

B.K. Saktaganov¹

*¹Kazakh National Academy of Choreography
(Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan)*

A.K. Kypshakbaeva²

*²Kazakh National Academy of Choreography
(Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan)*

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL TECHNOLOGIES FOR REMOVING SIGNIFICANT BARRIERS IN LEARNING PROCESS

Annotation

The current state of the contemporary educational environment is a topical issue in the educational process, which is related to semantic dispensing between the system of values and the system of student values. In the context of educational issues, special cognitive barriers, which are traditionally considered as cognitive, and emotional difficulties, also arise through different ways of understanding life values and life relationships. The article presents a new scientific approach to the eradication of meaningful dissimilarities in the relationship between the teacher and the student.

Education is the developing environment for the development of a meaningful person, so it is necessary to create a special environment for the student's personality to develop the content of the content. Different levels of meaningful perception occur in the meaningful interaction between teacher and student.

Differentiation of meaningful barriers in the learning process puts the author of the article on the need to search for targeted and indirect technologies to eliminate meaningful barriers in learning process. The author analyzed various technologies of meaningful initiatives and identified their didactic effects.

Analysis of various psychological and pedagogical technologies has demonstrated the possibility of their use in elimination of meaningful barriers in learning process.

Key words: *meaning, meaning barrier, education, teaching, teacher, psychological and pedagogical technology, meaning-based technologies.*

Б.К. Сақтағанов¹

*¹Қазақ ұлттық хореография академиясы
(Нұр-Сұлтан, Қазақстан)*

А.К. Қытшақбаева²

*²Қазақ ұлттық хореография академиясы
(Нұр-Сұлтан, Қазақстан)*

ОҚЫТУДАҒЫ МАҒЫНАЛЫҚ КЕДЕРГІЛЕРДІ ЖОЮДЫҢ ПСИХОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ-ПЕДАГОГИКАЛЫҚ ТЕХНОЛОГИЯЛАРЫ

Аннотация

Заманауи білім беру ортасының шынайы жағдайы оқытушы құндылықтар жүйесі мен білім алушы құндылықтар жүйесі арасындағы мағыналық диссонанспен байланысты оқу үрдісінің бірқатар нақты мәселелерін тудырып отырғаны қазіргі таңда өзекті болып отыр. Оқу мәселелерінің контекстінде дәстүрлі түрде қарастырылатын тек танымдық, когнитивтік, эмоционалдық қиыншылықтармен бірге, өмірлік құндылықтарды, өмірлік қарым-қатынасты әртүрлі түсіну арқылы туындайтын арнайы мағыналық кедергілер де қарастырылуда. Мақалада оқытушы мен білім алушының өзара қарым-қатынасы барысында мағыналық диссонанстарды жоюға жаңа ғылыми көзқарас ұсынылған.

Білім беру мағыналық тұлғаның дамуы жүретін дамытушы орта болып табылады, сондықтан білім мазмұнын игеру барысында оқушының жекелік мағынасы қалыптасуы үшін арнайы жағдай тудыру қажет. Мұғалім мен оқушы арасындағы мағыналық өзара әрекет үрдісінде мағыналық қабылдаудың әртүрлі деңгейлері пайда болады.

Оқу үрдісіндегі мағыналық кедергілерді саралау мақала авторының алдына оқытудағы мағыналық кедергілерді жою бойынша бағытталған және жанма технологияларды іздеу қажеттілігін қояды. Автор мағыналық бастамалардың түрлі технологияларын талдап, олардың дидактикалық әсерлерін анықтады.

Әртүрлі психологиялық-педагогикалық технологияларды талдау оларды оқыту барысындағы мағыналық кедергілерді жою үшін қолдану мүмкіндігін көрсетті.

Түйінді сөздер: *мағына, мағына құраушылық, мағыналық кедергі, білім беру, оқыту, оқытушы, психологиялық-педагогикалық технология, мағына құраушы технологиялар.*

Б.К. Сақтағанов¹

¹*Казахская национальная академия хореографии
(Нур-Султан, Казахстан)*

А.К. Қыпшақбаева²

²*Казахская национальная академия хореографии
(Нур-Султан, Казахстан)*

ПСИХОЛОГО-ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИЕ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ УСТРАНЕНИЯ СМЫСЛОВОГО БАРЬЕРА В ОБУЧЕНИИ

Аннотация

Современное реальное состояние современной образовательной среды, а также смысловой диссонанс системы ценностей обучаемых и преподавателей, возникающий в образовательном процессе, является одной из актуальных проблем современной науки. В контексте образовательных вопросов наряду с традиционным изучением вопроса познавательными, когнитивными, и эмоциональными трудностями, рассматриваются смысловые проблемы, возникающие в процессе восприятия жизненных взаимоотношений и жизненных ценностей. В статье

представлен новый научный подход к искоренению смысловых дисонансов во взаимоотношениях между преподавателем и обучающимся.

Образование является развивающей средой для развития значимой личности, поэтому при обучении студентов является необходимым создание особой среды для развития личностной значимости студента. Существуют различные уровни значимого восприятия возникающие в учебном процессе между преподавателем и обучающимся.

Автор статьи определяет необходимым поиск новых технологий посредством анализа смысловых трудностей в учебном процессе. Автор проанализировал различные технологии смысловых инициатив и выявил их дидактические эффекты.

Анализ различных психолого-педагогических технологий показал возможность их использования при устранении смысловых барьеров в процессе обучения.

Ключевые слова: *смысл, смыслообразование, смысловой барьер, образование, преподавание, педагог, психолого-педагогические технологии, смысловые технологии.*

The introduction of new educational standards and the formation of an appropriate social request actualize for the pedagogical community the problem of finding new effective technologies in teaching. The realities of the modern educational environment generate a number of specific problems of the educational process associated with the semantic dissonance between the values of teachers and the values of students [1; 2]. As a result, there is a contradiction, due to which the student can not be understood educational material, and the teacher (teacher) can not be conveyed a certain amount of knowledge according to the requirements of modern standards of education; the problem of comprehended learning material at the level of semantic acceptance is of particular importance, because there are not just cognitive, emotional barriers, which are traditionally considered in the context of educational problems, but there are specific semantic barriers, the origin of which is determined by a different understanding of life values, life relationships [3]. At the same time, semantic barriers can arise not only in the student, but also in the training, and in the situation of simultaneous formation of semantic barriers in the subjects of the educational process, the process of translation and assimilation of knowledge becomes extremely inefficient and unproductive [6; 7]. Independent overcome the semantic barrier subjects of study or reduced its severity over time is unlikely, special efforts will be required, in particular, the mastery of the teacher of special techniques, methods and technologies.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the didactic resource of psychological and pedagogical technologies for removing the semantic barriers in learning. In modern science, attempts are made to develop didactic technologies that will initiate not just the emergence of individual situational meanings within a lesson or educational situation, but also to

influence the entire trajectory of value-semantic development. These technologies are designed to actualize the life orientations of students, to form values, to determine their life priorities. In didactics, several typologies and classifications of such methods and technologies are proposed for the level of their meaningful potential. However, when describing such technologies and mechanisms of their implementation in the practice of the educational process, those of them that not only initiate a sense of education, but also help overcome the semantic barriers that arose during the training as the contradiction between the evaluation position of the teacher and the student, as dissonance of the meanings of the trainee and the essence of the subject. The specifics of such technologies are described in this article.

The semantic barrier can be phenomenologically conceptualized as a certain mental state, arising either before the beginning of the activity, or during its execution. The existing state (semantic barrier) either does not allow to turn around activities, or blocks and disorganizes already begun activity. Such state causes sufficiently high level of nervous-mental tension, to reduce which, the person can use various types of psychological protection; while the reasons that led to the appearance of a semantic barrier (external or internal), can be hidden from the person in the sphere of unconscious, and the less mature (in age or social terms) will be the person, the less able to understand the true causes of difficulties in the activity [6].

Education is a developing environment in which there is self-development of the individual, therefore, for the formation of students' individual meanings in the development of the content education it is necessary to create special conditions. According to E.G. Belyakova, "... the General conditions of meaning formation in the study of subjects of different educational cycles are realized through individualization of education, activation of the personal-semantic factor in the selection and development of the content of education, the involvement of humanitarian texts, interdisciplinary integration on an axiological basis. The specific conditions of meaning formation are associated with the interpretative potential of texts acting as the content of education, age-psychological characteristics of students, their basic semantic settings and level of education» [7, p.112–113]. Meaning formation is interpreted by her "as the development of individual meanings of participants of pedagogical interaction – their enrichment and acquisition of multidimensionality through interaction with personal meanings of other subjects of pedagogical interaction, with pedagogical meanings» [7, p.6].

In relation to the educational activities of the semantic barriers serve two major purposes: destructive and constructive. The destructive function of the semantic barrier is that there is a decrease in self-esteem, frustrated creative abilities, there is a decrease in the effectiveness of educational activities, formed dissatisfaction with the results of activities. The

constructive function of the semantic barrier (which includes protective, stabilizing, regulatory and mobilization aspects) is manifested in the fact that the consciousness of the subjects of training activity is protected from traumatic experiences caused by internal and external conflicts, the mobilization of internal resources of the body occurs, the mental and volitional processes that restrain activity slow down.

Overcoming the semantic barrier allows the individual to move to a new level of development, actualize all previously hidden potentials, and mobilized resources which could give the activity a new vector, this leads to a sharp decrease in the level of anxiety, normalization of a significant number of mental processes, the appearance of a number of tumors-adequate self-esteem, the ability to make constructive decisions [8, p.17].

D. A. Leontev points out that there is both a natural development of semantic dynamics and the possibility of arbitrary development of the semantic sphere with the help of various semantic techniques. It is possible both to develop own voluntary activity of the subject directed to management of processes of semantic regulation, and to operate semantic dynamics of other person. In this case, the meaning technicians will act as a special case of psychotechnics. As the object of influence of sense engineering acts semantic dynamics, namely the processes of meaning, sense-awareness and sense-building. From the point of view of D.A. Leontiev, it is through these processes that changes in the semantic sphere are being implemented [9].

Such conceptual changes can include features of volitional regulation (arbitrariness of the management of the motivation), the possibility of increasing or decreasing motivation, reflexive analysis, features of semantic choice, the technique of contractile dialogue [10]. At the same time it is possible both to influence features of the separate behavioral act, and through certain semantic dispositions to carry out influence on steady relations to certain people or things, to form or transform the general semantic orientations – outlook, self-relation, system of values.

In the psychological and pedagogical discourse there is a theoretical justification of the possibilities of initiation meaning formation, practical developments and technologies that have a meaning-forming character (S.Y. Zilberbrand, S.V. Gurov and etc.) [11-17]. With all the variety of technologies, methods and forms of education, it should be noted that not all of them have the meaning-generating potential which is necessary for the formation or transformation of educational attitudes, educational values and educational motives.

In modern pedagogical psychology, there is a section associated with the study of technologies, the use of which will allow the teacher to activate the meaning-forming activities of students. The development of the technology of semantic activation requires taking into account the psy-

chological mechanisms of initiation of meaning formation, as well as taking into account the action of mechanisms that inhibit meaning formation [1; 2].

New didactics allows us to consider the psychological mechanism of initiating the process of thinking education in the process of teaching from a fundamentally new position: "... according to traditional didactics, technologies in relation to the content of the educational process are secondary, act as a kind of superstructure, mechanism for its implementation.

In the "New didactics" there implementation. In the "New didactics" there are cases of inverse dependence-content on technology, when technology in the actions of the teacher is so rooted that it subordinates the content itself. This can be seen in the example of dialogue as an educational technology, which prescribes a special, problematic content. Moreover, the technology itself can move to the rank of content. If we agree that the content is something to be mastered, and assume that with the help of the same dialogue mastered some piece of educational material, then the mastered may be the dialogue itself and rightly interpreted as content. Finally, according to the New didactics, there is a sphere in education in which educational technologies are not "in honor". Here "in honor" psychological, moral, didactic support» [2, p.18].

Based on the theory of semantic initiations, you can specify the initial conditions making sense in the real techniques of the educational process: «technologies of the directed formation of value-semantic units in the educational process as a pedagogical technologies have different meaning-making potential and different trajectories of implementation in practice of educational process depending on their level of semantic actualization and meaning-making potential. Technologies of content subjectivation (filling it with potentially disclosed meanings), its simultaneous and subsequent objectification (when the content makes sense for everyone), assignment (crystallization) of meaning to students (each for himself) should be implemented in the real educational process only taking into account the fact that the content operates at several levels that reflect the logic of the educational process from design to implementation, from the moment when the teacher begins to plan and prioritize the determined content, prior to the direct disclosure and appropriation by students of the meaning of what is being studied» [2, p.70].

Theoretical analysis allowed to reach the level of empirical research of didactic technologies from the point of view of their potential as meaning-forming initiations.

Analysis of the results of empirical research on the use of technologies of initiation meaning formation in the practice of the educational process.

In the research of I.E. Nesterenko tried to analyze and evaluate traditional didactic technologies in the educational process from the point

of view of the greatest potential of meaning education, and the following typology of technologies were proposed with high meaning potential.

“- technologies that provide a number of aspects of self-actualization of subjective experience of students (initiation of semantic images through actualization of semantic installations and semantic generalizations);

- dialogue technology (external, internal, multiple dialogues, intercultural dialogue);

- technologies using the game component (role-playing, didactic, educational, business and other types of games);

- problem-creative technologies (creation and reflection of problem situations, solving problems on the “meaning” of situations) »;

- technologies related to self-assessment, self-presentation tasks, and self-reflection.

- technologies providing psychological and didactic support of trainees (task for self-identification, development of empathy, development of interpersonal and extrapersonal values as priorities in the formation of collective consciousness)» [13].

The presence of semantic barriers has been prevented the process of recrystallization of personal meanings, alienates the student from the educational material, and insurmountable semantic barriers impede the interaction of the student with both the teacher and the educational content. The meaning-forming effect arises on the basis of persuasive influence on the part of the teacher, at the moment when the teacher offers a certain meaningful material is assimilated.

In a situation in which the meanings of teachers and students are synchronized, the semantic barrier of alienation of students from the content of the educational material does not arise, since the educational content already has a personal meaning for students, and there is no need to initiate the meaning of education.

If the content of the material is assimilated, causes the student to disagree, then there is a semantic barrier with varying degrees of severity.

The pupil correlates the presented educational content with the semantic fund available to him, in case of coincidence of semantic centration there is a cognitive consonance and an initiation of sense formation.

Since the main source of meaning learners are substantial aspects of the educational process, the nature of meaning and, consequently, the risk of forming semantic barrier, influence the spatial-temporal characteristics: the distribution of content between teacher and student, between groups of learners taking into account temporal sequence learning activities. Content and technology are organically interrelated-the content “saturates” the development of personality, its semantic structures, and technology is a barrier to development. If the technology is inadequate to the content, it will not “work”, because in this case there is a violation of the principle of

isomorphic dependence “content-technology”. Thus, the question of technologies of possible overcoming of a semantic barrier in training is transferred from the didactic plan to the psychological plane since the contents of training can be presented at different levels of training:

- at the design level – in the form of text, sign;
- at the level of the real educational process as the appearance and manifestation of feelings, emotions, thoughts of students;
- at the personal level - as a system of meaningful life priorities of the student, his values and life priorities.

Technologies of overcoming semantic barriers have a two-way stadi-al process of mastering a certain set of psychological and pedagogical tools that provide a certain level of achievement of the predicted results in specific learning environments [18]. To address the issue of the choice of pedagogical technologies that allow to equip teachers with an Arsenal of techniques for initiating meaning formation in the realities of a particular educational process, it is important to address the classification of psychological and pedagogical educational technologies, taking into account their impact on meaning formation [19].

E. S. Zorina in research “Psychological bases of application of sense techniques as a factor of initiation of sense formation in educational process” showed how various psychotechnics and sense techniques can influence features of sense formation of pupils in real practice of educational process. She proposed her classification of such semantic techniques, focusing on the modality of perceptual influence:

- semantic techniques (formation of associative semantic connections, semantic generalizations, meaning-inducing images-symbols);
- dialogue techniques (dialogues of different levels of semantic saturation, polylogues, monologues, dialogue of cultures, etc.);
- game techniques (games-excursions, role-playing didactic games, methods of specific situations);
- self-expression techniques (self-expression, self-esteem, reflection);
- support and facilitation techniques (empathic tasks, sensory training, peer-to-peer techniques»);
- meaning techniques of creativity development (art techniques, tasks with multiple solutions, installations, eurythmy) [20; 21].

In classes where the learning process took place with the use of these techniques in order to achieve psychological understanding, semantic consonance between the teacher and the student (according to E. S. Zorina), the initiations of semantic development in the following areas were identified:

- self-esteem and self-reflection, the need for public recognition (0.356, with $p \leq 0.01$);

- attitude to others (“having good friends” (0.223, at $p \leq 0.05$), “sensitivity” (0.221, at $p \leq 0.05$), “tolerance” (0.215, at $p \leq 0.05$), the development of empathic abilities (0.274, at $p \leq 0.05$));

- attitude to social values (“courage in defending one’s opinion” (0,197, at $p \leq 0,05$), social intelligence (0,227, at $p \leq 0,05$), “productive life” (0,244, at $p \leq 0,05$)).

According to E. S. Zorina, an experimental study on the use of semantic techniques in the practice of overcoming semantic barriers showed their effectiveness, the level of semantic acceptance of the comprehended educational content increased, the number of students with positive strategies for achieving consonance with the evaluation position of the teacher increased [20].

V. Abakumova proposed a hierarchical classification of technologies according to the level of influence on meaning from the lowest to the maximum degree [6]:

1. Classification of technologies based on the criteria of “method of information coding”. This group consists of verbal, audiovisual, multimedia, hypertext, holographic technologies.

2. Classification of technologies according to the criterion “the value of the radius of action of the educational process.” At this level, there are technologies that ensure the assimilation of material in a small academic space – in the form of lessons and other types of training sessions (explanatory-reproductive, information-computer, heuristic, problem, situational-game, dialogue).

3. Classification of technologies based on the criterion of “teacher-student relationship”. This group includes: subject-object technology (explanation, lecture, reproducing interview, work samples, exercise training type), the subject-subject-technology (methods Elkonin – Davydov “Image – simulation – integration” technology problem the presentation of the teaching material, advanced technologies of construction of educational process, large-block technology of presenting learning material); subject-text-subject technology.

4. Classification of technologies according to the criterion “the nature of cognitive activity of students.” This group includes technologies of reproductive type (explanation of the teacher with the subsequent reproduction by pupils, training exercises), technologies of problem type (problem introduction of material by the teacher and problem-search activity of pupils stimulated by it; statement of problem-cognitive tasks; dialogues, disputes, discussions), technologies of research type (a method of the project, abstract work, experimentation, creative works of trained).

5. Technologies based on the criteria “the ability to provide personal and semantic development of students.” This type of technology is not focused on the “solid assimilation of knowledge”, not on the formation

of “active thinking” and “creative activity”, but on the actual meaning of students, accompanied by states of experience of varying severity degrees.

Most authors who typologize meaning-generating technologies separately distinguish dialogue as a technology that has a very great potential in the perspective which we are interested in.

The study of the mechanisms of transition from impersonal meanings to concepts filled with personal meanings makes it possible to develop technologies of directed and indirect initiation of meaning formation of students, to overcome value-semantic barriers in the real practice of the educational process. A certain obstacle to the interiorization of the theory of meaning in the real practice of the educational process is the existence of a contradiction between the mandatory attribute of the management of the educational process by the teacher and very essence of meaning as an intentional act of consciousness, which is actually not subject to directional control. To resolve this contradiction, we need a new learning technology based on the achievements of semantic psychology and offers not just a description of the mechanisms of functioning of meaning in the practice of the educational process as directed knowledge, but also reveals the impact of technology on the meaning-forming potential of the participants. It is necessary to create and introduce into the practice of the educational process methods and technologies that will initiate the semantic development of students, to bring the system of interaction “teacher – student” to the level of semantic understanding and acceptance of each other. In modern psychological and pedagogical science, several typologies of overcoming semantic barriers in the real practice of the educational process are proposed. Most of them have been experimentally tested and can be reasonably considered as technologies of sense-initiations. They have certain similarities and differences.

Almost all the proposed technologies are based on the development of three main semantic centers (attitude to oneself, to others and social values), and procedural – on dialogue and facilitating technologies, however the direction and practice of realization has the essential features: depending on age (school students, university students, adults), on level of complexity and prolongation of the curriculum (situations of retraining, specifics of educational purposes, training duration, level of cognitive complexity of the comprehended material, availability of interactive methods, etc.). When analyzing the dialogue as a basic technology for overcoming semantic barriers, different authors interpret its result as the achievement of semantic consonance, as the convergence of the evaluation positions of different participants in the educational process, and semantic consonance, in turn, helps a person to feel understandable and emotionally close to both classmates and teachers, who begin to seem to those who express positions that can be taken as personally close.

Despite the fact that in modern psychological and pedagogical science analyzed quite a large number of didactic technologies that have meaning-generating potential, technologies which help to overcome semantic barriers in the educational process. To solve the didactic contradiction, meaning technologies are needed that will “work” overcome it. Technologies of overcoming semantic barriers are a two-way staidly process of mastering a certain set of psychological and pedagogical tools that provide a certain level of achievement of predicted results in specific learning environments.

This approach allows not only to expand the instrumental capabilities of teachers, but also to make significant changes in the organization of the real educational process, in the rethinking of its goals, content and methods.

Список использованных источников:

1. Абакумова И.В., Ермаков П.Н., Фоменко В.Т. Новодидактика. Книга Методология и технологии обучения: в поисках развивающего ресурса. – М.: КРЕДО, 2013. – 162 с.
2. Абакумова И.В., Ермаков П.Н., Фоменко В.Т. Новодидактика. Книга 2. Образовательные технологии: новые ракурсы. – М.: КРЕДО, 2013. – 122 с.
3. Асмолов А.Г. Оптика просвещения: социокультурные перспективы. – М.: Просвещение, 2012. – 447 с.
4. Кагермазова Л.Ц. Формирование индивидуального стиля педагогического общения у будущих учителей: Учебно-методические рекомендации. – Нальчик: Изд-во КБГУ, 2006. – 45 с.
5. Ермаков П.Н., Абакумова И.В., Осипова А.А. Смысловые барьеры в обучении: дидактическое содержание и технологии преодоления: монография. – М.: КРЕДО, 2016. – 274 с.
6. Абакумова И.В., Ермаков П.Н., Кагермазова Л.Ц. Технологии направленной трансляции смыслов в практике учебного процесса. – М.: КРЕДО, 2016. – 234 с.
7. Белякова Е.Г. Смыслообразование в педагогическом взаимодействии. – Тюмень: Изд-во Тюменского государственного университета, 2008. – 208 с.
8. Леонтьев Д. А. Методика изучения ценностных ориентаций. – М.: Смысл, 1992. – 17 с.
9. Леонтьев Д. А. Психология смысла: природа, строение и динамика смысловой реальности. – М.: Смысл, 2007. – 511 с.
10. Агафонов А. Ю. Основы смысловой теории сознания. – М.: Речь, 2003. – 296 с.
11. Зильбербранд Н.Ю. Дидактическая сущность смысловых задач // Вестник Череповецкого государственного университета. – 2013. – Т. 2. – № 4 (52). – С. 106–109.
12. Гуров С. В. Психологические особенности смыслообразования студентов: типы, стили, стратегии // Российский психологический журнал. – 2012. – Т. 9. – № 1. – С. 62–66.
13. Нестеренко И. Е. Психолого-дидактические особенности формирования смысловых установок старшеклассников в учебном процессе: дисс. ...канд.

психол. наук. – Ростов н/Д, 2009. – 198 с.

14. Суфиянов В. В. Диалог как педагогическая технология в смыслообразующем учебном контексте: автореф. дисс. ... канд. пед. наук. – Ростов н/Д, 2007. – 24 с.
15. Brehm J. Post-decision changes in desirability of alternatives // *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. – 1956. – № 52. – P. 384–389.
16. Cattell R. B. *The Scientific Analysis of Personality*. – Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1965. – 399 p.
17. Festinger L.A *Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. – Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson & Company, 1957. – 291 p.
18. Language, Meaning, and Culture: The Selected Papers of C. E. Osgood/C. E. Osgood & O. Tzeng (Eds). – N.Y.: Praeger Publishers, 1990. – 428 p.
19. Белова Е. В., Лукьяненко М. А. «Задачи на смысл»: диалоговые формы и условия использования в учебном процессе // *Российский психологический журнал*. – 2014. – Т. 11. – № 3. – С. 33–40
20. Зорина Е.С. Психологические особенности смысловых техник в ситуации инициации смыслообразования в учебном процессе: дисс. ... канд. психол. наук. – Ростов н/Д, 2017. – 208 с.
21. Abakumova I.V., Zorina E.S. Sense-making techniques in educational process and their impact on the personal characteristics of students // *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*. 2017. – Vol. 5. – № 2. – P. 41–46.

References:

1. Abakumova I.V., Ermakov P.N., Fomenko V.T. *Novodidaktika. Kniga Metodologija i tehnologii obuchenija: v poiskah razvivajushhego resursa*. – M.: KREDO, 2013. – 162 s. (In Russ.).
2. Abakumova I.V., Ermakov P.N., Fomenko V.T. *Novodidaktika. Kniga 2. Obrazovatel'nye tehnologii: novye rakursy*. – M.: KREDO, 2013. – 122 s. (In Russ.).
3. Asmolov A.G. *Optika prosveshhenija: sociokul'turnye perspektivy*. – M.: Prosveshhenie, 2012. – 447 s. (In Russ.).
4. Kagermazova L.C. *Formirovanie individual'nogo stilja pedagogicheskogo obshhenija u budushhih uchitelej: Uchebno-metodicheskie rekomendacii*. – Nal'chik: Izd-vo KBGU, 2006. – 45 s. (In Russ.).
5. Ermakov P.N., Abakumova I.V., Osipova A.A. *Smyslovye bar'ery v obuchenii: didakticheskoe sodержание i tehnologii preodolenija: monografija*. – M.: KREDO, 2016. – 274 s. (In Russ.).
6. Abakumova I.V. *Smysloobrazovanie v uchebnom processe*. Diss.d-ra psihol. nauk. – Ростов н/Д, 2003. – 440 s. (In Russ.).
7. Beljakova E.G. *Smysloobrazovanie v pedagogicheskom vzaimodejstvii*. – Tjumen': Izd-vo Tjumenskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2008. – 208 s. (In Russ.).
8. Leont'ev D.A. *Metodika izuchenija cennostnyh orientacij*. – M.: Smysl, 1992. – 17 s. (In Russ.).
9. Leont'ev D.A. *Psihologija smysla: priroda, stroenie i dinamika smyslovoj real'nosti*. – M.: Smysl, 2007. – 511 s. (In Russ.).
10. Agafonov A.Ju. *Osnovy smyslovoj teorii soznaniya*. – M.: Rech', 2003. – 296 s. (In Russ.).
11. Zil'berbrand N.Ju. *Didakticheskaja sushhnost' smyslovyh zadach* // *Vestnik Cherepoveckogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. – 2013. – Т. 2. – № 4 (52). – S. 106–109. (In Russ.).

12. Gurov S.V. *Psichologicheskie osobennosti smysloobrazovanija studentov: tipy, stili, strategii* // Rossijskij psihologičeskij žurnal. – 2012. – T. 9. – № 1. – S. 62–66. (In Russ.).
13. Nesterenko I.E. *Psichologo-didaktičeskie osobennosti formirovanija smyslovyh ustanovok staršehklassnikov v učebnom processe*: diss. ...kand. psihol. nauk. – Rostov n/D, 2009. – 198 s. (In Russ.).
14. Sufijanov V.V. *Dialog kak pedagogičeskaja tehnologija v smysloobrazujušhem učebnom kontekste*: avtoref. diss. ... kand. ped. nauk. – Rostov n/D, 2007. – 24 s. (In Russ.).
15. Brehm J. *Post-decision changes in desirability of alternatives* // Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. –1956. – № 52. – P. 384–389. (In Engl.).
16. Cattell R.B. *The Scientific Analysis of Personality*. – Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1965. – 399 p. (In Engl.)
17. Festinger L.A. *Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. – Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson & Company, 1957. – 291 p. (In Engl.)
18. *Language, Meaning, and Culture: The Selected Papers of C. E. Osgood/C. E. Osgood & O. Tzeng* (Eds). – N.Y.: Praeger Publishers, 1990. – 428 p. (In Engl.)
19. Belova E. V., Luk'janenko M. A. «Zadachi na smysl»: dialogovye formy i uslovija ispol'zovanija v učebnom processe // Rossijskij psihologičeskij žurnal. – 2014. – T. 11. – № 3. – S. 33–40 (In Russ.).
20. Zorina E.S. *Psichologicheskie osobennosti smyslotehnik v situacii iniciacii smysloobrazovanija v učebnom processe*: diss. ... kand.psihol. nauk. – Rostov n/D, 2017. – 208 s. (In Russ.).
21. Abakumova I.V., Zorina E.S. *Sense-making techniques in educational process and their impact on the personal characteristics of students* // International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education. – 2017. – Vol. 5. – № 2. – P. 41–46. (In Russ.).