

UDC 364-787.2-056.24
BBC C993
GSNTI 14.29.01
Code VAK 13.00.03

V. Z. Kantor
Saint Petersburg, Russia

**PERSONAL ATTITUDES OF PEOPLE
WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS:
REHABILITATION-PEDAGOGICAL CONTEXT**

Abstract. In the context of the conception of personal attitudes and in line with the theoretical and methodological approaches, developed by the classics of the Russian psychology and pedagogy of the 20th century, as well as with reference to the author's structural model of social rehabilitation of persons with health disabilities and on the basis of results of a theoretical analysis, the article reveals the relative nature and the psychological essence of the object of pedagogical rehabilitation. The article is based on socio-political understanding of social rehabilitation of people with special needs according to which rehabilitation becomes a poly-dimension phenomenon admitting of classification on various principles (from the species (morphological) point of view: labor, everyday, cultural rehabilitation; in the dynamic (stage-hierarchical) aspect: initial, elementary, complete; in the instrumental (technological) aspect: medical, engineering, psychological, pedagogical). Pedagogical rehabilitation is an activity-based pedagogical variant of the whole process of rehabilitation as it represents realization of measures aimed at the formation of specific knowledge, habits and skills and personal properties necessary for the people with health disabilities for participation in social practice. External attitudes of such a person reflected in their attitude to various objects of reality constitute the target of rehabilitation of this kind. The attitude is tripartite and includes the cognitive (knowledge-based), affective (emotional) and conative (behavioral) components. The article also presents a classification according to the objects of attitude: attitude of a person with health disabilities to others, to oneself, to the objects of work, everyday life and culture.

Keywords: people with special needs; social rehabilitation of people with special needs; pedagogical rehabilitation of people with special needs; personal attitudes; cognitive, affective and conative components of attitudes; spheres of labor, everyday life and culture.

About the author: Kantor Vitaliy Zorakhovich, Doctor of Pedagogy, Professor, Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs.

Place of employment: A.I. Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, Department of Foundations of Special Pedagogy, St.Petersburg.

Recent decades have seen the formation in domestic defectology of an understanding of pedagogical rehabilitation of people with developmental disorders as a kind of specific pedagogical activity presupposing

stage-by-stage improvement of social legal capacity of such people in the sphere of labor, everyday life and culture and aimed at facilitating their preparation for the lifestyle normal for concrete historical conditions [5].

© Kantor V. Z., 2015

The given assumption is based on socio-political interpretation of social rehabilitation of people with special needs in general; in accordance with this idea social rehabilitation appears to be a multidimensional phenomenon possessing:

1) *the species (morphological)* dimension defining the basic content aspects of rehabilitation of people with special needs:

- labor (socio-labor) rehabilitation presupposing social advancement of people with special needs in professional sphere;

- everyday (socio-everyday) rehabilitation presupposing social advancement of people with special needs in the sphere of home and social everyday life;

- cultural (socio-cultural) rehabilitation presupposing social advancement of people with special needs in the sphere of cultural production and consumption

2) *dynamic (stage-hierarchical)* dimension differentiating the main stages (phases) or quality levels of rehabilitation of people with special needs:

- initial rehabilitation presupposing suspension of development of social inferiority brought about by disorders of psychic functions;

- elementary rehabilitation presupposing creation of foundations of legal capacity of people with special needs in key spheres of social practice;

- complete rehabilitation presupposing achievement of maximally possible independence and autonomy in the main spheres of social activity;

3) *instrumental (technological)*

dimension defining the basic kinds of rehabilitation activity:

- medical rehabilitation, i.e. provision of treatment for people with special needs;

- engineering (technological) rehabilitation, i.e. creation and implementation of special technical teaching aids widening the possibilities of people with special needs;

- psychological rehabilitation, i.e. holding psycho-diagnostic, psycho-prophylactic and psycho-corrective events for people with special needs;

- pedagogical rehabilitation, i.e. holding events with the aim of formation in people with special needs of specific knowledge, skills and habits necessary for participation in social practice.

Thus, pedagogical rehabilitation of people with special needs represents a certain activity-related pedagogical “slice” of their complete rehabilitation [4; 6].

Psychologically relevant comprehension of the scope of the given pedagogical activity is principally important in this context.

This assumption stems from the conception of L. S. Vygotskiy about “psychological difference” of one and the same psycho-physical disorder in different social environments and about “degeneration of external attitudes” leading to “social dislocation” which constitutes the essence of the defect [2, p. 70, 104].

And it is “external attitudes” of the personality suffering from developmental disorders that should be studied as an object of pedagogical rehabilitation of

people with special needs.

Fundamentally important here becomes the conception worked out by V. N. Myasishchev about personal attitudes according to which it is attitudes that represent “an integral system of selective conscious personal attitudes to various aspects of objective reality” [8, p. 143]; and “based on the rich individual and socio-historical experience, they (attitudes) become conscious and expressed not only in external behavior, but also in the inner world of a person created on the basis of such experience” [8, pp. 142—143]. A. S. Makarenko’s thesis that “it is attitude that constitutes the real object of pedagogical work” [7, p. 573] gets special significance in this context.

Anyhow, we are faced here with the question of which of the real attitudes function as determinants and indicators of the lifestyle of people with special needs.

The cue may be found in the conclusion of V. N. Myasishchev about the fact that with all versatility of personal attitudes we can single out the dominant ones which are represented by attitude to people, having a mutual character, attitude to oneself and attitude to real objects [10]. And attitude to people can be further specified in terms of interaction between “We” and “They” [3].

Taking into account this fact and the morphological structure of social rehabilitation of people with special needs, the determinant of their lifestyle ought to be described, first, as the attitude of a person with special needs to other people with special needs (“We”) and to normally devel-

oping people (“They”) as subjects of socio-labor activity, subjects of socio-everyday activity and subjects of socio-cultural practice; secondly, attitude – in similar terms – to oneself, and, thirdly, attitude to the object of labor, everyday life and objects of culture (first and foremost, treating arts as an object focus of art culture).

Meanwhile, attitude is known to have a tripartite structure including the cognitive (knowledge-based), affective (emotional) and conative (behavioral) components [12]. Consequently, after defining these components in terms of dominating attitudes of people with special needs it would be possible to reveal certain psychological substrata characterizing the object of their pedagogical rehabilitation.

Anyhow, the problem here lies in the fact that the corresponding task has not been properly solved on the general psycho-pedagogical level.

And the key to the solution may be found in the assumption of V. N. Myasishchev that “attitude as a connection between the subject and an object represents a unity, but the multitude of attitudes manifest more or less clearly separate components which can be termed as partial attitudes ...”, and as such, we primarily observe needs and emotional attitudes and, springing on their background and acquiring a certain degree of independence interests, responsibility attitudes, evaluations, moral-legal attitudes, etc. [9, pp. 112—113].

The principal importance of this conclusion is not connected with its nomenclature of psychological phenomena as such.

What is more, laying special emphasis on this nomenclature and the attempts to simply “project” or “superimpose” it on the tripartite structure of attitude with the purpose of making the constituent psychological phenomena take positions within the inner structure of the latter would be inappropriate.

Firstly, as long as V. N. Myasishchev has not made it a point to *classify* the kinds of partial attitudes but only stated the fact of their existence, heterogeneous phenomena of different planes were named as such. This fact, principal in itself, does not make it possible to make a conclusion about the exhaustive character of the nomenclature of partial attitudes singled out in this way. Having this in view, it becomes impossible to correctly project them on the inner structure of the basic attitude.

Hence, the search of psychological phenomena representing the components of the dominant attitude of man should be undertaken in a different location.

And really, V. N. Myasishchev’s assumption that the components of the basic attitude are also attitudes, though having a partial character, becomes a key concept.

Principally important consequences follow from this fact.

First of all, from the point of view of the structure of the components of the basic attitude it is important that not certain “corpuscular” inherently indivisible psychological phenomena, but psychological units with a tripartite structure – the structure of attitude – function as such.

And the partial character of attitudes should be interpreted not in terms of insufficiency of their structure, but in terms of their more narrow “orientation”.

In this light, an important circumstance having criterial bearing on the definition of the components of the dominant attitudes of man: same name components of the given attitudes should be treated as psychological units of the same nature, becomes evident in its turn.

On the other hand, an important conclusion about qualitative characteristics of such psychological units follows from the fact that the components of the basic attitude are also attitudes, only smaller in “scale”. This means that the given units have all features immanent in the attitude as such.

Thus it becomes possible to single out at least three more criteria necessary for the definition of the psychological substrata of the components of the dominant attitudes of man.

First, the attitude has valency, i.e. it is capable of having a positive or negative mark; hence, the psychological attitudes under study should also possess this immanent property.

Secondly, the attitude is always pointed at something or “addressed”; it exists as long as it is an attitude to something or somebody; that is why psychological units embodying its components cannot be characterized by such property as intentionality.

Thirdly, the attitude is always subjective and biased, because objective properties of material and social phenomena are the same for everyone, but the positions the people take in relation to them are selective and differ-

ent. As far as the generally accepted notion of “objective attitude” is concerned, it is connected first of all with the situation in which the attitude of a person to a certain phenomenon, being basically subjective, reflects the essential characteristics of the given phenomenon; in a different situation a person regards as objective an attitude which simply coincides with his own one.

In accordance with this fact, the psychological substance representing the components of the dominant attitudes of man should also possess the property of subjectivity and impartiality.

The criterial basis formed in this way allows the researcher to resolve the problem of psychological essence of the components of the dominant attitudes of people, including those with special needs.

As far as cognitive components are concerned, they are represented not as knowledge as such, i.e. as objective information about the essence of phenomena, but as a psychological phenomenon in which this information is combined with objective-subjective information about the value phenomena – socio-perceptive images¹.

The same criterial approach makes it possible to give an adequate definition to affective components of the dominant attitudes of man by specifying emotions as their psychological substratum.

¹ It is characteristic that much earlier S. L. Rubinshteyn practically took knowledge out of the frames of attitude by saying that psychic processes “express not only knowledge about phenomena but also attitudes to them” [13, c. 264].

At last, as far as conative components of the dominant attitudes of man are concerned, they should be represented not by his or her real behavioral acts – deeds, actions, etc., – but by corresponding social aims.

In this light, the basic components of the dominant attitudes of people with special needs, functioning as psychological substrata characterizing the object of pedagogical rehabilitation of people with special needs are clearly seen.

The attitude of a person with special needs to other people contains the cognitive component in the form of an interpersonal perception, based on the image of “we” (people with special needs) and the image of “they” (all others) as subjects of labor, everyday life and culture.

The affective component of the attitude of a person with special needs to other people as subjects of labor, everyday life and culture is represented by his or her interpersonal feelings disclosed along the lines of “we” and “they”.

The conative component of the attitude of a person with special needs to other people as subjects of labor, everyday life and culture, also opposed by the feature of belonging to areas of “we” and “they” is manifested as an aim – disposition to a certain form and character of interpersonal interaction in socio-labor, socio-everyday-life and socio-cultural spheres.

In its turn, **the attitude of a person with special needs to oneself** is correlated with its cognitive component of self-perception – the image of “I” – as a subject of labor, everyday life and culture.

The affective component of the attitude of a person with special needs to oneself embodies his or her self-perception as a subject of labor, everyday life and culture interpreted not physiologically but psychologically, which stems from the image of the feeling of “I” (“Ichgefühl”) founded earlier by W. Wundt [1].

And, finally, the conative component of the of a person with special needs to oneself as a subject of labor, everyday life and culture functions as a corresponding aim, i.e. a behavioral tendency oriented at a certain level of self-actualization in socio-labor, socio-everyday-life and socio-cultural spheres defined for oneself.

As far as the **attitude of a person with special needs to objects of labor, everyday life and culture** is concerned, its cognitive component also may and should be defined with reference to the term “perception” – this interpretation is kept in view while formulating problems of subjective perception of labor by a specialist in this or that field, as well as questions of perception, in particular, of national life and arts, and when we do not speak of a concrete character of arts but of a generalized image of “arts” as a whole as a social phenomenon [11; 14; 15].

The affective component of the attitude of a person with special needs to objects of labor, everyday life and culture represents the corresponding feelings; in this context the widely spread phrases “love of one’s work”, “love of everyday life” or “love of arts”, often used metaphorically or in general sense get concrete psycholog-

ical content.

Finally, the conative component of attitude to objects of labor, everyday life and culture represents the motivation of a person with special needs for socio-labor, socio-everyday-life and socio-cultural activity.

References

1. Vundt, V. Ocherk psikhologii / V. Vundt. — SPb. : F. Pavlenkov, 1896.
2. Vygotskiy, L. S. *Sobr. soch.* T. 5 / L. S. Vygotskiy. — M. : Pedagogika, 1983.
3. Dubrovskiy, D. I. Problema ideal'nogo / D. I. Dubrovskiy. — M. : Mysl', 1983.
4. Kantor, V. Z. Pedagogicheskaya deyatel'nost' v sisteme reabilitatsii lits s narusheniyami v razvitiy / V. Z. Kantor // *Izv. Ros. gos. ped. un-ta im. A. I. Gertsena.* — 2002. — № 2 (3).
5. Kantor, V. Z. Pedagogicheskaya reabilitatsiya invalidov po zreniyu kak spetsificheskaya pedagogicheskaya deyatel'nost' / V. Z. Kantor // *Defektologiya.* — 2003. — № 5.
6. Kantor, V. Z. Pedagogicheskaya reabilitatsiya i stil' zhizni slepykh i slabovidyashchikh / V. Z. Kantor. — SPb. : KARO, 2004.
7. Makarenko, A. S. *Izbrannye pedagogicheskie sochineniya* / A. S. Makarenko. — M. : APN, 1949.
8. Myasishchev, V. N. Problema otnosheniy cheloveka i ee mesto v psikhologii / V. N. Myasishchev // *Voprosy psikhologii.* — 1957. — № 5.
9. Myasishchev, V. N. Osnovnye problemy i sovremennoe sostoyanie psikhologii otnosheniy cheloveka / V. N. Myasishchev // *Psikhologicheskaya nauka v SSSR* / APN. — M., 1960. — T. 2.
10. Myasishchev, V. N. *Struktura lichnosti i otnosheniya cheloveka k deystvitel'nosti* / V. N. Myasishchev // *Psikhologiya lichnosti* / MGU. — M., 1982.
11. Permyakova, T. M. *Vospri-yatie*

professii prepodavatelya angliyskogo yazyka studentami yazykovoy spetsial'nosti / T. M. Permyakova, M. S. Sheveleva // Vestn. Perm. un-ta. — 2013. — № 4 (16).

12. Prokhvatilov, A. A. Sotsi-al'no-psikhologicheskie probleme-my formirovaniya polozhitel'nogo otnosheniya k trudu / A. A. Prokhvatilov // Chelovek i obshchestvo / LGU. — L., 1971. — Vyp. 8.

13. Rubinshteyn, S. L. Bytie i soznanie / S. L. Rubinshteyn. — M. : AN SSSR,

1957.

14. Terent'eva, N. A. Khudozhestvenno-tvorcheskoe razvitie mladshikh shkol'nikov na urokakh muzyki v protsesse tselostnogo vospriyatiya razlich-nykh vidov iskusstva / N. A. Terent'eva. — M. : Prometey, 1990.

15. Uzhankov, A. N. Vospriyatie tvorchestva i pisatel'skogo truda v Drevney Rusi / A. N. Uzhankov // Baltiyskiy filologicheskiy kur'er. — 2005. — № 5.