Ableism and Mindset of Future Educators

Maja Lebeničnik
Univerza na Primorskem,
Pedagoška fakulteta
maja.lebenicnik@pef.upr.si

Karmen Drljić
Univerza na Primorskem,
Pedagoška fakulteta
karmen.drljic@pef.upr.si

Sensitivity toward vulnerable social groups and ensuring equal opportunities for them represents an important social aspect of a sustainability-oriented society. This paper therefore examines the phenomenon of ableism – a form of prejudice against individuals with special needs, that stems from the ideal of the fully capable individual and the simultaneous underestimation of the abilities of people with special needs. This study also researches the role of beliefs about the malleability of individual traits (so called 'mindset') in the self-assessment of ableism. Among students (N = 232) enrolled in various educational study programmes at the Faculty of Education, University of Primorska (UP PEF), we assessed the presence of ableism and their mindset, as well as potential correlations between the two concepts. The analysis of the results revealed that students preparing for future work primarily with vulnerable groups (e. g. individuals with special needs) report less ableism than those preparing to work mainly with the normative population. Fixed mindset was weakly positively correlated with the component of ableism named 'Discrimination.' Growth mindset showed moderate positive correlation with the ableism component named 'Personal Responsibility.' Multiple linear regression showed that the nature of study programmes significantly predicted ableism and its components, but growth mindset significantly predicted only the facet of ableism, in which people pass the responsibility for success solely onto the disabled individual. We can conclude that mindset (about intelligence) is not a useful concept for predicting ableism.

Keywords: ableism, mindset, higher education, pre-service teachers

https://doi.org/10.26493/978-961-293-538-2.9

Introduction

Sustainability is defined as a multi-dimensional concept, covering the economic, environmental, and social spheres. In addressing the social dimension of sustainability – that is, the pursuit of a sustainable society – the emphasis is placed on the provision of inclusive and equitable education, ensuring equal opportunities for lifelong learning for all of those with disabilities (UNESCO,

Hudovernik, S., Lepičnik Vodopivec, J., Drljić, K., Birsa, E., Mezgec, M., Cotič, N., Dolenc, P., Ferbežar, N., Hozjan, D., in Štemberger, T. (ur.). (2025). *Vseživljenjsko učenje kot temelj trajnostne družbe.* Založba Univerze na Primorskem.

2016). The overarching concern of a sustainable society is to focus on the removal of barriers, including discriminatory practices towards persons with disabilities in the education system. Discriminatory practices may be the result of prejudice (Sherwood & Kattari, 2023).

Ableism

Prejudice against people with disabilities is referred to as ableism (Bogart & Dunn, 2019), which manifests in either discrimination against people with disabilities or favouritism towards people without disabilities (Conley & Nadler, 2022). An essential characteristic of ableism is that its nature is not always overt and thus readily identifiable. Indeed, it is often identified in its subtle form, for example, in its patronizing and protective attitude, as well as in its overstated expressions of empathy (Nario-Redmond et al., 2019; Sellwood et al., 2022).

Despite the growing focus on ableism in societal research, it remains a relatively understudied phenomenon within the educational context (Storey, 2007; Evans et al., 2017). Parekh (2022) identifies the origins of ableism in education in meritocracy, the recognition of one's responsibility for one's success, and the consequent favourable treatment of students who can achieve the expected goals and demonstrate high school performance. However, this perspective has the consequence of failing to acknowledge the role of educators in fostering a supportive and inclusive learning environment. Consequently, this perspective results in low expectations for students with disabilities and special needs (Damianidou & Phtiaka, 2017).

In addressing issues of ableism within the context of higher education of future educators, providing students with direct experience of people living with disabilities has been shown to contribute towards a reduction in ableist prejudicial attitudes (Rizzo et al., 2021). Drljić and Lebeničnik (2025) identified a four-dimensional construct of ableism in students – future educators, which includes the following components: (1) Personal Responsibility, (2) Inspirational Portrayal of Disability, (3) Discrimination, and (4) Low Empathy for Disabled People. Personal responsibility is the first dimension of the ableism construct, emphasizing individual effort as the sole determinant of success. Future teachers, who exhibit stronger ableism, endorse the notion that perseverance alone ensures positive outcomes for disabled people, disregarding systemic barriers. The second factor, inspirational portrayal of disability, is more subtle, advocating that an individual's determination can overcome any disability-related challenges. This perspective implicitly frames disability as primarily an attitudinal limitation. Discrimination, the third factor of

ableism, assumes that people with disabilities are not discriminated against but rather expect too much from society. Ableism also manifests as a lack of empathy towards disabled individuals (the fourth factor) and an inability to recognize the social injustice they face, thereby underscoring the pervasive nature of ableism in various facets of society. Beside defining the concept of ableism, it is important to research potential factors that contribute to the formation of ableist attitudes.

Mindset and Prejudices

More recent literature indicates a potential link between the concepts of mindset and ableism (Hoyt & Burnette, 2025). According to the mindset theory (Dweck, 2006), people hold varying beliefs about how much human characteristics (for example personality traits, abilities, talents) can change. Some individuals believe these traits are largely unchangeable – an outlook Dweck (2006) termed a fixed mindset. In contrast, those with a growth mindset believe that abilities can be developed through effort, persistence, experimenting with different strategies, and seeking support or guidance from others.

In their work, Hoyt and Burnette (2025) presented two theoretical frameworks to elucidate the relationship between mindset and prejudice: the double-edged sword model and the stigma-reduction model. The double-edged sword model is somewhat equivocal, as it possesses the capacity of growth mindset to simultaneously augment or diminish prejudice towards individuals. The enhancement of this bias occurs when individuals are held responsible for their condition, so they are blamed for it (Hoyt & Burnette, 2025). That is why sometimes 'fixed' messages about the nature of the stigmatized attribute (e. g. obesity as the disease and not the consequence of lifestyle) are believed to reduce prejudices against stigmatized groups (Hoyt & Burnette, 2025). In the context of disability, the blame is attributed to the condition itself. Conversely, the role of growth mindset in a decline in prejudice can be attributed to the deconstruction of the categorization of individuals based on presumed inherent characteristics or so-called social essentialism (Hoyt & Burnette, 2025). Consequently, adopting a growth mindset concerning the intelligence of disabled individuals, wherein intelligence is conceptualized as malleable, may potentially diminish prejudice towards the intelligence of disabled individuals. The stigma-reduction model suggests that when a condition is attributed to external causes, the reduction in blame is linked to a growth mindset. The perception of capability plays a pivotal role in this regard (Hoyt & Burnette, 2025). Babij et al. (2023) investigated the role of the double-edged sword model with regard to mental illness and found

that a stronger growth mindset about mental illness is negatively linked to prejudices. This outcome was attributed to the negative links between prejudice and social essentialism but also to blame, which is inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the double-edged sword model. Moreover, the author also reported that the link was not consistent between conditions (i. e. prejudice differed between obesity and mental illness) and differed with the perception of the condition being more or less controllable. The relationship between mindset and prejudices is not clear at that point.

Research Problem and Hypothesis

Ableism is a form of prejudice that manifests through stereotypes and systemic discrimination, much like other prejudices. Nevertheless, the conceptual framework of ableism provides a useful lens through which to comprehend contemporary, covert biases against disabled individuals, particularly in the context of educational systems that frequently serve to perpetuate these biases. Mindset has recently been identified as a potentially important factor with an ambiguous effect on prejudice and stigma. This study explores the role of mindset in the manifestation of symbolic ableism, since there exist interventions, aimed at influencing and changing an individual's mindset (Yeager et al., 2016).

We set the following research hypotheses:

- H1 There is a statistically significant difference in self-reported ableism between students studying to work with the general population and those studying to work with vulnerable groups.
- H2 There is a statistically significant correlation between mindset and ableism.
- H3 Mindset and the type of study programme (prospective work with mainly vulnerable groups/mainstream population) and self-assessed knowledge significantly predict ableism.

Methodology

Participants

This study involved 232 education students from the University of Primorska's Faculty of Education, representing various programmes: Pre-school Teaching (32.3 %), Social Pedagogy (14.7 %), Pedagogy (9.9 %), Primary School Teaching (32.8 %) and Inclusive Pedagogy (10.3 %). Reflecting the gender imbalance in education fields, 94.8 % of participants identified as female (N = 220), with

4.3 % male (N = 10) and 0.8 % not specifying (N = 2). Participants were 20.6 years old on average (SD = 1.7).

Instruments

Adapted Symbolic Ableism Scale (A-SAS)

The A-SAS (Drljić & Lebeničnik, 2025) was used to measure symbolic ableism. It encompasses 15 items, subdivided into the following four subscales: (a) Personal Responsibility, (b) Inspirational Portrayal of Disability, (c) Discrimination, and (d) Low Empathy for Disabled People. Total score represents the general assessment of symbolic ableism. Respondents were invited to rate their level of agreement or disagreement with the statements presented to them using a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 indicated 'strongly disagree' and 7 indicated 'strongly agree.' The A-SAS demonstrated adequate reliability (α = 0.72–0.84 across four subscales). The detailed psychometric analysis of A-SAS conducted on our sample can be seen in Drljić and Lebeničnik (2025).

Implicit Theories of Intelligence (Self-Theory) Scale

Constructed by De Castella and Byrne (2015), the Implicit Theories of Intelligence scale was developed to measure mindset about intelligence as a unidimensional construct. Individuals scoring higher see their own intelligence as being a malleable characteristic (having more growth mindset about intelligence). Lower scores indicate a view of one's intellectual abilities as less malleable (fixed mindset). We used the Slovenian translation of the scale (Polh Budja & Košir, 2019). The scale consists of 8 items with a 6-point assessment scale. The reliability of the 8-item scale in our sample is adequate (α = 0.83).

Even though initially conceptualized as a unidimensional construct by Dweck (2006), recent research trends suggest that fixed and growth mindset may be correlated, but in fact be representing two distinct continuums, since scores on growth mindset and fixed mindset scales often predict different outcomes (Boncquet et al., 2023). Because of this, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the instrument on our sample. The data was appropriate for conducting EFA. Principal axis factoring revealed that a two-factor structure of the instrument is more valid for our data, explaining 46.8 % of variance. A solution, using Varimax rotation, provided two interpretable factors. Four items, describing growth mindset loaded on one factor (α = 0.82) and four items, describing fixed mindset, loaded on the other factor (α = 0.67).

Self-assessment of knowledge was measured with three items. These items reflected the self-assessment of knowledge in three domains: (a) the inclu-

sion concept; (b) educational strategies to use with students with special needs; and (c) psychological characteristics of students with special needs. Participants self-assessed their knowledge on a 5-point scale (1 – 'I don't know well at all'; 5 – 'I know very well'). Principal component analysis was conducted on three items. One clear component explained 73.3 % of the variance. So, it was statistically appropriate to merge the three variables into one composite score. All three items loaded strongly (>0.79) on the single extracted component. However, one item significantly reduced the reliability of the scale and was deleted. The reliability for the remaining two items was high ($rSB = 0.84$).

A *Demographic questionnaire*was employed to ascertain information regarding gender, age and programme enrolment.

Data Gathering

Using a non-random convenience sampling approach, data were collected through the 1KA online platform from January to February 2024. We obtained ethical approval from the University of Primorska's Commission for Ethics in Research Involving Human Participants (Approval No. 4264-41-6/23). The participants provided their informed consent to participate in this study.

Data Analysis

After establishing psychometric characteristics of scales, we performed a set of statistical analysis to check the hypotheses. We performed a *t*-test and Mann-Whitney U test to check Hypothesis 1. For Hypothesis 2 we calculated Spearman's rho correlation coefficient. A hierarchical linear regression with enter method was conducted to test Hypothesis 3.

Results with Discussion

In our survey we investigated the nature of ableism among students from various educational study programmes and aimed to identify significant predictors of ableism of prospective educators.

Ableism among Education Students from Different Study Programmes

Our sample consisted of students from five different study programmes. Some study programmes prepare students to a greater extent than other programmes to work with vulnerable groups (such as students with special educational needs, marginal groups, etc.) in and/or outside of educational settings. On the basis of this distinction, we compared self-assessed

Table 1 Comparison Between Groups on the Adapted Symbolic Ableism Scale (Mann-Whitney U-test)

Subscale	Mean Rank		*U*	*p*
	(1)	(2)		
Personal responsibility	100.88	124.88	7380.5	0.01
Discrimination	99.4	125.69	7502.5	0.004
Inspirational portrayal of disability	119.63	114.82	5862.0	0.601

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) group 1 ($n = 81$), (2) group 2 ($n = 151$).

Table 2 Comparison Between Groups on the Adapted Symbolic Ableism Scale (*t*-test)

Subscale	Mean		*t*	*p*
	(1)	(2)		
Low empathy	3.18	3.69	−3.45	<0.001
Symbolic ableism	3.02	3.34	−3.44	<0.001

Notes Column headings are as follows: (1) group 1 ($n = 81$), (2) group 2 ($n = 151$).

ableism between two groups. Students from Group 1 ($N = 81$) will more probably work with vulnerable groups. Those students are enrolled in the study programmes Pedagogy, Social Pedagogy and Inclusive Pedagogy. Students from Group 2 ($N = 151$) are students from Pre-School Teaching and Primary School Teaching programmes. Curriculums from those study programmes are more oriented towards work with the mainstream population of children and students. However, because of the inclusive paradigm in Slovenian primary and pre-school education, those students also receive some knowledge on working with vulnerable groups. Analysis of differences between groups in self-assessed knowledge confirmed that students from Group 1 ($Me = 3.0$) report higher knowledge on topics from special education than students from Group 2 ($Me = 2.5$); the difference was statistically significant ($U = 3037.0$; $Z = -5.59$; $p < 0.001$). Effect size ($r = 0.38$) was moderate. Both groups also statistically significantly differed in the age variable. Students in Group 1 were significantly older ($Me = 22.0$) than students in Group 2 ($Me = 20.0$) ($U = 2970.0$; $Z = -6.63$, $p < 0.001$; $r = 0.43$). In Hypothesis 1 we expected that there will be differences in expressed ableism between two groups. In Tables 1 and 2 those differences are presented.

There was a statistically significant difference between the two groups on low empathy, with a large effect size (Cohen's $d = 1.06$; 95 % CI [−0.75, −0.20]). On the symbolic ableism variable (representing total score on A-SAS), the effect size was medium (Cohen's $d = 0.68$). Analysis, using nonparametric tests, showed that the groups differ significantly on the personal responsibility and

Table 3 Correlations between Mindset and Different Components of Ableism

(Sub)scale	Mindset		Fixed mindset		Growth mindset	
	ρ	p	ρ	p	ρ	p
Personal responsibility	0.16‡	0.02	−0.04	0.60	0.42‡	<0.001
Discrimination	−0.16‡	0.02	0.14‡	0.04‡	−0.13	0.05
Low empathy	−0.11	0.11	0.11	0.09	−0.06	0.38
Inspirational portrayal of disability	0.04	0.55	−0.03	0.69	0.05	0.47
Symbolic ableism	−0.03	0.68	0.06	0.41	0.02	0.75

Notes ‡ Significant correlation coefficients.

discrimination subscale, but not on the inspirational portrayal of disability subscale. Students from Group 1, who are expected to work with vulnerable groups, report ableism to a lesser degree than students who will work mainly with the mainstream population. They report fewer discriminatory beliefs, higher empathy towards people with disabilities and assign less personal responsibility for success to people with disabilities. Those results were expected, because students from Pedagogy/Social Pedagogy/Inclusive Pedagogy programmes probably have more experience and contact with people with disabilities, and contact can lower the degree of prejudice against the group (Rizzo et al., 2021). Differences in age or knowledge between groups can also cause differences in ableism and so we will address this later with linear regression analysis.

Mindset and Ableism

Mindset has recently been proposed as a potential factor contributing to stigma and prejudices (Hoyt & Burnette, 2025). The nature and direction of this relationship is not clear yet. In Hypothesis 2 we suggested that mindset and ableism are significantly correlated, but the direction of the correlation was not assumed. In Table 3 we can see the correlation coefficient between mindset (measured as a unidimensional and two-dimensional construct) and different components of ableism.

As seen in Table 3, two subscales from A-SAS showed statistically significant correlations with mindset. Correlations between the personal responsibility, discrimination and mindset scales (when measured as unidimensional construct) are weak ($-0.16 < \rho < 0.16$). When measuring mindset as a two-dimensional construct, a correlation between growth mindset and personal responsibility becomes moderate ($\rho = 0.42$). Fixed mindset is positively related to the discrimination subscale, but correlation is weak. Results on other A-SAS subscales as well as the scale's total score (labelled Symbolic

ableism) do not correlate with mindset. Our results show that the double-sword model may be appropriate to explain the relation between mindset and prejudice, as both growth mindset and fixed mindset are indeed positively related to some components of ableism. It is not surprising that personal responsibility is correlated with growth mindset as both concepts imply personal control, whether for one's own development (growth mindset) or success (personal responsibility). Discrimination beliefs are weakly and positively correlated with fixed mindset, but not with growth mindset. Among all subscales, discrimination most obviously measures stigmatization and therefore this may also be proof that the stigma-reduction model is valid. Hypothesis 2 is partially confirmed; however, correlations are weak and not all facets of ableism seem to be correlated with mindset.

Predictors of Ableism

Next, we wanted to discover which are the significant predictors of symbolic ableism and its components. Therefore, we conducted a set of hierarchical linear regressions for three different outcome variables: symbolic ableism (measured as a total score on A-SAS), personal responsibility and discrimination. We decided on only those two subscales, because those were the only components of ableism that correlated significantly with mindset measures. Further, the inspection of scatterplots revealed that only for those two variables is a linear relationship with mindset observable. We applied two-dimensional measures of mindset (separate variables for fixed and growth mindset), because in that way correlations were higher with outcome variables.

In Step 1 fixed and growth mindset was entered, because those were the predictors that interested us the most. In the second step we inserted a dummy variable (study programme related/not related to vulnerable groups). This was done because in Hypothesis 1 we confirmed that there exist differences in ableism among those groups. In the third step we added the age and self-assessed knowledge variables into linear regression, because both groups significantly differed in those variables and we wanted to check if differences in ableism observed between groups could be due to age or (self-assessed) knowledge rather than the type of study programme.

As seen in Table 4, symbolic ableism is predicted solely by the type of study programme. Being a student in a study programme which includes training for work with vulnerable groups, predicts reporting lower ableism. However, only 4.2 % of variance of ableism is explained with the type of study programme. In step 3, where age and self-assessed knowledge were put into

Table 4 Multiple Regression Results for Symbolic Ableism

	Predictor(s)	ΔR^2	R^2	F†	β (Std.)	t	p
1	(Constant)	0.010	0.010	1.086			
	Fixed mindset				0.087	1.064	0.289
	Growth mindset				0.119	1.443	0.150
2	(Constant)	0.042	0.052	9.619*			
	Fixed mindset				0.025	0.295	0.768
	Growth mindset				0.094	1.154	0.250
	Study programme				−0.213‡	−3.101	0.002
3	(Constant)	0.004	0.056	0.464			
	Fixed mindset				0.019	0.225	0.822
	Growth mindset				0.093	1.148	0.252
	Study programme				−0.173‡	−2.167	0.031
	Age				−0.061	−0.797	0.426
	Self-assessed knowledge				−0.035	−0.499	0.618

Notes * $p < 0.05$. † Change. ‡ Significant correlation coefficients.

Table 5 Multiple Regression Results for Personal Responsibility

	Predictor(s)	ΔR^2	R^2	F†	β (Std.)	t	p
1	(Constant)	0.076	0.076	8.863***			
	Fixed mindset				0.085	1.069	0.286
	Growth mindset				0.315‡	3.960	<0.001
2	(Constant)	0.026	0.102	6.141*			
	Fixed mindset				0.036	0.444	0.657
	Growth mindset				0.295‡	3.739	<0.001
	Study programme				−0.165‡	−2.478	0.014
3	(Constant)	0.007	0.109	0.838			
	Fixed mindset				0.023	0.281	0.779
	Growth mindset				0.290‡	3.671	<.001
	Study programme				−0.145	−1.871	0.063
	Age				−0.083	−1.127	0.261
	Self-assessed knowledge				0.048	0.694	0.489

Notes * $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.001$. † Change. ‡ Significant correlation coefficients.

regression, study programme remained a significant predictor. This means that the type of study programme explains variance in ableism above the variance that could be explained by differences in age and knowledge. Mindset is not a significant predictor of general symbolic ableism.

Presented in Table 5 is a hierarchical linear regression for prediction of the

Table 6 Multiple Regression Results for Discrimination

	Predictor(s)	ΔR^2	R^2	F†	β (Std.)	t	p
1	(Constant)	0.018	0.018	1.927			
	Fixed mindset				0.066	0.803	0.423
	Growth mindset				−0.083	−1.019	0.309
2	(Constant)	0.051	0.069	11.864***			
	Fixed mindset				−0.004	−0.043	0.966
	Growth mindset				−0.111	−1.384	0.168
	Study programme				−0.234‡	−3.444	<0.001
3	(Constant)	0.004	0.073	0.474			
	Fixed mindset				−0.010	−0.124	0.901
	Growth mindset				−0.112	−1.387	0.167
	Study programme				−0.195‡	−2.466	0.014
	Age				−0.066	−0.879	0.381
	Self-assessed knowledge				−0.026	−0.374	0.709

Notes *** $p < 0.001$. † Change. ‡ Significant correlation coefficients.

component of symbolic ableism, named personal responsibility. In Step 1, mindset variables were entered. The model with mindset variables explained 76 % of variance. Growth mindset was the only significant predictor in the model.

In Step 2, a dummy variable (study programme) was added, significantly improving the model, with an additional 2.6 % of variance explained. The final model, where we added age and self-assessed knowledge, did not significantly improve prediction, but new variables caused study programme to become a non-significant predictor, meaning that the effect of study programme on personal responsibility could be explained through differences in knowledge and age. Growth mindset predicting personal responsibility is expected, because both concepts emphasize the control and the role of an individual.

Table 6 represents results of linear regression for the outcome variable of discrimination. Again, only the study programme is the sole important predictor of this component of ableism. This predictor explains 5.1 % of variance in the discrimination variable.

Hypothesis 3 cannot be confirmed, because only the type of study programme was a significant predictor of ableism and its component, except for the personal responsibility component which was predicted also by growth mindset. We can conclude that neither mindset (as measured in our study) nor self-assessed knowledge are significant predictors of ableism.

Limitations and Future Research

Ableism is an important construct in inclusive education and should be more widely researched in the future. Measuring ableism faces the same problems as measuring any other kind of prejudices. There is a great possibility for conscious or unconscious biases when self-assessing and self-reporting prejudices. Our study revealed that future educators who will most probably work with vulnerable groups reported lower levels of ableism than their peers in other education programmes. Unfortunately, our study does not answer why these differences occurred between students of different study programmes. One of the major limitations of our study is that we did not clearly distinguish between students who had already covered special education topics during their studies and those who had not. Although we measured participants' self-assessed knowledge of these topics, assessing the actual extent of this content during their previous study process would provide a better understanding of the curriculum's contribution to ableism. Future studies should examine which elements of curriculum contribute to lower ableism, as this can be a part of the solution.

Future studies on the topic should focus on measuring ableism in different ways (e. g. implicitly, in vignette-style questionnaires). Also, further research is needed for identifying ableism, specifically in educational settings, and discovering factors contributing to ableism. Mindset was not confirmed as a (strong) predictor for any facet of ableism, but mindset related to more specific attributes may be more predictive for ableism.

Conclusion

One of the main findings of our study is that future educators, enrolled in study programmes where they gain more knowledge about special needs and possibly have more personal experiences, report lower levels of ableism than their peers. One of the main aims of our study was also to assess the role of mindset in the manifestation of ableism. The development of the theoretical underpinning for this connection is still in its early stages. This study is one of the first to empirically research the possible connection. Unfortunately, mindset about intellectual abilities is not a strong predictor of ableism, predicting only personal responsibility, a facet of ableism that is per se very similar to the concept of growth mindset.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Slovenian Research Agency [P5-0444] Vseživljenjsko učenje za trajnostno družbo prihodnosti.

References

Babij, A. D., Earl, S., Becker, W., Hoyt, C. L., Burnette, J. L., Marston, A., & Crispin, K. (2023). Mindsets of mental illness: What are the implications for stigma? *Stigma and Health*. https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000482

Bogart, K. R., & Dunn, D. S. (2019). Ableism special issue introduction. *Journal of Social Issues, 75*(3), 650–664.

Boncquet, M., Flamant, N., Lavrijsen, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Verschueren, K., & Soenens, B. (2023). The unique importance of motivation and mindsets for students' learning behavior and achievement: An examination at the level of between-student differences and within-student fluctuations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 116*(3): 448–465.

Conley, K. T., & Nadler, D. R. (2022). Reducing ableism and the social exclusion of people with disabilities: Positive impacts of openness and education. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research, 27*(1), 21–32.

Evans, N. J., Broido, E. M., Brown, K. R., & Wilke, A. K. (2017). *Disability in higher education: A social justice approach.* Wiley.

Damianidou, E., & Phtiaka, H. (2017). Implementing inclusion in disabling settings: The role of teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 22*(10), 1078–1092.

De Castella, K., & Byrne, D. (2015). My intelligence may be more malleable than yours: The revised implicit theories of intelligence (self-theory) scale is a better predictor of achievement, motivation, and student disengagement. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 30*(3), 245–267.

Drljić, K., & Lebeničnik, M. (2025). Adaptation of the Slovenian version of the symbolic ableism scale. *Cogent Education, 12*(1), 2461038.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success.* Random House.

Hoyt, C. L., & Burnette, J. L. (2025). How mindsets can mitigate or sustain prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 34*(2), 82–87.

Nario-Redmond, M. R., Kemerling, A. A., & Silverman, A. (2019). Hostile, benevolent, and ambivalent ableism: Contemporary manifestations. *Journal of Social Issues, 75*(3), 726–756.

Polh Budja, K., & Košir, K. (2019). Miselna naravnanost v šolskem okolju. *Revija za elementarno izobraževanje, 12*(1), 89–112.

Rizzo, S., Frolli, A., Cavallaro, A., Sinigaglia, G., & Scire, S. (2021). Social representation of disability and teachers. *Education Sciences, 11*(6), 266.

Sellwood, D., Raghavendra, P., & Walker, R. (2022). Facilitators and barriers to developing romantic and sexual relationships: Lived experiences of people with complex communication needs. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication, 38*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/07434618.2022.2046852

Parekh, G. (2022). *Ableism in education: Rethinking school practices and policies.* Routledge.

Sherwood, K. L., & Kattari, S. K. (2023). Reducing ableism in social work edu-

cation through universal design for learning and policy. *Journal of Social Work Education, 59*(1), 119–132.

Storey, K. (2007). Combating ableism in schools. *Preventing School Failure, 52*(1), 56–58.

UNESCO. (2016). *Education for people and the planet: Creating sustainable futures for all*.

Yeager, D. S., Romero, C., Paunesku, D., Hulleman, C. S., Schneider, B., Hinojosa, C., Lee, H. Y., O'Brien, J., Flint, K., Roberts, A., Trott, J., Greene, D., Walton, G. M., & Dweck, C. S. (2016). Using design thinking to improve psychological interventions: The case of the growth mindset during the transition to high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 108*(3), 374–391.

Ableizem in miselna naravnanost bodočih pedagogov

Občutljivost za ranljive družbene skupine in zagotavljanje enakih možnosti zanje predstavljata pomemben socialni vidik trajnostno naravnane družbe. Prispevek zato obravnava pojav ableizma – oblike predsodkov do oseb s posebnimi potrebami, ki izhaja iz ideala popolnoma zmožnega posameznika in hkrati podcenjuje zmožnosti oseb s posebnimi potrebami. Raziskava prav tako raziskuje vlogo prepričanj o spremenljivosti posameznikovih lastnosti (t. i. miselna naravnanost) pri pojavu ableizma. Med študenti (N = 232), vpisanimi v različne pedagoške študijske programe na Pedagoški fakulteti Univerze na Primorskem (UP PEF), smo preverjali samooceno ableizma, njihovo miselno naravnanost ter morebitne povezave med obema konceptoma. Analiza rezultatov je pokazala, da študenti, ki se pripravljajo na delo z ranljivimi skupinami (npr. z osebami s posebnimi potrebami), poročajo o nižji stopnji ableizma kot tisti, ki se pripravljajo na delo pretežno z normativno populacijo. Fiksna miselna naravnanost je bila šibko pozitivno povezana s komponento ableizma, imenovano »Diskriminacija«. Razvojna miselna naravnanost je pokazala zmerno pozitivno povezavo s komponento ableizma, imenovano »Osebna odgovornost«. Multipla linearna regresija je pokazala, da narava študijskega programa pomembno napoveduje ableizem in njegove komponente, medtem ko je razvojna miselna naravnanost pomembno napovedovala le tisti vidik ableizma, kjer posamezniki vso odgovornost za uspeh pripisujejo osebi z invalidnostjo. Lahko zaključimo, da miselna naravnanost (glede inteligentnosti) ni uporaben koncept za napovedovanje ableizma.

Ključne besede: ableizem, miselna naravnanost, visoko šolstvo, bodoči učitelji