

THE ESSENCE OF STUDYING THE PHENOMENON OF DISABILITY IN SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIES

Abduvaliyeva Mumtozxon Asilbekovna
PhD, doctor of philosophy in sociology

ANNOTATION

This article is devoted to the analysis of the classical theoretical and methodological foundations of concepts about the phenomenon of disability in sociology. During the study, it was found that there were three main interpretations of disability, which can be divided into socially dominant (G. Spencer, E. Durkheim), personality-dominant (M. Weber) and two-sided (R. Merton). The study of various concepts of classical sociologists about persons with disabilities has shown that a significant number of concepts and theoretical works have been accumulated that are tailored to questions about this community.

Keywords: disability, social model, medical model, constructivism, positivism, phenomenological approach, interactionist approach, institutional approach, stigma, deviation, physical defect.

In the process of studying the theoretical and methodological foundations of the phenomenon of disability, it was found that the concepts of disability serve as the theoretical basis for studying this subject. These concepts establish methodological approaches to the consideration of people with disabilities as a social group, contribute to the perception and understanding of the phenomenon of disability.

To date, Western and domestic scientists study the phenomenon of disability within the framework of positivist (objectively existing phenomena of generally recognized measures, laws, values) and phenomenological (subjective components – limitations, barriers, obstacles) approaches in various fields of science [1].

Positivism developed under the influence of concepts such as deviation, stigmatization and discrimination. Disability concepts based on this approach consider people with disabilities as a special community. From the point of view of this approach, people with disabilities are the object of influence of the image of a person with disabilities existing in the consciousness of society [2, 3,].

This approach determines the advantage of objective conditions of social adaptation of persons with disabilities and was formed from the "Medical model" of understanding disability, according to which people with disabilities were considered as people with a particular physiological disability, a disease that determines the state of disability. Proponents of this model believe that the solution to the problem lies only in the complete cure of the existing disorder [4, 5].

Positivism is formed through three theories (socio-pathological, socio-disorganization and socio-deviant theories) according to which people with disabilities were personified with the image of people objectively living in difficult living conditions.

The works of the famous Italian social psychiatrist Ch. Lombroso and one of the founders of sociology, E. Durkheim, were based on the concept of a socio-pathological approach. The essence of this approach was that people with disabilities were viewed as carriers of a certain pathology, and society was compared with an organism whose normal functioning is hindered by diseases associated with the inability to provide for certain people, including people with disabilities. And only social treatment, therapy to correct individual and physiological pathologies, endowment with self-support skills, is the only condition for social adaptation of persons with disabilities [6, 7].

In our opinion, the peculiarity of the socio-pathological theory is excessive biologization (from Greek. *bios* life and *logos* word, teaching)[8] approach as a social group of persons with disabilities in particular, and reducing their problems to medical and mental. Unfortunately, in our country, discriminatory terms based on the health status of a person with a disability are still found in various regulatory legal acts and documents, which in fact legitimizes such stratification.

In their writings, well-known scientists from the USA U. Thomas, F. Znanetsky, were based on the second, socially disorganized approach with disability. According to this approach, it is not the functionality of social institutions that contributes to the emergence of persons with disabilities

(first of all, healthcare institutions and rehabilitation centers), poor-quality provision of services and failure to fulfill the tasks that they must solve in the course of their activities [9]. Works focused on social policy, social protection and support of persons with disabilities in the context of a socially disorganized approach to disability are presented in the works of Russian sociologists, E. Kholostova, N. Guseva, V. Petrosyan, G. Sillast [10, 11, 12, 13].

In our opinion, the socially disorganized approach limits the understanding of people with disabilities to the clients of the social protection authorities, they do not take into account that people with disabilities are capable of self- and mutual assistance.

The third, socially deviant approach to the social group of people with disabilities within the framework of objectivism is described in detail in the works of R. Merton and T. Parson. According to this approach, the stability of

society is guaranteed by the functioning of the existing standards of behavior in them. People with disabilities, due to their physiological and mental limitations, are considered as deviants[14, 15]. In the studies of modern American scientists M.Oliver, J. Campbell and Ch.Oldman can see a more detailed approach to the understanding of disability within the framework of objectivism, according to which the understanding of disability is associated with medical and social models [16, 17].

In our opinion, the positive side of this theory is the designation of the need to meet the special needs of people with disabilities as conditions for their social adaptation. But reducing them to the number of deviants distorts the social nature of this social group. Also, the main factor contributing to solving the problems of socialization and adaptation is compensation for physical or mental disorders by providing medical services to an individual and providing them with disability pension payments, which in our opinion is insufficient.

Gradually, with the realization that the social adaptation of a person with a disability in society is associated not only with objective factors,

but also with subjective ones, phenomenological (constructionist) concepts of understanding disability began to appear, formed under the influence of information provided by the media and through interpersonal communication [18].

So in 1963, American sociologists Peter Berger and Thomas Lukman published the book "The Social Construction of Reality", thereby marking the beginning of the phenomenological socio-constructionist theory of disability. According to their theory, people, based on social circumstances and context, form social reality themselves and create their own identity. Also, they believed that social reality cannot exist independently, it is a certain reality of a person living in a particular society. In the view of P. Berger, etc. People with disabilities live in a society characterized by people without disabilities, and who assign them the role of the sick and needy, but in the hands of people with disabilities themselves the possibility of isolating their "I" and the surrounding reality [19].

Later, one of the bright proponents of the constructionist approach, G. Bloomer, said that the criteria for determining people with disabilities should not be a set of objective social conditions, but are, first of all, the result of a collective definition process. He condemned the classical approach, which is aimed at finding and analyzing the circumstances, conditions and causes that led people with disabilities to dysfunction, deviance and maladaptation.

G. Bloomer stated that he is against the definition of people who find themselves in difficult life circumstances, through people who supposedly reveal characteristic features, as confirmation he cites the following circumstance: persons who find themselves in difficult life circumstances have every chance not to be regarded as such in a specific period and in a certain place while preserving the circumstances that were noted in as a complex life circumstances[19].

So, during the intensive development of constructionist views, one of the conditions for the formation of disability studies was the separation of the definitions of disability and disability. Since a violation means a defect or deficiency in the body, disability refers to the peculiarities of the environment, which excludes or restricts people with physiological or mental limitations. Based on these principles, disability is considered as the oppression of people with disabilities by society, by protecting them from participation in key areas of public life.

Thus, scientists working within the constructivist understanding of disability did not agree with the positivist approach, which considers their objective features to be the reason for the appearance of people with disabilities. On the contrary, in their opinion, the process of socialization of people with disabilities complicates the conditions in which this social group exists. In our opinion, this approach laid the foundation for the formation of a "social model" of understanding disability[20].

In parallel with the development of the constructionist approach, a completely new, interactionistic approach began to develop. In particular, in 1963, the fundamental work of the American sociologist Irving Hoffman "Stigma: Notes on the management of corrupted identity" was published, which laid the foundation for the study of disability in the concept of interactionism. It analyzed the marginalization and stigmatization of the "Abnormal" body. Under the stigma, I. Hoffman saw "a situation where an individual is considered incapable of a full-fledged social life," while he combined this problem with deviance. I. Hoffman believed that any individual who became a victim of "Labeling" by a person in a deviant position. In accordance with his concept, "Normal people" regularly stigmatize people with disabilities and this, according to him, is a two-way process. That is, not only "Non-disabled people" subject them to stereotypes, but also people with disabilities themselves treat themselves according to the opinion established in society. The definitions of identity and stigmatization in Hoffmann are connected and overlap with each other. He divides it into two types: conditional social identity (those assumptions and guesses that we establish in relation to a stigmatized person, for ourselves, understanding in advance about the meeting); real social identity (these are the features and qualities that a stigmatized person possesses in reality)[21].

In his book Hoffman "Stigma: Notes on the Management of a Corrupted Identity," he writes: "When we meet a stranger, we may notice evidence that he has some quality that distinguishes him from other people of his category and is undesirable for him. Thus, in our consciousness, he turns from a whole ordinary person into an inferior one, possessing some kind of defect (spoiled). Thus, the term "stigma" will be used to denote a quality that gives out some shameful property of a disabled person. Moreover, the nature of this quality is determined not by the quality itself, but by the attitude about it"[21]. That is, according to I. Hoffman, a person with a disability is thus a person with a stigma. Based on this, discrimination against him and a decrease in his personal life chances for social adaptation in society are quite likely.

In our opinion, the study of the phenomenon of disability from the perspective of stigmatization by Irwin Hoffman contributes to the creation of more effective measures to combat it, and is important both for sociologists and

social workers, as well as for all other specialists dealing with health, rehabilitation, well-being and moral status of individuals and groups of the population.

Later in 1966, Hoffman's research was continued by the British human rights activist and a person with a disability, Paul Hunt. He collected 12 essays under the title "Stigma: Disability Experience" based on the experiences of people with disabilities, as well as practitioners in which the social nature of stigmatization was highlighted. In their work, Paul Hunt and other scientists paid special attention to the imperfections of the British social system, which, as a rule, were of a formal nature and which they, together with the participation of the public, would like to get rid of[22].

It can be considered that the work of P. Hunt and his co-authors is the first attempt to transform the attitude to disability, which was characterized in the 60s of the twentieth century as a physical defect, as well as the beginning of a strictly medical approach to disability to a social one. Since the main issue for sociologists working in the tradition of symbolic interactionism in the 1960s was the study of the social interaction of society with vulnerable categories of people, such as people with disabilities. They studied the relationship between disability and socially prohibited actions. At first, researchers focusing on this paradigm were interested in illegal actions of people and drug addiction, but after a significant ethnographic study, they were interested in the mechanisms of forming theories of labeling people with disabilities.

In his sociological study "Social Pathology" M. Lemert identified the differences between primary and secondary deviation. In his opinion, secondary deviation is the main and strongly impressing element for those who have focused their social life on stigmatized social roles. People with disabilities are subjected to "Typical stigmatization", and their stigma acts as the main status that determines the nature of their interaction with other people, the general reaction to this label will certainly consolidate and strengthen for them the stigmatized image of themselves as unlike everyone else, as a "Person with disabilities"[23].

Within the framework of this theory, M. Lemert studied the phenomena of social control and social reaction, as well as how a person's social problem affects his relationship with society. He approached this issue from two positions, that is, from the position of the community and from the position of a person with deviance and placed great responsibility on society, since it, being an agent of social control, is responsible for labeling people with disabilities.

The study of disability in the USA revealed that norms were often formed under the influence of consumer culture. Mass media, advertising depict the body as a means to extract pleasure. They popularize the image of a young, healthy and beautiful body. Consequently, in order to achieve these results, people's consumer demand is increasing. If the state of the body deviates from the "Normal", a person automatically leaves the consumer and becomes a deviant, scientists with the theory of stigmatization for the first time tried to influence the change of attitudes and practices in the field of disability [24, 25].

American sociologist Robert Scott believed that the "Theory of Deviance" should not be used in social relations between rehabilitation specialists and persons with disabilities. In his opinion, disability is a kind of forced socialization, where a person with a disability becomes dependent and subordinate to society, while he loses his normal human status, reduces the degree of responsibility for rehabilitation and improvement of his own health conditions. But the price of this is the categorization of persons with disabilities as second-class citizens. Later, Scott studied socialization and the connection of blind people with disabilities with social services[26].

Most of the studies of sociologists in the USA and England contributed to the further development of the theory of stigmatization, where they explained the position of society towards a stigmatized person (including people with disabilities), their status and position in society. Society assigns a number of other problems to a person with a spinal injury, such as that a person in a wheelchair is not able to fully work and perform the same functions as a healthy person. He is not able to play sports, move around without the help of other people, buy groceries in a store, and the like. Over time, the understanding of disability has consistently evolved and changed. If, on the one hand, some scientists defined it as a consequence of stigmatization, labeling. Others considered disability to be one of the forms of deviant behavior. Most of the definitions of disability are close to concepts such as "abnormality" (abnormality), or inability to exercise "normal participation" (normal participation) in life. American scientists have focused their attention exclusively on the point of view of "Abnormality", "Subnormality" and "Difference" as the main element of disability. The inability to productively carry out their own social functions was seen as a deviation from the norm, as a result, people with disabilities were considered a layer of society that threaten the destruction of established cultural values and social traditions, aesthetics, productivity and morality.[27, 28, 29, 30].

The analysis showed the presence of the phenomenon of social construction of disability. At the same time, the process is controlled primarily by the mass media and the public opinion about disability formed by them, which identifies the perception and assessment of people with disabilities. Thus, the interactionist approach to disability represents the definition of a person with a disability not only as people who have exclusively physical or mental disabilities or limitations, but also from the point of view of the social definition of this circumstance, a label pasted by social consciousness in relation to this minority.

In the 70s of the twentieth century, a new theory began to form – institutionalism, the development of which was largely influenced by constructionist theory. The researchers stated that the procedures and manipulations used in many modern institutional institutions can be regarded as culturally specific practices that are linked by myths, traditions and rules that exist in most societies and are used in organizations. That is, they are united by the transfer of cultural practices[31, 32, 33].

Thus, American sociologists Sharon Barnett and Richard Scott, having conducted a study and analyzed the changes taking place in politics, economics and culture in relation to people with disabilities in the United States, in the period from 1970 to 1999, postulated the institutionalization of disability through the formation of social movements protecting the rights and legitimate interests of people with disabilities. The researchers analyzed various aspects of protest movements, taking into account their cross-culturality and distinctive features of people with disabilities, and also tried to assess the possible results of their activities[34].

Later, studies were conducted on negative attitudes towards people with disabilities, on financial support and public services provided to people with disabilities in the context of historical changes, on the development of legal aspects of the phenomenon of disability, as well as on organizations providing social and medical assistance to people with disabilities. If in the USA and European countries the processes of studying the sociology of disability intensified in the 60-70 years of the XX century, then domestic research on the phenomenon of disability began only at the beginning of the XXI century[35, 36, 37, 38, 39].

The study of conceptual approaches to understanding the phenomenon of disability allowed us to draw the following conclusions:

Firstly, the positivist approach has developed such concepts as "Deviation", "Stigmatization" and "Discrimination". This approach is based on the idea that a person with a disability cannot provide for an independent life and be considered a full member of society. This approach is a prototype of the "Medical Model" of understanding disability;

Secondly, the phenomenological (constructionist) approach is characterized by the connection of social and individual construction of reality. The constructionist approach or "Social Model" to disability takes the problems of a person with disabilities beyond personal capabilities and attitudes and analyzes the existence of links between an individual and various structures offering, in addition to medical care, a whole range of social services, such as socio-environmental adaptation, vocational rehabilitation, information support and other social measures. protection. thereby creating favorable conditions for the life of persons with disabilities;

Thirdly, according to the interactionist approach, a person with disabilities, due to their physiological or intellectual disabilities, acquired "deviance" and became "marginal". As a result, it acquired a two-way character, as a result of which people with disabilities themselves began to feel like "deviants". In this process, theories about labeling and stigmatization of people with disabilities are of particular interest in the study of social adaptation of persons with disabilities.

Fourth, the institutionalist approach analyzes the subjective components that affect the life of people with disabilities, in which the activity of people with disabilities themselves, the formation of disabled movements and the increase in the number of scientific communities researching the problems of people with disabilities play an important role.

The use of various theoretical concepts of disability provides opportunities for the study and comprehensive study of the phenomenon of disability.

REFERENCES:

1. Merton R.K., Nisbet R. Contemporary social problems. - N.-Y., 1976. – P.152.
2. American Social Problems. An institutional Analysis. — New Jersey, 1992. P. 23–25; Spector M. Constructing social problems. — N.-Y., 1987. P. 58;
3. Fuller R. Social Theory and Social Problems // Social Forces. 1937. № 15. – P. 496–50.
4. Medical and labor expertise and rehabilitation of the sick and disabled: collection of scientific tr. — Tashk. gos. med. in-t, 1991. p. 123;
5. Dementieva N.F. Forms and methods of medical and social rehabilitation of disabled citizens. — M., 1991. pp. 156,157.
6. Durkheim E. Sociology: its subject, method, purpose: monograph. M.: Terra-Book Club, 2008. – p.399.
7. Lombroso Ch. Genius and insanity: monograph. M.: Astrel, 2012. – p.349.
8. Explanatory dictionary of Sociology. 2013. URL: <http://sociology.niv.ru/>
9. Thomas W., Znanetsky F. The concept of social disorganization. Kazan. 2001. – p.135.
10. Kholostova E. Social work with the disabled. Publishing House "Dashkov and K". 2009. – p.240.
11. Guseva N.K. Formation of individual rehabilitation programs as a direction of work of the ITU Bureau / N.K. Guseva // Questions of balneology, physiotherapy and physical therapy. 1994. No. 1. – pp.33-35.
12. Petrosyan V.A. Integration of disabled people into Russian society: dissertation of the Doctor of Social Sciences. M., 2011.
13. Sillaste G.G. Social assistance and social adaptation of children with disabilities: social analysis: Materials on the courses "Social pedagogy", "Social worker". M., 1995. – p.46.
14. Merton R.K. Social theory and social structure: monograph. M.: AST, 2006. – p.873;
15. Parsons T. On Social systems: a monograph / edited by V.F. Chesnokova. M.: Academic Project, 2002. – P.830.
16. Oliver M., Campbell J. Disability Politics: Understanding Our Past, Changing Our Future. L., 1996. – P 83-97;
17. Oldman Ch. Later life and the social model of disability: A comfortable partnership? // Ageing a. society. Cambridge. 2002. № 6. – P.791–806.

18. M. Abduvalieva. Countering the negative impact of the pandemic on the lives of people with disabilities in Uzbekistan. 2021. *Modern society: assessment of the state and prospects of development*. Monograph. P - 139-143.
19. Berger Peter, Lukman Thomas: *Social Construction of reality. A treatise on the sociology of knowledge*. Translation into Russian: E.Rutkevich. M., 1995. – p.478.
20. M. Abduvalieva. Problems of overcoming stigmatization and the formation of a tolerant consciousness in society in relation to persons with disabilities. 2021. *Journal of Social Research*. Volume - 4.pp. 62-75.Goffman E. *Stigma. Notes on the management of spoiled identity*.L.; N.-Y., 1986. – P.48.
21. Cm: Hunt P. *Stigma: the experience of disability*. London; Dublin. Geoffrey Chapman, 1996. – P.176.
22. Lemert E.M. *Human deviance, social problems, and social control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1967 – P.110.
23. Hayward K.A. *A Hierarchy of disability: attitudes of people with disabilities toward one another*. a doctoral thesis. Los Angeles: University of California, 2005. – P.29.
24. Featherstone M. *The body in consumer culture // Theory, Culture and Society*, 1982. T. 1. № 2. – P.18–33.
25. Scott R.A. *The making of blind men: a study of adult socialization*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1981. – P.141.
26. Susman J. *Disability, stigma and deviance // Social Science and Medicine*, 1994. L.38. № 1. – Pp.15–22;.
27. Ablon J. *The nature of stigma and medical conditions // Epilepsy and Behavior*, 2002. L. 3. № 6. – Pp.2–9;
28. Schriener K. *The political implications of the disability construct in public policy // Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 2000. L. 11. № 2. – P.103-104;
29. Silvers A. (In) equality, (AB) normality, and the Americans with Disabilities Act. // *The Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*. 1996. L. 21. № 2. – Pp.209–240.
30. Meyer J.W., Rowan B. *Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony // American Journal of Sociology*. № 83. 1977 – P.340–363;
31. John W. Meyer and W. R. Scott, *Organizational environments: ritual and rationality* (Beverly Hills, Sage, 1983); and Paul J. DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell, 'Introduction' in Powell and DiMaggio (eds.),
32. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1991). – P.1–40.
33. Barnartt S.N., Scotch R.K. *Disability protests: contentious politics 1970-1999*. Washington: Gallaudet University Press, 2001. – P. 274
34. Finkelstein V. *The commonality of disability* URL:<http://disabilitystudies.leeds.ac.uk/files/library/finkelstein-Commonality-of-Disability>.
35. Braddock D. *Disability at the dawn of the 21st century and the state of the states*. Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Retardation, 2002. – Pp.498.
36. Bowe F. *Handicapping America: barriers to disabled people*. New York: Harper and Row, 1978. – Pp.254.
37. Zola I. *Missing pieces: a chronicle of living with a disability*: Temple University Press, 1982. . – Pp.247.
38. Imrie R. *Barrierred and bounded places and the spatialities of disability // Urban Studies*, 2001. Vol. 38. № 2. – Pp.232.