitaires de France.

Merkys, G., Ruškus, J. (1999). Socialinių specialiojo pedagogo nuostatų profesinės veikos atžvilgiu struktūra. *Ugdymo psichologija,* 2 tomas, Nr.2, p.29-37).

Miškinis, K. (1989). Psichologinis klimatas – svarbus mokymo tobulinimo faktorius. *Pedagogika,* 25, 56-62.

Morvan, J. S. (1993). Représentations-attitudes des futures intervenants éducateurs et sociaux. In Ionesscu S. (sous la direction). La déficience intellectuelle. *Aproches et pratiques du l'intervention précose. T.1.* Quebec : Agens d'Arc.

Rosental, R. A., Jacobson, L. (1971). *Pygmalion à l' école. Succcés ou échec scolaire ? Un facteur important : le préjugé du maître.* Paris : Casterman.

Ruškus, J. (2000). Specialiojo pedagogo socialinių nuostatų, pedagoginės sąveikos ir mokyklinės socializacijos ryšys. *Socialinių mokslų (edukologija) daktaro disertacija*. Šiaulių universitetas.

Šalkauskis, S.(1991). *Pedagoginiai raštai.* Kaunas: Šviesa.

Thurstone, L.L. (1959). *The measurement of attitude: a psycho-social method and some experiments.* Chicago: Univerity of Chicago.

Vaitkevičius, J. (1995). *Socialinės pedagogikos pagrindai*. Vilnius: Egalda.

Бурлачук, Л.Ф., Морозов, С.М. (1999). *Словарь-справочник по психодиагностике*. Санкт-Петербург: Питер

Adviced by Todar Lakhvich, Belarusian State M.Tank Pedagogical University,
Republic of Belarus

Ineta Ruškuvienė	Research and Quality Department, Coordinator, Kolping College, Raguvos Street 7, LT-44275 Kaunas, Lithuania. E-mail: ruskuviene@yahoo.fr Website: http://www.kolping.lt
Dalia Augienė	Assoc. Professor, Department of Education, Šiauliai University, P. Višinskio Street 25, LT - 76351 Šiauliai, Lithuania. E-mail: augiene@gmail.com Website: http://www.su.lt
Domas Auga	Assistant, Department of Humanity Sciences and Studies, Šiauliai College, Aušros al. 40, LT-76241 Šiauliai, Lithuania. E-mail: da@inbox.lt Website: http://www.siauliukolegija.lt/