

S.D. Maksymenko

GENETIC PRINCIPLES OF CREATIVE
PERSONALITY CONFIDENT
AS A PROPULSION OF MENTAL
DEVELOPMENT

Monograph



Published by
Accent graphics communications & publishing (Canada)
Society for the support of publishing initiatives and scientific mobility Limited (UK)

Approved and Recommended for publication by Academic council of Society for the support of publishing initiatives and scientific mobility Limited (Glasgow, Scotland)



Vyigotskiy Medal in Psychological Sciences

For deserving of special recognition by reason of outstanding contributions to Fundamental and Applied Psychological Sciences and Humanities.

Awarded for a series of scientific works in the field of Arts, Psychology & Philosophy of Science

The monograph considers the personality, its sources, structural components, and its inward world in terms of genetic psychology.

The principles for construction of experimental genetic and genetically-modelling methods as the most adequate for explanation of laws and mechanisms of appropriation, formation and development of human abilities and genesis of personality development are presented for the first time.

Genetically original units of various abilities and “needs” as sources for stimulating activity of individual, its deepness and initial unity (synthetic character) that constitutes the personality are presented.

The following fundamental analysis is made:

- theory of learning as a way for development and self-realization of personality
- study as a public form for management of learning and personality development
- learning as a direct and by-product of study.

The following specific peculiarities for needs (in vital force or vital power) were found:

- energy informative virtues of human in onto- and phylogenesis
- genetic psychological problems, as well as personality structure were fixed
- sources and driving forces of personality activity were proved (presented)
- fundamentally new personality structure, its forecast for development and life way
- life (existence) of human
- realization of love and needs and motivational regulators for life way of personality

inward space.

ISBN-978-1-77192-605-8

Accent Graphics Communications & Publishing

807-2625 Regina st., Ottawa, Ontario, K2B 5W8, Canada

**Society for the support of publishing initiatives and scientific mobility Limited
(Glasgow, Scotland)**

272 Bath Street, Glasgow, G2 4JR Scotland

<https://scientificassociation.co.uk/>

© Maksymenko S.D., 2021

TABLE OF CONTENT

Foreword	5
Introduction	10
In search of core for personality.....	26
Soul – a reasonable basis of human	26
Mental development and learning: approaches to problem.....	29
Genetic psychology: problems and perspectives (basics of concept).....	57
§1. Approaches to problem	58
§2. G.S. Kostiuk and genetic psychology	62
§3. Subject of genetic psychology.....	65
§4. Research methods in genetic psychology.....	68
§5. Problems of genetic psychology	73
§6. Some perspectives	74
Mechanisms of human psychics	76
Psychics and awareness.....	78
Concept of personality in psychology.....	81
Development and education of personality	82
General psychological theories of development, study and education.....	89
Theory of higher nervous activity by I.P. Pavlov	94
Genetic epistemology by J. Piaget.....	103
Behaviorism, Gestalt psychology and Wundt’s structural approach	111
Psychoanalytical theories of development of personality and psychics ...	115
Personalistic directions in study of development	128
Theory of human behavioral growth by P.P. Blonskyy	131
Cultural historical theory of development by L.S. Vygotskyy	140
Theory of experimental learning.....	160
Associative reflectory theory of learning by N.O. Menchynska	169
Theory of specific drivers for development G.S. Kostiuk.....	180
Concept of personality self-development	191
Theory of learning activity by V.V. Davydov.....	211
Theory of developing and educative learning	218
Theory of gradual formation of mental actions by P.Ya. Galperin	228
Theory of management of knowledge acquisition process by N.F. Talyzina...	238
Cybernetic theory of learning.....	240

Modern stage of genetic researches in psychology	243
Learning activity – prerequisite for quasi-discoveries	243
Directions in study of mechanisms for personality development.....	264
Personality as an internal moment of activity	265
Personality – human that has the creative potential.....	267
Process of personality establishment	270
From feeling of sufferings to scientific concept “need”	282
Ontogenesis of personality.....	282
Development of personality – deployment or new growth?	299
State of need in juvenile age	323
Personality starts from love.....	337
Genetic psychological problems in structure of personality	364
Structure of personality – special arrangement of its functions.....	364
Biopsychic structure	414
Inward world	421
Feelings.....	427
Sources for activity of personality	449
Character	454
Mental states	473
Expertise	499
Cognitive sphere of personality.....	504
Orientation.....	513
Abilities	516
Personality: forecast of development and life journey	532
Human being (existence).....	532
Realization of love and need.....	547
Stages in life journey of personality	564
Motivational regulators for life journey of personality	580
Afterwords	591
List of literature	596

*A stone, ignored by builders,
became a key one...*

Foreword

Modern practical psychology is rather a many-colored and, at the same time, a sad picture. A great number of empirical data (which very often tell about something they do not know), handmade, everyday in their essence theoretical schemes, which usually describe only one thing – peculiarities for mental process of their authors and somewhere quite apart – the fundamental philosophic methodological provisions about being and awareness, activity, essence and phenomenon, etc.

The important motive of our higher attention to methodological bases for genesis of psychics is the desire to get moving a number of problems in psychological practice. The absence of efficient theoretical basis causes, for example, to the situation when such necessary and important work in the sphere of child developmental psychology is just absent or is based only on everyday notions of general psychologist.

Our data also tell that the integrity in ontogenesis of psychics should be considered in another plane – as integrity of human life journey since birth until death. Hereby we should not abstract from anatomic morphological structures (dispositions), about which our psychology shyly kept silence for many years. So, the specificity of ontogenetic human development is that it is subject to effect of biological laws (as development of animals) and effect of social historical laws.

Thus, the object of genetic psychology is personality, spiritual physical individual, born by its own subject-based practical activity, which later is transformed into its own activity in some aspects.

A normative object (appropriate personality) is set by program of long-term goals for learning and education. Hence, there arises the deep content of subject of psychology – genesis of human mental capacities.

A certain complexity in nature of psychological concepts is that they act in three different aspects:

1) axiological – as a kind of general human knowledge that precedes any scientific analysis – a way to transfer the experience from generation to generation;

2) semantic – knowledge about psychics, awareness and human activity – a product of scientific research;

3) pragmatic – application of psychological knowledge about genesis of psychics, awareness and activity – a way for their practical application.

To understand the personality as integrity that self-develops is one of the cardinal tasks for genetic psychology of personality, sphere of psychological knowledge, which at that moment experiences the process of establishment but has the great future.

The study of such complex systems as personality and their actual understanding requires applying the corresponding method. It shall be adequate to the object, being studied. And at the same time the method is the implementation and methodological reflexive expression of basis for theoretical position. The genetic psychological opinion on personality means its understanding as a unique integrity, being self-developed, self-regulated and being the carrier of lifelong common human spirit.

Modern science is not in fact able to study the formations with such degree of complexity as scientific empirical fact: almost all methods and methodic procedures are aimed to “stop” in time and decomposition of a complex object into elementary parts, thus, the actual destruction of an object takes place, however its most important properties (which make it to be just the object of particular kind) hopelessly disappear from the sight of researcher.

Further movement in this empirical paradigm, as yet L.S. Vygotsky rightly noticed, already cannot provide with something that is principally new and important but starts causing to disappointment and scientific negativism.

The cultural historical theory created the unique methodic procedure, experimental genetic method, which overcomes with

“element by element” approach to the complex phenomenon and its stop in time (in fact in the course of existence and establishment).

It is known which fundamental phenomena allowed establishing this method in the plan for human appropriation of common human experience in the form of own abilities.

But this method just is not designed for work with unique integrity that self-develops (personality). Thus, the problem of method was of top-priority and fundamental for us. It seems that we managed to define that genetic modeling method (within the meaning, set forth in the book) is completely adequate to the object under research, exists and is constantly variable to human personality.

The book reflects our attempt “to see” the psychology of personality namely from this position and to feel its (i.e. position’s) possibilities to clear out numerous secrets of human existence. It seems that we did not make a mistake in the heuristicity of chosen aspect view, however let’s mention that it was not easy to keep, strictly speaking, the scientific heuristic view – the desire to “slip” to analysis of existing theories of personality and ... to build its own one is very attractive.

We hope that we managed to avoid such temptations and the book is about personality and not about its theories.

According to the original theoretical paradigm, established by us, the basis for psychology of personality genesis is the effect of need as a genetic initial unit of development and existence of personality. Being an energy demanding and information flow, the need specifically unites the biological and social determinants and acts in the form of lifelong driving force for self-development of human being – personality.

The contradictory unity of the biological and social, conscious and unconscious things that takes place “at the point of the world” in personality and provides with its dynamics, so – existence, gives birth to the most important attributive features of personality.

The constant energetic course of the need creates the real prerequisites for personality on its self to form strict reciprocal mechanism, which are built on rather powerful social factors that are

transformed into biological (morphological) structure in the ontogenesis of human being.

The novelty, even bravery of our opinion for genesis of personality, is that we consciously accept the opinion that the biological and social one “in” personality is the correlation (as it is usually postulated in modern science), in fact these two fundamental determinants of life establish the actual (not only metaphoric!) unity, and the social in human ontogenesis becomes the biological one.

It is the cardinal thesis. The human relations of two loving beings, the force of need that is found in them are met, subjected and make the work – a new creature, which is the biological one due to definition as it is alive. But it was generated by social relations, and this makes it to be a human alive creature since the origin. Originally it is a miracle (it is how O.F. Losev called a human personality).

The inward world of a new personality as the first derivative from energetics in union of the biological and the social one in need is a lively and beautiful picture of what may occur as a result from dynamic interactions and mutual transitions of the biological and social one. Thus, the nature in fact reflects itself (feasts its eyes) in this miracle, created by it...

Potentially and urgently the embryo of human, which is the Creation of two social beings, is the personality in its other specific forms of existence. No matter how unusual and contradictory this our opinion would be, we lay the stress on it and with satisfaction we mention that it coincides with those empiric data about early ontogenesis of human, received recently by world biology and medicine.

The fruitful union of these two ways in scientific search – genetic psychology and human biology – may result in real revolutionary improvements in our opinions on human, the spiritual, personal one. Perhaps, we will again reinterpret the religious world outlook...

We hope that we managed to realize the unique opinion on how the inward picture of human world, being implemented in feelings, builds the tissue of life itself from own mental states.

And quite logically there arises the problem of structure.

The rigidity and inopportunity of disputes as to whether the personality in fact has the structure is obvious: any complex system is obligatorily the structure and as personality is the system that self-develops its structure is procedurally realized during the whole time of its existence, providing with vital activity of human and at the same time acquiring more and more mature, delicate forms. In this book we would like to overcome with simplified logical mechanistic approach to definition of personality structure. The approach, about which G. Olport mentioned that each researcher artificially brings any mental phenomena into personality structure from the ones that he/she “likes” mostly.

It seems to us that this artificiality is overcome by one short but fundamental significant thought – personality structure arises as an original reflection of the world, where one will have to live... We would like that this thought will not pass behind the attention of those ones, who are interested in psychology of personality.

In general, we hope for careful attitude of reader to our work and are grateful for it.

INTRODUCTION

The actuality of research, developed by us, is defined by necessity in accelerated implementation of results from psychological sciences into the sphere of education, and first of all in that field, which directly relates to the theory and practice in understanding the personality of growing generation. In this connection the central moment in psychology is the personality in its ontogenesis (it is the birth of personality, it is a child under school age, it is a young school pupil, it is a teenager, it is a young man).

What is the heart of the problem? The heart of the problem is that it is necessary to introduce the psychology of personality into attributive and categorical apparatus of psychology because the partial approach, which exists now (due to good expression by Lange), reminds Priam, who sits on the wrecks of Troia when all speak different languages. The enormous number of methodologies, “burial ground” of those methodologies does not define and does not deepen the personality, this breaks it into “pieces”, in the same manner as subjects of general educative disciplines in the schools, in the same manner as subject in higher schools – the integral approach to understanding occupationally significant qualities is absent and understanding the personality acquires more fundamental importance.

Thus, before approaching to the problem of personality, we hypothetically anticipated that firstly we need to find and to ground the principles for construction of the method, which would be adequate to study of personality, its integrity and uniqueness. In virtue of this we need to make the methodological reflection of problems in personality development in psychology, to set the concrete procedures. The direct progress along the straight line in study of personality as if straight forward gives no results, there is only a set of characteristics, on the one hand, on the other hand, it gives no way to understand the personality, its inward world and its driving force.

Thus, the methodological reflection, developed by us, is that modern psychology fits, as L.S. Vygotsky told, “to progress along the straight line”, the simple continuation of the same work, accumulation of materials becomes “vain”.

And so in the course of methodological reflection we have to form the new approaches to organization of pedagogical and psychological researches, to define their efficient borders, to define the criteria for realistic and practical activity of psychological knowledge, to develop the means and ways for verification, as well as the methods for their organic implementation into research, heuristic procedure for discovery of personality again and ways for their organic implementation into social, pedagogical practice in terms of such understanding the personality. Herewith it is necessary to understand, hypothetically to plan: what motion shall be personality? Which approaches shall constitute the personality? Is the experimental genetic approach suitable in this case or is it necessary to address to genetic modeling method? Are some or other procedures, which are used in psychological practice for deeper study of personality, suitable? No. It is not reasonable to rake this “burial ground” of methodologies and all other procedures, they can be used as additional means. Thus, having made the logical psychological analysis for theory of personality and different approaches, we came to what exactly requires dividing genetic initial unit at definition of some or other ability, which is appropriated by school pupil, student, adult, i.e. through construction of content for some or other disciplines (Mathematics, History, Natural Science, etc.).

So what is the moment, as O.M. Leontyev told that personality – it is the internal moment of activity, it is the methodological measure, it is the methodological paradigm, within which we will work, and we concentrate our efforts on inward possibilities of personality? How to disclose this personality? Is it complicated from substructures? What are genetic initial units? It is necessary to disclose its nuclear basis in order correctly to disclose the personality itself. What constitutes the personality? What is the one that “dies off” and there remains only the core that contains the primate of the whole? If we find this abstraction, which is indivisible, and divide it into parts, it contains as we have already mentioned the primate of the whole, i.e. developing,

the personality is “modeled”, strictly speaking, around this genetic initial unit.

And what is in the personality that moves on its own, that develops, that is inherent to all social, pedagogical influences? What is the main one there? Thus, here we came to necessity to build the new principles for construction of genetic modeling method. Hypothetically we anticipated that *the need* may act as such “nuclear” formation of personality. What is it? We answer a bit later.

The scientific research on psychology of personality, as an actual (and not only imaginary) subject of study as a unique, unrepeated and integral system and unity, presents a very large problem. The thing is that modern science has no main thing – the method, which would be adequate to this subject. The method is the central chain in the whole problem on psychology of personality as it is not only the method to receive the scientific empirical facts. The method is also the way to implement the scientific knowledge, the means for its existence and preservation.

Experimental genetic method consists of theory, within which it appeared: designing (modeling), transforming (forming) experiment and diagnostics (fixation) both of intermediate and in certain degree final psychological new formations of personality, being developed.

The conformity of experimental genetic method to study of mental functions is directly defined by dialectic provisions about social genesis of individual awareness, mental development as appropriation of cultural achievements in society by subject. Thus, it is the most adequate research method for problems in study and mental development of personality.

The experimental genetic approach is not used and cannot be used to research the personality as it is. But those actual empirical results, which were received thanks to its application, theoretical generalizations that were made within the theory of developmental learning allow considering it in the form of conceptual background for creation of the method to study the personality.

So, let’s mention the principles for construction of experimental genetic method: *principle of analysis due to units, principle of historicism, principle of systemacity, principle of designing.*

Principle of analysis due to units. The construction and use of experimental genetic method for psychological research anticipates the disclosure, clarification of causal (causative dynamic due to L.S. Vygotsky) relations and attitudes that underlie the complex mental processes. The way to solve this problem is the analysis “due to units”. The analysis “due to units” is aimed to divide the initial attitude into parts (in fact it always exists in the form of a certain contradiction) that gives birth to the class of phenomena as the whole.

The separated psychological unit – “cellule” – preserves the properties of the whole. This kind of analysis enables distinguishing a certain moment in each psychological whole one, which preserves the main properties of the whole. It should be mentioned that a unit preserves the properties of the whole in the potency as a possibility for their origin in process of own development. These properties – it is the entire diversity of forms, certain features, in which a unit as the essence of diverse one is displayed.

It is the integral analysis. Its main task is not to divide the psychological whole into parts or even into pieces but to distinguish certain features and moments in each psychological whole, which would preserve the primacy of the whole; the use relates to natural explanation of mental processes.

The analysis due to units enables clearing up and interpreting the real relations and attitudes that form this phenomenon. Such analysis shall explain the appearance, origin of external features for mental process. It is possible at full dynamic deployment of all moments in mental process that always requires a certain deceleration in the course of processes and is achieved best of all when their course is complicated.

“The analysis due to units” in experimental genetic method was united with genetic way for scientific research, and as a result, this analysis acquired the status of scientific grounds for development of mental processes. Such approach to research resulted in that all psychic formations as something stable became to be considered as processes.

Principle of historicism. This principle is implemented as a logical deployment of the previous principle (*analysis due to units*).

The thing is that a separated unit as a contradictory initial relation, based on requirements of dialectic logics, is considered as the process that has its own historical start and end. The historicism requires tracking all moments in development and laws in their relations and transitions. Using the principle of historicism for psychic formations it is necessary to take into account its certain adequacy to the state under research but in no case the identity to phylogenetic and ontogenetic aspects of development.

The task of researcher under these conditions is the genetic study of structural components in mental process, being deployed. To cover the process of development for some thing in all its phases and changes in the research – since origin until destruction means to disclose its nature, to learn its essence as its availability is observed only in motion.

Principle of systemacity. The choice of the system, in which it (development) is considered, has the top-priority importance for receipt of objective data about driving forces and mechanisms for mental development. This principle was for the first time used by K. Marx and F. Engels at description of public processes.

In the course of time the corresponding method of analysis, overcoming with difficulties, acquired the proper place in the science about psychical life of human. Then the cultural historical theory for development of human psychics became the result from application of this method. Hereby the abovementioned principle was realized most strictly and consistently namely in its development.

While implementing the experimental genetic method into academic process, the principle of systemacity acts as a necessary logical step while constructing the content of learning material. It anticipates performing the logic psychical analysis of scientific knowledge and its design into the system of academic content. In EGM the principle of systemacity is the derivative from principle of analysis due to units and principle of historicism and characterizes the historical deployment of analysis due to units.

Principle for designing and modeling the forms of psychics. The principle for designing in experimental genetic method describes its qualitative difference from corresponding structural components in other psychological methods.

The experimental genetic method is directed for artificial establishment of such mental processes, which are absent in the inward world of individual.

This circumstance dictates the necessity in designing the experimental model for their genesis and development, clarification of laws for this process. Similar experimental models for some or other psychical functions, some or other abilities (or processes) are established with cognitive purpose but they are the prototype for really functioning processes. Usually, designing the psychological models is not the result from intuition of researcher. It appears in the process of complex logical processing the results of cognition that are the essence of human culture.

Based on the principle of designing and modeling the forms of psychic after loss of their abilities, the experimental model means that the culture (mathematical, physical, biological) is constructed in the form of learning tasks. And these learning tasks are built so that they reflect and, strictly speaking, are planned into the sphere of academic subject. This subject acts as a form, means, and method for appropriation of this culture. The difference is that the aspect of personality in the experimental genetic method, which enables forming reflection, abilities, intellectual development, theoretical attitude to reality, falls out and the individual typological peculiarities of a school pupil and adult is not taken into consideration to a certain extent. Thus, it is necessary to build the method, which is called genetic modeling one in order to unite the problem of age and pedagogical psychology and problem of genetic psychology into single organic unit. Unlike experimental genetic one, it aims to distinguish a genetic initial unit from those theories of personality that in general exist. And pursuant to this analysis, having passed such way as logical psychological analysis, theoretical analysis, didactic and methodological analysis, we distinguished such unit. Such unit at us is the need.

So, the **genetic modeling method** aims to study the integral personality, being self-developed, itself. In this connection there arose the necessity in search for “units” of absolutely other nature, and it was found out that such unit is the need as a contradictory initial unity of the biological and the social, which stipulates the existence of personality.

The principles for construction of method reflect the nature for existence of object under research: social, impossibility to receive the residual (final) empiric searches for inward world of human (reflexive relativity). The technology of method (principle on unity of genetic and experimental lines in development) anticipates the performance of research under maximal natural conditions for existence of personality and establishment of actual space for realization of numerous possibilities for modeling own development and existence by personality itself.

Thus, the analytical component of genetic modeling method is directed to separate the content-rich mobile units of genesis and self-modeling. And although it principally differs from establishment of units within experimental genetic ones, we leave the name for the first principle of our method without changes – **1st principle of analysis due to units** (study on the basis of logical psychological analysis for contradictory unit – the need, which contains the abstractions in undeveloped form of primate of the whole: biological and social).

According to our methodological paradigm, the application of genetic modeling method will allow, finally, “returning a human into psychology”, as this method enables analyzing and at the same time interpreting that initial system-forming basis for personality, i.e. the need as a unique unity of the biological and social and their activator. The development of method, thus, is the top-priority and the most urgent problem. At this stage we developed the main principles for its construction and application (the first one among them – “analysis due to units” is set forth here).

Another important principle in genetic modeling method for research of personality reflects its initial nature. It is the principle for unity of **the biological and the social**. The status for principle of

scientific method does not allow only declaring this unity as in this case it will cease being a principle. It is necessary clearly to aware what is meant, understood under unity?

The principle for unity of the biological and the social opens the real essential nature for outflow of activity at personality. When the psychology states that such outflows are the demands, it makes the mistake. So there is a rather simple and appropriate question: from where do the demands appear?

Besides, the effect of the demands cannot explain the self-motion, self-development of that complex open system, which is the personality. So there arises the notion about spirit as a primary source of activity, which cannot be studied within modern science. Again the most interesting and the most important for psychology disappears (by the way, the term “soul” in Ancient Greece meant the source of activity).

We are based on the fact that the need is the initial energetic basis for personality, biosocial due to its nature. The ontogenesis of personality starts significantly earlier than it is born physically. Its origin – dementalisation – is implementation of the needs from two persons, who love each other. There arises the new form for existence of the need, which (need) just cannot exist without physical media (at least, modern science does not know another way for existence of biosocial need, except its existence as a sociobiological energetic ground for human personality).

Following to the principle for unity of the biological and the social within genetic modeling method means to study the ontogenesis since its real start, research on mechanisms for origin of demands from the need. In general, it means the consideration of personality existence as development of initial biosocial unity, being capable to self-develop, in any particular psychological research.

Next important principle for construction of genetic modeling method is **the 3rd principle – of creativity**. “Meetings” of the need with numerous and different objects and phenomena do not just give birth to the demand, they stipulate the goal-setting and development of own and unique means to achieve goals.

Creativity is a deep, original and absolutely natural feature for personality – it is the highest form of activity. The activity that creates and tracks is implemented. On the other hand, creativity means the aspiration to express its inward world. When O.F. Losev calls the expression as one of attributive features for personality, he clearly defines that such expression is in fact the act for establishment of that world at the same time.

Following to principle of creativity in analysis (and in research) of personality means “to take” its existence in the whole, in its unique directed unity, in which it only exists.

And it means really to take into consideration the multivalence, suddenness and unpredictability of personality. On the other hand, it means to report to ourselves that not everything is simple and expected. All that we try to receive in modern experiments is in fact even not a certain case but a real artifact. And here there is the main disadvantage of researches in the sphere of personality psychology. We think that the latter one is very important, first of all, methodically, and thus we formulate the next **4th principle – reflexive relativity**, which fixes the principal impossibility to determine the exact dimensions and to fix final highest unique creative expressions of personality.

So, the self-determination through own need opens the principally unsaturated and unlimited possibility for diversity laterally in all expressions and properties to human. The available reflection as one of the most interesting and mysterious consequences from meeting of the need with human life makes this life illimitably original, opens a real endlessness of resources for self-change at each moment of time to human.

At the same time the principles of creativity and relativity open the real content of subjectivity event: the need in ontogenesis seems to be divided into branches. One its part exists and functions as it was in the childhood, as it was at the beginning: beyond the will of such human its viability and course of the life in whole is provided. Other “branch” of the need is directed exclusively to meeting with social world. Namely these meetings give birth to the highest mental functions, goal-setting, passion of inward world, creativity. So, a subject is being born.

The last 5th **principle** for genetic modeling method on research of personality is **unity of experimental and genetic** lines in development. In our opinion, it is a very significant moment of characteristic only for our method and the general state of things in cultural historical theory. This integral personality comes to the first place in genetic modeling research. And we easily lean to phenomenological direction when we report to ourselves that here (see **principle of creativity**) there is nothing “to model”, without infringing the filigree thin process of **self-modeling** and self-development. Thus, is there only the description left?

No, we are sure that the unity of this “naturally” genetic line in development with experimental one is possible but not through the way of formation – appropriation of abilities and through creation of special conditions for deployment and “deceleration” in establishment of integral units in analysis during experiment. It shall take place at the background of different (but fixed) possibilities for self-modeling.

The psychic phenomena of human do not exist, in fact, separately and individually. In their totality they make a unique and unrepeated pattern – psychological integrity (cross-functionality psychological system). Only understanding structural dynamic laws for such integrity may open both understanding its certain components (psychological functions) and awareness for existence of human sense and ways for optimization of this existence to us. This integrity and indissoluble unity of human psychics is the thing that creates personality.

Personality – it is the form for existence of human psychics, which is the integrity, capable of self-development, self-determination, conscious objective activity and self-regulation and has its own unique and unrepeated inward world.

So, at such understanding personality what is a driving force for development of personality? Such unit, as we have already mentioned starting the consideration of generic modeling method, is the need. It is the informative energetic feature of human that consists in expansion of life in onto- and phylogenesis. Namely the need is the basal basis, on which the subject demands are

developed. The demands are always of subject character. And here arises the question: from where do they originate? And they originate from the need, as it is the need that sets the energetic information basis for formation and development of the demand (whether biological, physiological, social or cognitive, etc). And when certain subject demands are developed on the basis of the need, they, being realized, become the motive and thus a human acts. And here again we have the question: how does a human act and what are its attributive features of the need that enable determining the personality in the nature or nature with personality? Thus, to answer this question we must clear up what are the attributive features for the need.

Thus, the first **attributive content-rich feature** for the need is its *heterogeneity*: the biological and the social here originally constitute the contradictory by absolutely indissoluble *unity*.

Another important characteristic for the need is connected with its informative aspect. We think that the actual formulation of invariability in nature of initial vital energetic substance by scientists is a stupid error (Freud, Jung, Plotin, Plato, etc.). Jung was right about numerous branches of initial vital force. Each branch of the need gives birth to a living being as a subject for realization of its essential function. While a living being lives – there is the branch of the need in it, which is namely the branch, i.e. it remains a component in the single stream of the need. Numerous vital manifestations and contacts of a living being, all its changes are absorbed (assimilated) by the need, remain in it, enrich and diversify this infinite energetic course with the great integrity of new information. Each meeting of two beings that takes place with the purpose for own continuation through creation and birth of a new being, means not only the reduplication of energy but the reduplication of information, multiple colors of existence. It is the initial condition for development. So, the second **attributive feature of the need** is its ability of development (self-development).

The analysis for phylo- and ontogenesis of a living being, as it has already been mentioned, testifies that infinite course of the need, its self-development is not sudden and chaotic. It has the directions.

And it is directed to constant complication and increase in integrity. This movement is finished under conditions of the Earth with “exit” of the need to position of possibility to realize itself (reflection). But we can speak with responsibility that it is not the *real* final stage in establishment of the need: just the mankind appeared in this stage and the need reflected itself. But the movement continues... Thus, **the third attributive feature for the need** is that its development is directed and it is the *orthogenesis*.

The fourth important attributive feature for the need is its ability of generation. This creative quality is shown in everything that relates to the life, and this is in fact the real *miracle* (O.F. Losev). But we will fix there on the most significant thing. Meeting of two branches of the need, embedded into living beings of different sex, gives birth to the qualitatively new need (informative and energetic new), which is continued in existence of a new living being.

This act is a single integral *dementalisation* of the need in wild life. If we speak about human, we meet with “*another*” reality: the need of *human may create a new human and qualitatively new product (creativity)*. We will consider the peculiarities for this aspect below. However, it should be mentioned that the need in the act of creation does not play the role of some modified *libido* (even in the animal world), so, it is originally the *unity* of the natural and the social.

The fifth attributive feature for the need is *that it exists in the form of embodiment into living being, born by it*. Beyond a living we do not have such energetic informative biosocial essence as the need. One can imagine that it relates only to physical energetics of the Universe but appears and exists exclusively as embedded into biological being. Here, most probably we have the effect that is similar to those phenomena of microworld, which discovery caused to *necessity in creation of principle for complementability*: a living being exists as a structure and as the need, *embedded into it*, at the same time. On the other hand, we cannot cover the need by another way, except study of a living being as its manifestation. Thus, all depends on the perspective of research.

The sixth attributive feature for the need is its *affiliative nature*. This work shows that the actual *form for existence* of the need is *the*

love. Within the context of analysis of the need, we are inclined to consider the love (according to T. de Sharden) rather widely, assuming it to be the force *that opposes to space entropy and stipulates the motion of all living beings* (not only humans) *one to another*. Likewise the result of this motion is *the birth*.

Finally it should be mentioned that **the seventh important attributive** feature for the need is *the infinity* of its existence. The complete (final) is the existence of organism, personality as media and embodiment of the need. And thanks to meeting and *through* it, the need continues its existence and is infinite in time. It seems to us that the analysis of this attributive feature will allow, on top of everything else, discovering the new aspects for meaning of time in the life.

The abovementioned attributive features for the need define (meanwhile schematically) its nature. In particular, we see the principal difference in our understanding in comparison with the point of view by Jung and other scientists.

So, using flexibility on abovementioned attributive features for the need, as it has been mentioned, we can explain the personality from the nature and the nature from personality. And it can be made only in motion of learning, in genesis as common life stream that is complicated and developed from generation to generation.

Please, note that the thing, called “libido” by Sigmund Freud, is also a medium of vital power but it is unchangeable within the context of generations. Each representative of any generation (if historically – from Cro-Magnon man to modern human) has the libido and it is always the same. What makes people be different, what develops them in the phylo- and ontogenesis? We will also speak about culture and socium in general because it is impossible to understand the phenomena of phylo- and ontogenesis in human learning without those categories (i.e. without psychological explanation).

On the other hand, we postulated informative unsaturation of the need and its orientation to ontogenesis. How does the need have to excite the practical concrete kinds of activity such ones as really exist in order to be adequate to abovementioned features? Or in other words how does the need develop human learning and human world but is not circulated due to example of libido?

Let's make one comment: when we tell "to explain the nature from personality" we are not engaged into metaphors. However, none but S. Rubinstein theoretically faultlessly proved: with appearance of human – all surrounding nature, all immeasurable worlds become different – it becomes human. Thus, when they tell "human nature", it should mean not only its health or psychics or inward world – but the whole world, both artificial and natural – about machines and cities, forests and lakes, all our Earth, Space, as all that became human. How? We made the attempt to answer only psychologically, without resorting to other disciplines and directions.

The need forms and enforces the demand to learn at human. Hereby we do not mean school (any organized) learning, and, on the other hand, we object to the thesis that as if human is enforced to learn by some circumstances (although it may happen in human life).

We mean another thing – desire, thirst for learning, to master new ways of actions and to form own experience is the inner one for each human already in prenatal period and it is stipulated by energy of the need.

Hereby, this desire does not disappear until the end of human physical existence. The idea of this phenomenon, in our opinion, is that mastering the ways of action, acquiring experience is directed not to itself but to what a human, having mastered all that, on its own started creating the world. To create, literally to create own motions, own ways for management of sensorics, own thoughts, ideas, finally to create a new life. So, using philosophic terminology, a human desubjectivates the world in learning and dematerialises it (literally – creates a new world) in creativity. It would be interesting to track the motion of learning (as a manifestation of the need in history of the mankind, human ontogenesis and its interaction with official learning but this is the task for a new great work. Now it is obvious for us that in the world there are no people (especially children), who would not like to learn. So, they (we all) need it very much just for continuation of existence. And the fact that people do not learn (or learn badly) relates to external factors; they realize the thirst for learning that the need brings – in other places, in other objective spheres. But all people learn. And we mentioned the sense of this phenomenon. Self-

actualization, achievement, self-regulation, individualization – one can call it as one likes but the sense is the same – ontogenesis of human community. We will concretely fix on the situation with human of elderly age. Paradoxically but with what desire and enthusiasm they learn the new vocabulary of grandchildren and their actions, learn to track the political events, learn to sing, to dance, to paint, to take care about themselves and others. How to explain this? We think that it is the action of the need: learning as a common undifferentiated demand means that the need is the force of life until its end – as well as in its social manifestation. We would like really to show how the principles of experimental genetic method differ in relation to what we define as the most adequate method – genetic modeling one, in order to study the self-developing phenomenon, which is absent in the world, in the nature, except a human and animal being, how it recreates itself. Thus, for comparative analysis we separate here the principles for research of succession in establishment of abilities, on the one hand; on the other hand, we come closely to principles for research of development and self-realization of personality.

The initial methodologemmas of genetic psychology, in our opinion, are the most successful, most productive, most significant approach, that paradigm, which determines the mains for research of personality psychology and the central questions: “How does personality appear?”, “What are psychological mechanisms for its existence and development?” The answer for the first question is that personality is created and thus it is some certain creation. On the other hand, it is quite special creation that during the whole life is in its own establishment, i.e. it constantly moves. Human in 4 years, human in 9 years, in 15 years, in 20 years, in 40 years, is self-realizing during the entire time. Very special creation moves and continues creating itself, complicating (or simplifying), self-realizing, improving. It self-exists. The personality in this sense is own author of its personality. But the real miracle is that personality is not only the author of itself as a creation: it is potentially and actually the author of another, new personality – a human child. This absolutely

unique, unrepeated act for co-creativity of two personalities, two loving people and is the real start for personality. I state that “Personality starts from love” – this thesis contradicts to initial provision in national psychology about ontogenesis of personality, which was embedded into the title of article by O.M. Leontyev “Start of personality – action” and gave rise to the whole direction of Ukrainian “psychology of action”. Action, if we take it in the meaning of O.M. Leontyev and V.A. Romenets, can never be “the start for personality” as in order to do it, it is necessary already to be the personality: to realize own “Ego”, to realize “Ego of other” and how to treat to it. The start for personality is not an action but love.

Starting to setting such complex problem as genetic psychology of personality, to be more precise, we will speak about genetic development if psychology of personality, it would be necessary to address to those assessment, which the system itself has already received, the approach itself, the paradigm itself, until clarification of psychological mechanisms for formation, establishment and self-realization of personality.

Thus, before coming to consideration of the main materials, which will represent the personality in three images and will be described in pages of 6 volumes, we can introduce the reader into the problem of personality, problem of its interaction with society, with ecological environment, into the problem of personality creativity, that, which through the need as a manifestation of love to formation of personality, to its embodiment and its creativity would be needed to set forth the reflections by the words of reviewers, received to the book.

Why do we think it is reasonable to do it? The problem is so wide, central and powerful despite the society, environment, natural cataclysms, but the personality was, is and remain that “God’s” being, which contains that need, that love. It is the only being in the world, which gives birth to another human, gives birth to another life, and gives birth to itself as the truth of the nature and the Universe. Thus, based on this approach, we cite some responses for this work in order a reader could understand the purpose of our great work.

IN SEARCH OF CORE FOR PERSONALITY

Soul – a reasonable basis of human

The term “psychology” is derived from two Greek words: “psyche” – soul and “logos” – laws of nature, and psychology means “laws of soul life”.

Psyche – soul is the concept of Old Greek philosophy. It had some meanings:

- 1) vital power that leaves the body with the last breathing;
- 2) bodiless basis, deprived of awareness and memory after human death;
- 3) “demon” – immortal being of godlike origin;
- 4) purpose of holy life;
- 5) “punishment” for the first sin of the Titans, etc.

At the same time psyche is a medium of memory about all past incarnations, it is identified with psychical “Ego”.

Psyche at Heraclitus – phenomenon for substrate of awareness and a medium of moral qualities (dried psyche – wisest and holiest). He distinguishes different psyche and different forms for its relation with the world: the highest level – it is the relation with logos, with the world law, the lowest level – with daily activity of human.

The study of Plato [Plato, 1970] about psyche interprets it as the immortality and the incorporeality that makes it close to supersensible world and, thus, a human has the possibility, is able to learn ideas through “recollection”. Plato created the hierarchy for three parts of psyche:

- 1) rational,
- 2) emotionally angry,
- 3) lascivious.

They are located in different parts of the body: rational – in the head, emotionally angry – in the chest, and lascivious – in the abdominal cavity.

Pursuant to division of psyche into parts Plato divides member of society into: 1) guards-philosophers, 2) warriors and 3) industrial agricultural state of human. According to Plato only the highest part of soul – rational, which he calls as demiurge-builder of the whole world, ideal arche, is immortal.

Aristoteles in “Tractate about soul” [Aristoteles, 1976], in addition to analysis on different kinds for manifestations of psychics, being actual for modern psychology, provides with its original vision. For him the soul and the body are indivisible parts of the whole, likewise image and material, which are reflected in it, as a form, are indivisible. Psyche – the principle of life is closely connected with organic life.

Aristoteles spreads the principle of psyche on all levels of organic life: each level has its own, inherent soul with certain functions. Body (soma) – it is an organism, totality of organs or tools of soul; soul – essence of body. He distinguishes three kinds of soul in human:

- 1) vegetable, inherent to plants, which still have neither sense organs, nor motion control organs;
- 2) animal, available in animals, which body has the differentiated sense organs, motion organs and organs that control them;
- 3) sensible, only human that has organs for cognition and activity.

Aristoteles, distinguishing three different forms of soul, clearly defines the idea of human development as the evolution of consequent forms for development of psychics in plants, animals and human. At the same time in human they relate to different functions of its soul: a) consumption, b) sensation, c) intellect.

R. Descartes [Descartes, 1950] in sharp form opposes the soul and the body. His position anticipates the existence of two different substances: materia – extensive and non-thinking substance and soul – thinking and not extensive substance. And if it is true they have different attributes – inherent only to them features and thus are opposed one to another as independent objects.

We will not speak how such differentiation of the soul and the body influenced on development of psychology and what resonance it caused in philosophy.

R. Descartes introduces two new concepts into scientific use: reflex and awareness. The concept of awareness becomes the main one in psychology in all further centuries.

Here we observe the transformation of concept of psyche; from principle of life (due to Aristoteles), soul, spirit it is transformed, according to R. Descartes, to principle of awareness. And thus the principle of introspection is implemented – it is necessary to look inside yourself, into your closed inward world, which is the reflection of itself by human.

B. Spinoza [Spinoza, 1957] approached to interpretation of problem on human soul and body by another way. In his opinion, the problem of soul and body is formulated wrongly. It is not worth fixing on the question about interrelationship of the body and the soul.

There are no opposite phenomena – soul and body but one single subject of study. It is a thinking body of human. The living, really existing, which, however, is considered in the science under two opposite angles of view. So we have that not only the soul thinks, which the God “installs” into human body but the human body itself.

Thinking – is the same way for existence of the body as its extension: thinking and extension – are not two isolated and opposite substances but only two features for the same material formation – human. In this case “imagination”, “awareness”, “conception”, “sensation”, “will”, etc. are the ways for external sensation, stipulated by the nature of features for thinking body of human.

K.D. Ushynskyy [Ushynskyy, 1990] distinguished “soulful” and “spiritual” psychical processes. Soulful processes are elementary psychical phenomena, common for human and animal; spiritual of the highest order and relate to moral, legal, aesthetic, ideological and other formations, inherent only to human.

I.M. Sechenov [Sechenov, 1952], considering the problem to whom and how to develop the psychology, mentioned that the psychology shall study:

1) history for development of sensation, conceptions, thoughts, feelings, etc.;

2) ways to unite all kinds and characters for psychic activities each with other, with all consequences of such unity;

3) conditions for reproduction of variety for psychic activity.

Unfortunately, during a long time the concept “soul”, “psyche” were excluded from scientific use.

Mental development and learning: approaches to problem

The experience, acquired in the sphere of psychological researches, persistently actualizes the demand in cognition of the most mysterious and complex – human personality as integrity. Naturally we are aware that psychology of personality has already been the most attractive object for scientific search for ages. Careful and dialogic open study of ideas by famous personologists, understanding empirical materials has significantly enriched our conceptions about nature of personality but at the same time demonstrated the available significant number of contradictions and unsolved issues.

On the other hand, the long work, related to realization of development principle in scientific psychological researches (L.S. Vygotsky, G.S. Kostyuk), development of methodological bases for genetic psychology, its categorical apparatus led us to the thought that personality may be understood only as such one that develops.

The development is the form for existence of personality just so as it itself is the form for existence of human psychics. Thus, S.L. Rubinstein in his time wrote that “a human psychic is personal due to its nature”.

Is it possible “to catch” the course of such complex structured formation as human personality in the scientific analysis? To answer this question is very simple: it shall be made compulsorily as only in such case we will receive the data about object under study and not the confirmation or disproof of our own considerations about it. But is it really possible to realize such perception at the modern stage in development of psychology? It is already the question about method.

Genetic psychology studies the personality in its real self-motion and thus overcomes with the problem of reductionism and “elemental character” of approach. Genetic modeling method, to

which our book devotes the significant place, allows detecting the real psychological mechanisms for establishment of integral personality and its certain structural functional units. The use of this method allowed closely coming to understanding such global issues as sources of personality and interrelation of the biological and the social in it.

The catching horizons of scientific search are opened. Let us say “start”, initial starting point of personality life. With some surprise we found out that the psychology had never seriously studied this initial significant moment, defining habitually that everything starts after physical birth of human. But is it really so in fact? What occurs after this act? Precise following to fundamental provision by A. Walloon that any psychic structure appears on the basis of previous one, made us seriously analyze this issue. It was found out that the problem on appearance of personality is in fact the problem on origin of the life, it does not appear in literal sense from non-personality (as the life does not appear from the non-life, at least the Earth science does not know such events). The personality is created (in the sense that it is the creation) by two other, loving personalities and this way it is the constant continuation and lifelong motion-development of human spirit, culture, civilization. Thus, lifelong existence of personality at “finiteness” of life of a certain human leads out to the very urgent plane – problem of time. Its actual dimensions are the social and the biological (natural) in human. The correlation of these two phenomena also seems to be unstudied in the psychology. Besides, we found out that it is heterogeneous and variable: an initial unit of any social – interaction – defines the start for motion of a new personality. The social becomes the biological, and it is a cardinal moment, within which the socialization and education (in general, interiorization of cultural historical experience) are the compulsory processes but not unique initial ones.

The research of personality as a self-motion of unique integrity cannot be sufficient if the problem on initial driving forces of this lifelong and at the same time such short and brilliant course is not solved.

What is this force? Our analysis allows assuming that it is the need. This special universal energetic informative formation is a medium and reason for social vital force of human. It is based on contradictory unity of powerful biosocial processes, which fertilizes with itself and defines the infinite motion of human life in the Universe.

The energetic and the informative is melted into unity in the need that provides not only with the motion but development, as the experience, accumulated in individual existence of human, thanks to motion of the need, becomes the acquisition of the whole mankind.

In general, genetic psychology opens an interesting and unknown aspect for existence of personality. We hope that our book will help a reader to see the focal points of this exciting complex and beautiful phenomenon by another way.

The wild interest to problem of personality that is easily stated in modern Ukrainian psychology is natural. It relates not only to discovery of numerous and content-rich acquisition of world science (first of all personology) that occurs during existence of Ukraine as an independent state, which moves to open society. The most significant reason is that this motion gradually led to awareness of necessity in existence of a figure of practical psychologist as a specialist, who has to solve very important and unique problems on existence of personality and it is him/her, who can solve them, in modern space of post-Soviet mentality.

Thus, there arose the request for realization of psychological knowledge – a phenomenon, completely justified and absolutely natural, well known to representatives from all spheres of science: the existence of scientific direction is justified only when its achievements are in time and actively used in the life of society. However, this phenomenon was absolutely unknown to Soviet psychology (except, short but productive period for existence of pedology. It was productive because it knew this phenomenon). The appearance of real practical request means that national psychology receives the second chance for its short history to become a real science. We remember the words by Ecclesiastes, used by L.S.

Vygotsky as the epigraph to his work in 1927 “Historical sense of psychological crisis”: “A stone, ignored by builders, was put into foundation of a corner” [68]. Vygotsky meant namely the practice: “Not only the life requires psychology and practices it in other formats but the psychology needs to wait for rise from such collision with the life [68, p. 390]. And further – the crisis in psychology “has started, is taking place and will finish in the line of *practice*” [68, p. 393].

The classic in this work showed what psychology should be in order to be a real science – i.e. necessary for life. “The psychology, which is called by practice to confirm the validity of own thinking, which aspires not only to explain the psychics but to understand it and to possess it, puts the practical disciplines into principally another position than the previous psychology” [68, p. 387]. “Thus, the psychotechnics cannot have doubts in the choice of the psychology, which it needs ... it deals exclusively with causal one, and objective psychology; non-causal psychology does not play any role for psychotechnics... We assume that the single psychology, which is required by psychotechnics, shall be descriptive explanatory science. We can now add that this psychology in addition is the empirical science, the comparative science that uses the data of physiology and, at least, the experimental science” [68, p. 390]. (Let’s mention that “psychotechnics” by Vygotsky is the modern “practical psychology”). The provision by L.S. Vygotsky is understandable and indisputable but it was found out that the results, received within scientific (empirical, comparative, experimental) psychology cannot directly and efficiently be used in psychological practice. They are not *applied*. Understanding this fact led to appearance of mythologemes about existence of as though two psychologies (again two, as during Vygotsky’s time), actual refusal of practitioners from use of scientific data in the practice (that our practical psychology at present moment is *off-diagnostic*, unfortunately causes to no doubts).

However, the enormous interest has been developed to existing theories of personality, and the interest to it, we should tell, is not only cognitive but pragmatic: even not theory of personality but the model for psychological assistance, being developed within its limits,

is studied. Then this model is directly used and the patients are actively treated “due to Freud”, “due to Jung”, “due to Rogers”, etc. There arise the corresponding “specializations”, absolutely inadmissible in the practice of psychological assistance. So what happens at it? Real personality with its unique inward world and psychic thesaurus without any scientific psychodiagnostics is just “involved” into the limits of correction and influence scheme, existing in the brains of psychologist.

And this scheme is external and abstract as very few people, who master the corresponding theory, pass a long and difficult way of its author. The influence becomes inadequate, hence – numerous problems. We forget “the commandment” by K.G. Jung: “I made a rule for myself to treat each case as an absolute new problem, about which I have no even initial data. Vital responses may be practical and useful until we deal with the surface but as soon as we meet internal problems, it is the life itself that enter into his rights, and even most brilliant theoretical provisions become invalid words” [317, p. 425].

It is natural that this individually oriented, the only correct in practical psychology position, shall be grounded on the objective scientific knowledge namely about this human, individuality. Why is it ignored, why cannot and does not want a psychologist to use the scientific knowledge and is based on daily impressions and schemes? As it is the objective state of things – the results that exist in scientific psychology cannot be *directly* and immediately used – implemented into practice. Likewise, the ways to acquire such knowledge cannot be *directly* used. The scientific psychology is being developed for a long time due to scheme of natural science – its object artificially pushed aside and considered due to logic of research purpose and not due to own logic of object itself (human psychics). The masses of certain facts about certain (artificially separated) phenomena are accumulated but their sum never produces the integrity. And it cannot do it. There occurs what G. Allport figuratively told: we know how thinking of most healthy people works but it gives nothing to us to understand about what and how a

certain representative of this majority thinks [210]. In this case we speak about difference in subjects of study: the subject of psychologist-researcher is always very narrow (it can be even not a certain process but its elements – components), and, from scientific point of view, the narrower it is, the more efficient the research will be. And the subject of psychologist-practitioner is always the same – psychological peculiarities for a certain personality, the one that stands in front of him. It turns out that psychologist-practitioner cannot *directly* use the scientific knowledge no matter how he/she united them, – the following nuance encumbers: they are received due to logic of researchers.

He/she cannot also use the ways to acquire that knowledge (due to the same reason). Such contradiction is overcome if the methodology of scientific researches is changed – they shall provide with integral but not separately-elementary knowledge and reflect (reproduce) the logic of object but not the logic of researchers. It seems to us that the question shall be the integration of subject of scientific psychology – it shall be the psychology of personality as integrity. We should mention: the personality shall be not the subject of theorization and generalization of infinite host of empirical data and the subject of real scientific experimental research. Once we mentioned that the structure for subject of cognition significantly depends on the level of cognition, at which it is formed. There are two levels of cognition, and, accordingly, of scientific research: empirical and theoretical. These levels are contradictorily linked between themselves, although they never create the unity. The empirical research requires the artificially narrowed (due to logic of researcher), detached and separated subject of study. The empirical generalizations for received facts in combination with theoretical knowledge, being available at subject of cognition, stipulate the appearance of proper theoretical subject and theoretical cognition. The theoretical subject (theoretical level) in psychology of personality in general gravitates towards union with object of cognition. Such object in psychology is the psychological reality, human in its integrity – real and discrete carrier of such reality. As the concept of human is

system-forming, such one that directs the anthropological way of thinking and at the same time the strategy for cognitive activity of subject, this concept shall also be considered as a world outlook principle that defines the character and the way for separation both of the subject of cognition and the way of its disclosure.

In fact the psychology operates three objects. The primary object is the conception about human as a public spiritual being. This object includes all sciences about human, thus, it is *general (gnoseological) object*, that performs the world outlook function for definition of specificity for object of cognition in relation to some or another concrete science.

The real object of psychology is a human as available, mental physical reality, born by subjective-practical activity under concrete historical conditions. This object acts for researcher as *object- entity* (and for psychologist-practitioner it is the subject of his/her professional activity).

Ideal object is a human as universal, integral being, which is formed due to program of remote targets. This object can be defined as *object-construct*.

Thus, speaking about change in methodological orientation of scientific psychology, which would allow it to be more efficient in practical highly sought sphere, we mean the approach of empirical and theoretical levels in psychological cognition, and, thus, – approach of the subject and object of psychological research. Such possibility, in our opinion, really exists. On the one hand, the personality (as a real object of human psychology) is objectively integral. Integrity is an attribute, form for existence and development of this formation, inherent to it *absolutely* (it is reflected even at the lexical level – expression “non-integral personality” is a nonsense). Any artificial, imaginary separation of this integrity, which is made not due to its logic, results in impossibility (again) for its imaginary filling with empirical facts, acquired during the whole “operation”.

It is here where the adequacy of cognition is lost and “logic of researcher” starts dominating.

At the same time it is enough to have the concrete empirical facts in modern psychology so that they would be adopted by subject of cognition, *would be used* in research of personality as a real subject of cognition, and further its narrowing, and, thus, “reduction in sizes” of received data may of course take place in certain spheres of psychological science that later, without any doubts, will play its role in psychology of personality. We have that level in development of experimental psychology, when received scientific knowledge is relatively sufficient for integral research of personality.

We need the new scientific calculated opinion, new methodological positions for further successful motion.

We are enforced to its creation by that vivid circumstance that modern psychology has come to that border, when, in opinion of L.S. Vygotsky, “further motion along a straight line, simple continuation of the same work, constant accumulation of material becomes fruitless or even impossible” [68, p. 292].

The new vision on problems of personality as a real subject of psychological research requires the serious methodological reflection: we have to find out and to form the new approaches to organization of psychological analysis, psychological research, to define its real criteria for heuristicity and practical efficiency in psychological knowledge about nature, sources and driving forces for development of personality. To develop the means and methods for verification of empirical data and to outline the methodological paradigms in order to have the possibility “to make both ends meet” by knowledge about personality during its ontogenesis. We are principally interested in the way, along which our research shall pass. Its appearance, in its turn, anticipates seeking for the ways of analysis and means for experiments, which will enable to come to the new horizons for understanding the generation of the life itself and to define, where, why and how the psychical appears, and the reality, which exists and is significant in the life of each human.

All those questions of common scientific methodological plan shall be settled within modern achievements and tasks not only for pedagogical, general or pathopsychology and practical psychology,

which is called to orient to requirements that are set to system of national education, health care and organization of those social influences, which are made in pre-school establishments, schools, higher schools and in the sphere of postgraduate education.

To understand the personality means to answer one of the key questions: “From what does the life start?”, “What constitutes the human life itself?”

We ask the questions so principally, and namely from that position we try to reflex the scientific historical experience, accumulated in the world psychology. Since the very beginning we shall take the decision about relation to this powerful field of modern personology: our work is not aimed to one more overall analysis for existing theories of personality. At the same time we do not set a task to create a new, our own theory. The idea is to try not to explain but to understand the psychology of personality, the logic of its appearance, establishment and existence, to open the psychological mechanisms for this mighty phenomenon, this miracle, which is a human personality, and, having understood, we built the theoretical paradigm for personality and method for its research.

From this point of view we seek for careful, curious and professional use of those acquisitions, which are contained in the space of psychology of personality, those facts and opinions, which are usually very deep and correct but often just genius. However they do not answer significant questions.

The genetic aspect for development and functioning of personality is central in our approach, as there is the essential interrelation between genesis of personality establishment and practical realization of those states, in which the personality may be in next periods of its life journey. From this position we need to pay the special attention to the analysis of existing theories of personality development. There are many such theories: A. Adler, L.S. Vygotskyy, V.V. Davidov, P.Ya. Galperin, E. Erickson, G.S. Kostyuk, A. Maslow, K. Rogers, Z. Freud, etc. There arises the task to find the genetic initial ratio, which could explain the sense and sources for existence of those theories (lawful, genius and in general those ones that are in

principle the real theories). In this connection I would like to return to the issue what is, strictly speaking, the theory? The theory, in my opinion, is the generalization of separate empirical data into a certain paradigm that allows a scientist, his school to move within the direction, which he established (typical example here – theory by Z. Freud). The theory, generalizing empirical data, enables taking the defined methodological position and pushing off from fundamental initial data, received in the experiment, and, in principle, using researches in practice.

In the whole totality of existing theories of personality we can distinguish two layers: first of all it is the theories, which build their theoretical initial data, relying on biological substrate of individual (Z. Freud, J. Piaget, A. Maslou, K. Rogers, etc.). And the second layer is the theories, for which the initial data are available social acquisition. So, the one about which L.S. Vygotsky (whom, however, we cannot refer to those layers) told dominates in those theories: these theories define the psychical development as an intravital process for socialization of individual.

And namely here we clearly feel the real urgency of the question: from where do the social functions originate in biological being, how does its social establishment as a personality appear?

Are the abovementioned layers of knowledge about personality justifiable in general? Yes, undoubtedly, they are justifiable. Can we tell that most theories, of which these layers consist, are beautiful, clearly logically built and can we tell that some of them are genius? How does the ratio of the biological and social exist as such one that constitutes the integral social individual (personality)? To answer this question it is necessary to develop the new theoretical methodological approach, which will allow us to define the most essential thing in existence and development of personality, will allow defining the most essential thing in development, having used all important and significant things in existing theories, at the same time not pretending to construction of some metatheory of personality.

One of the competent modern personologists, S. Muddi, considers three possible directions, due to which the new researches of personality may develop, taking into consideration numerous

world achievements in this sphere: “friendly eclecticism”, “tendentious fanaticism” and “objective comparative analysis” [161]. The first direction includes the description of many theories, each of them will receive a certain place and “respect”. Authors distinguish one single theory in the second direction, or “build” their own theory, giving the destructive criticism to all other theories. S. Muddy considers the third direction to be the most appropriate, mentioning that its purpose is “to find out the similarity and peculiarity between numerous existing theories of personality, pursuant to which it would be possible to make conclusions, which of theories is the most fruitful” [161, p. 14]. Here we would like to focus the reader’s attention: Muddy’s position reflects *the tendency* that modern personology stopped being research, strictly speaking, experimental science. Muddy reasonably calls the scientists to cooperation but what for? It is the unities of efforts in order to define which directions in fact have the scientific value, will stimulate the development of the industry itself” [161, p. 15]. And after it we will have the reliable and efficient theories, which will be used for further researches and practice.

It is important and significant that it is anticipated to seek for these truths not in personality as a subject of psychological research but in existing theories of personality. It is of high principle as it redirects the efforts of scientists, concentrating them on works by personologists (it is very important and useful itself) and distracting from real empirical researches and theoretical generalizations for fact, received at them but not the opinions of other scientists (and it is irrelevant and harmful although it occurs just now). We are sure that the psychology of personality should long and scrupulously be studied and only within the context of received scientific knowledge in terms of own methodological reflected theoretical position, to analyze the facts and provisions, acquired by other researches. The real and the only justifiable tasks for scientist are to receive and to understand the scientific facts in their own logic. All the rest – it is the creation of myths about which Muddy writes that it is not quite excluded that here the invaluable important and vivid facts, which should be analyzed, are accumulated. A scientific fact has its own

logic but there exists that we call *the philosophy of fact*, and it is its existence and availability that results in “catastrophically” numerous constructions in the sphere of psychology of personality. Human, its inward world, its existence and development – it is the fact. Due to definition it is very complex (what is the most complex in the world but personality?) and multi-faced. V. Frankle explained very well how each face of personality in thinking of personologist gradually becomes the initial one (it is not because it is such one due to nature of phenomenon but because a scientist “likes” it), and how further the orderly, perhaps, genius due to vision of deep (or vertex) sources but in fact very partial and one-sided theory of personality is formed. L. Vygotsky described it in his time in the work, which was mentioned above. We must be based on acknowledgment of unity of human nature, complex structuredness of personality and the task to find out and to define this structure is very significant. On the other hand, we need to find out that central, initial driving force, which enforces the dynamism and development of complex-structured personality, to define the mechanism for this dynamics. And here, if to study the explanations for the most prominent theoreticians of personality from such point of view, then the unity of human nature will be represented as something problematic.

Each theoretician considers that he has found the sources for activity and principles for structuredness of personality, however, their leading ideas differs much each from other, thus, it sometimes seems that the thing is that they are different and unlike representatives of Homo gender. Each theoretician paints his own picture of human nature. Of course, the best theories (Z. Freud, K.G. Jung, K. Rogers, A. Maslou, etc.) are built on the basis of empirical facts, received, in fact, not in scientific research itself but as a result from practical correction consulting work. And it is the cardinal important moment as not scientific but vital facts are received by such way and thus we call some theories as genius that the “progress” to the essence of phenomena is carried out in them without scientific research, although it is “the merit” of thinking by scientist, his intuition. In general, strictly speaking, the science cannot and shall not be limited *only* by intuition. Just because of this

substitution “the interpretation of empirical evidence since the very beginning contains the spontaneous assumptions – and this spontaneity becomes more and more vivid as soon as the theory is developed and acquires more developed and refined shape”, – thinks E. Kasirer [122, p. 25]. Z. Freud underlines the importance of sexual instinct. A. Adler propagates the will to power, A. Maslou tells about aspiration for self-realization. And the abovementioned researches in *those* spheres (as well as others – in their spheres) have the consummate results and very important conclusions. But everything is changed when each theory tries to become universal, when it is transformed into “Procrustean bed”, on which *any*, including the new empirical facts start being adapted to preset sample. Just so the theories are transformed into myths. E. Kasirer mentions that “we have no method for ordering and organization of empirical material yet” [122, 26]. Here we would take up on the famous philosopher and a bit later we will give reasons for our disagreement. Now we should emphasize once more that we are going reliably and critically *to use* the materials that exist in personology, not criticizing them indiscriminately but not transforming them into fetish.

Already the superficial glance on variety of researches (conceptual theoretical and own experimental) in psychology of personality testifies that we shall step back from unconditional logic, according to which as if there are “righter” or more “wrong” theories and scientific data.

Almost any theoretical concept in certain degree reflects certain faces of human personality. Thus, a researcher shall be a very qualified and open human, who is able to assimilate different judgments (different experience), not rejecting them. Therefore, the interlocution of research position in the sphere of modern psychology of personality is necessary. This situation was vividly and picturesquely described by classic – personologist G. Allport: “The one, who would like to close all doors, except the one door, deserves the condemnation. The best way to lose the truth is to believe that there is someone, who already possesses it... We need to open the

doors, especially those ones that lead to formation and development of human personality. As it is here where our ignorance and our uncertainty are maximal” [209, 137].

Taking this into consideration, understanding the human personality (if we speak about understanding itself but not about measurement or assessment) anticipates the necessity in appeal to acquired experience to such an extent as the performance of theoretical or empirical researches. But using this experience we shall come to higher levels of generalization. So, each conceptual theoretical model of personality was created on the basis of certain and original logic of scientific approach: its own logic in psychoanalysis, its own one – in humanistic psychology, its own one – in theory of activity, etc. Their combination will approach us to understanding a mystery of personality only it will also be based a certain logical conceptual basis. Now we can tell only that such basis will be created, although, on the other hand, we have to mention its direction – personality shall be identified as such one as it exists – living, uniform, integral that is constantly being developed. The psychological science has already used up that period of its development when discoveries were made pursuant to artificial partition of an integral subject into certain parts and cognition of each from them. Integrity, uniqueness of personality is its first most important attribute. Thus, the possible future science about personality shall deal with its most significant property – uniqueness of its psychological organization.

Personality is the one that unites and builds up the psychical world of human, making an unrepeated pattern, inherent to this concrete individual. Let’s mention that “early” G.S. Kostiuk has formulated the subject of psychological science by such way.

On the other hand, V. Stern defines the personality as “consciously acting integrity that is self-developing and has a certain depth” [307, 188]. In order to understand the real nature of integrity and uniqueness of personality, it is not enough to be based on the obvious fact: personality is and cannot be anything else that the sum of its certain parts – cognitive processes, motivation, features of

character, etc. So, we understand that although it seems to be correct, in fact, personality is not only the sum of those parts but some things that constantly “slip out” from analysis. Personality lives, is developed, functions and is formed as integrity. V. Stern mentions: “The integrity of personality is never a completed and defined once for all construction, it is always complex, it exists really and potentially at the same time [307, 201]. The interrelations of certain components are changes in this living motion of integrity and namely these components are changed. But these changes are the secondary ones in comparison with the changes of the whole – personality. They appear as a result from living motion of personality, are accumulated and assist to the next integral motions.

G. Allport mentions: “Personality – it is rather a transitional process than a completed product. It is constantly changed. Namely this process of change, establishment, and individuation is of special interest [209, 87]. Thus, we see the interesting unity: real understanding the nature of integrity, uniqueness of personality has to pass not through understanding its some artificial structure (I use these terms “some” and “artificial” because no matter which structure of personality would be offered by some or other theory it is always the artificial product of this theory, set of concepts – so, a psychologically healthy personality self-evidently has no structure of something frozen, fragile, hard conservative one). However, the real structure of personality, which bears the essence of human “on itself, in itself”, is always flexible, multidimensional and such one that is changed and self-developing, remaining a structure at the same time. This real understanding comes to us through comprehension of motion – constant run, development, establishment of personality.

It seems unusual for modern society that the integrity and uniqueness is defined by ... motion, dynamics but in relation to psychology of personality it turns out to be the only correct solution of the problem. But the facts testify: suspension of human in his growth, development immediately negatively influences on personality: a human becomes less interesting, shallow, solely functional and just simplified boring. We say – the uniqueness, individuality and integrity is lost. It is the motion and constant

development that stipulate that personality, as A. Maslou mentioned, consists “not only of parts but of sides” [181], and each its side is an untraditional concept for psychology (whether attention or emotion or thinking) but an integrated, folded, crystallized unity and, at the same time, manifestation of the entire complex whole.

Thus, there arises “the premonition” for method, about which absence E. Kasirer wrote. So, *real* philosophy of the fact is compulsorily grounded on the research not only of its peculiarities “here and now” but on determination of laws and mechanisms for origin, appearance, existence and its development. And it means that we shall catch the personality as such one that has the integral structures nature, which *is moved*. It is the sphere of genetic psychology, and it shall be the genetic modeling method.

We rely on that fundamental provision, which was formulated already by Lev Semenovych Vygotsky: the cultural historical development of individual has its “pre-start” in some impulsive instinctive structures that form the motivation demand sphere of individual. It seems to me that Vygotsky just had no time clearly to find this idea “about return at the new level” and that line that has the name of genetic one in connection with well known circumstances.

Psychology of personality has its own “vicious place”, or, if you want, its own variant for task on “quadrature of circle”. We speak about problem of the biological and social in personality. This ancient, petrified in all its conceivable variants and terms, problem cannot be solved by any other way but “removing” it by other, more real and open problem that is *the development*, motion, its sources and consequences.

When we tell that personality is the product of public relations – it is absolutely true. But how and from where this product is generated – is unknown and ...obvious at the same time.

A human is included into society. But “with what” is it included here? If we analyze all theories and experimental data, in particular, structures by L.S. Vygotsky, S.L. Rubinstein, G.S. Kostyuk for self-motion, self-realization (as well as theories by A. Maslou and R. May), we can come to the following conclusion: “originally there is a certain

genetic initial unit, which constitutes this development and the whole process for adoption of social norms, between born human individual and its motivation demand sphere, which shall have to be formulated yet.

Analyzing the empirical results, received using experimental genetic method, which was grounded by L.S. Vygotsky, taking into consideration the laws for interrelation of learning, education and mental development (G.S. Kostyuk), relying on the nature of mechanisms for construction and design of social abilities, established in experimental researches (V.V. Davydov), taking into account the provisions in theory of stage-by-stage formation of mental actions (P.L. Galperin), analyzing the works on biology and genetics, we came to the conclusion that the force that generates a human life is *the need*.

When we tell that the life generates the life, it is necessary to answer the question “How does this occur?” The generation of the life itself consists in the need. And the love starts from the need and is realized, defined in the new person as its creative product. The performance of logical psychological analysis allowed identifying a genetically initial contradictory “unit”, which underlies the biological and social existence of human, as it, the need, is in fact “impossible”, “surprising”, contradictory unity of these two sources. That’s why it is endlessly active and energy capacious.

So, the sources, significant peculiarities for motion of personality should be sought in the sources of the life itself. Let’s listen to what Allen Willis tells: “We start our existence in the form of small thickening on the tip of the long thread. The cells start growing; the growth gradually acquires a human form. The tip of the thread is hidden inside, untouched and protected. Our task is to preserve it and to transfer further. For a short period of time we flourish, learn to dance and to sing, acquire some memories, which we immortalize in the stone – but quickly fade away and again lose the form.

The tip of thread is now in our children and is extended through us, going to the mysterious depth of centuries. The uncountable thickenings were formed on that thread, flourished and faded away

as we are now fading away. There left nothing but the thread of life itself. Not separate growths on the thread but the hereditary structures in it are changed during evolution". [277, 105].

What provides and causes to this constant, unceasing, everlasting motion of human spirit, succession and infinity in generations of human individuals? The life of human in the Earth (as the life itself) does not appear from the non-life, it *continues*, inherits the other life. And it is the cardinal moment: the life generates the life itself, and in the sources of it – there is the special life-forming common intention – *the need*, as the aspiration to be, to live, to be continued in others. We consider the need as the initial, all-embracing, stressed state of biosocial being, which enforces its activity – life. The nature of the need is the initial energy dynamic unity of the biological and social components of human being. Due to psychological indices the need is the special basal state, dynamical tension, which defines the possibility of individual to be active during the whole life. S.L. Rubinstein at his time mentioned "He (human – S.M.) is connected with surrounding world, he has the need in it ... This objective need, reflecting in the psychics of human, is felt as the demand by it". [254, 103].

The world literature pays so much attention to the study of demand sphere of personality. In particular, there is the authority for and the stable tendency to interpret different intentional manifestations of human in order to seek for initial sources of its activity ("libido" by Freud, "instincts" by Mac-Dougal, "basics demands" by Maslou, etc.). The category of the need, which we introduce, mostly correlates with "basic demands" by Maslou, although there are significant peculiarities. A. Maslou, although declaring the basic demands as common, "organismic", sees only *the biological* roots in them. In fact, these instincts, which, as Maslou thinks, are very weak in human in comparison with animals, are reinforced thanks to meeting with social world: "Understanding the fact that higher aspirations are a part of human biological nature as integral as the demand on meals will bring us much benefit...

We know that they are *modified* under influence of culture during accumulation of experience in interaction with surrounding

environment and cognition of adequate ways for their satisfaction” [180, 160] (emphasized by us – S.M.). The peculiarity of our position is significant.

The need as the intentional basal energetic intention since the very beginning *is not* in fact the biological but has the biosocial nature, as it is the original unique infinite continuation of the need at social beings (parents of child) that dementalised into its own creative product – new life. Thus, the biological is united with the social, forming the indissoluble integral unity in human being, so, the social becomes the biological. The need is not “*modified*” into any other structures: it generates separate and different demands “on itself”, “in itself”, which are dementalised, satisfied, experienced and developed. The demands arise as separate branches on the integral and single carrier – the need. This origin is stipulated by “meeting” of the need with the objects and phenomena of surrounding environment, first of all – the social. But the need itself as the initial intentional energetic force is dementalised only in such integral product – combination of two needs, two personalities, and then a human child is born... Another initial aspect is the available hereditary dispositions in this child. The motion of the need transforms the potential into the actual, and here we see the start of formation – appearance of personal *structure*.

We state previously that the dementalised need of two individuals of opposite sex gives birth to the new life. From here the unity of the biological and the social starts as the need originally has the biosocial nature. The need, having generated by the fact of its historical existence, is implemented into human being and comes to the new turn of its existence, only dementalising in the new life, in *the new* human being. Being as if only biological due to nature, this being through the mediation of dementalised, embedded into it, biosocial need, bears the huge layer of the *social* reality, which was appropriated by its ancestors in the process of life and became already biological one to some extent.

And, thus, a human living being (personality) has as much the biological as the social. It means, strictly speaking, that a human has no instinct, aspiration, demand, which would have exclusively the animal

nature (in the pure, as much as to say, form). Due to nature, content, way of expression and means of achievement, peculiarities of experience (as representation in the consciousness), all intentions are exclusively human, which grew on the single biosocial carrier – the need. And similarly as a human has no pure social, cultural intention and demand, so they all – manifestations and embodiments of the need at living, natural substance. It is here where the real unity and integrity of human being is. K.G. Jung in his time paid attention to this moment. “In the whole human activity there is, – tells Jung, – the a priori factor, so-called inborn, pre-conscious and unconscious individual structure of the soul... And at the moment when the first manifestations of psychical life become accessible for observation, it is necessary to be blind not to acknowledge their individual character, i.e. unique personality that stands behind them. It is difficult to imagine that all details acquire the reality only at the moment of their appearance [318, 214]. K. Jung, as it is known, thinks that the special images, archetypes that contain the ways and styles of human activity are behind the real behavior. He insists on their hereditary character. Human behavior arises from patterns of actions, which are the images-archetypes. It is solely human qualities of human being, specific human form that its actions acquire. “This form is hereditary and exists already in the plasma of embryo. The idea that it is not transferred by hereditary way, and again appears in each child is so much absurd as ancient belief that the sun, which rises in the morning, is the other sun that sets in the evening” [318, 215]. Jung, emphasizing the inheritance of images-archetypes, acknowledges that this thesis cannot be proved in modern science. We think that the need, in principle, may assimilate certain common ways of human behavior and define them at meeting with environment through the demands and their dementalisation. The need gives birth to existence and complicates it.

We may now tell about the soulful spiritual without mysticism and metaphors – it is the product from evolution of the need, embedded into human being. “The general direction of motion is the growth of form, more and more realization, from materia to intellect and self-consciousness. The harmony of human and nature may be

found during the journey along the old way that leads to more freedom and understanding [318, 108].

Thus, the need as a genetic initial relation that constitutes personality by incomprehensible yet, unique and complex way absorbs and unites the biological and social, and the social in the process of ontogenetic development is transformed into the biological but not in adult individuals but in the newborn individual as a product of the love. And when this specific form of the need is realized into ability to become personality it bears the initial intention: a newborn individual turns out to be ready for socialization. The social is appropriated very easily, surprisingly easily, if we assume that it is in fact the biological being in front of us. Without need to become a personality, no biological training can result in the social establishment of individual. Let us say that primates in principle have all necessary dispositions and functions but they will never be socialized as personalities. Why not imagine (in the meanwhile hypothetically) that the essence of the problem is that the social component is absent in the heredity of primate, and its need is solely biological, there is no social component in it. So, the corresponding demands are not formed at meeting with social environment, and, thus, the social cultural development is absent. And at the same time a human child, even if it is born blind, deaf and mute, bearing the need to become personality in itself, appropriates a human experience and becomes a human. It is the most significant moment. Here it is the key moment.

Understanding the need as a single contradictory integrity of the biological and social enables considering its specific outcomes – psychological means, social aspirations, other structures, which formation defines the orientation and namely the existence of personality, more meaningfully. Returning to the analysis of different theories, let's mention that in our opinion they just “catch” certain moments and aspects of existence and development of the need (G.S. Kostiuk, P.Ya. Galperin, J. Piaget, L.S. Vygotsky).

Going by different theoretical ways, the scientists came to the same (although not expressed) provision – the mechanism for generation of the psychical is in the need. Here there is the unity of

the biological and the social, physical and spiritual. We, in fact, now fix the availability of different ways to the same fundamental contradictory grounds of personality.

It seems to us that such our understanding opens the new possibilities in research of concrete problems, including those ones that have fruitfully been studied for a long time. Thus, considering the issue about learning and development of personality, now it should be mentioned that learning has in fact “to get ahead of” development but taking into consideration the period that constitutes the origin of this relation. So, the need generates the actual level of development and the area of the nearest development as in general it is that initial that defines the psychical existence of human as it is. If we now return to the sources and mechanisms for formation of personality in blind, deaf and mute child, it is necessary to take into account the important provision by E.V. Ilyenkov [116], who could find what is determinative in this case. He emphasized the meaning of social influence and it is very correct but the thing is not just in this. These influences are in fact very complex, didactically and methodologically very hard and really allow a child (providing that the leading analyzers are lost) becoming a personality. But the following other side is also important: these children have the original, biosocial need to become a personality. The biological turns out to be so plastic that under influence of the social environment, existing in the single dynamic pair, it enables developing in the ideal, psychical, even under conditions of significant deviations. And here there is the essence of the problem. If there were no need, which acts as the start and end of personality, there would be no this biosocial generation of the new unity – human personality.

The need, thus, is that genetically initial relation, which constitutes the ripening of the biological individual and psychological manifestation of social influences in the single dichotomic pair that gives birth to personality. Strictly speaking, the social appears “on the stage” twice: firstly as a distributed function between two individuals, then the appropriation of human abilities takes place and the law of the need enters into force but in another form (in juvenile age). Here the need enters into social context of continuation of the family.

Namely it defines “the second” generation of personality.

It is clear why the mystery in phenomenon of generation-continuation namely of human life enforces us to theoretical methodological analysis. The principal moment here is the introduction of concept of need into categorical system. Why do we address to this? It is referred to the research method for development of personality. The thing is that the category of the need acts as the explanatory principle in relation to modeling nature of human psychics and then we can speak about research method of personality.

When L.S. Vygotsky in his works analyzed this problem, during the whole time he returned to the method, calling it as causal dynamic, genetic, instrumental, and experimental genetic. In one place he tells about genetic modeling method, which, unlike experimental genetic one, shall work not with constructs of social order at appropriation of abilities that programmed by society but with modeling phenomenon and reproduction of this appropriation. Since what does it start? We are sure that it starts since the need. When demented need of two individuals of opposite sex grows into the new life, then (in language by L.S. Vygotsky) the biosocial being that appears in the world acts as a new growth. G.S. Kostyuk was right when he told that a human is born as a biological being but having the potency to become a personality. “Having the potency”, – it means that it already contains the biosocial need as a historical sense for reproduction of humankind.

We will again return to the problem of phenomenon when the social sometime becomes the biological whether at one individual or two ones. Why do I speak about two individuals? Because there is that “gala-effect”, which is defined by laying emotional biological structure one on another that gives birth to that what we call being in love. From where does it originate? Its real sources are biological. But namely biological ones were appropriated only as a result of powerful social interaction with environment, with people and society, which generate that ability, which is found in love to another human not at simple elementary level of chance reproduction but reproduction of oneself in oneself that is the one, I expect to see in the future.

It is that my genetic initial one, which already at the level of unity of ovule and spermatozoon contains both the social and the biological, being social due to its nature, due to its origin, it becomes the biological as it generates a new life. Generating a new life, it passes through certain stages. It is in details described in the literature, there are different theories, which we have already mentioned. We will now pay attention to the moment when a newborn child takes the position of readiness to become a personality.

A born social being is the biological one at the same time, and it, strictly speaking, moves in the dichotomic pair: firstly, it contains the gene equipment, which is realized through adaptive mechanism that acts as the mechanism for development. But there is another aspect: how does a married couple, which acts as an attributive standard for appropriation of relations of social order, behave? Here everything occurs: on the one hand, there takes place (as if) the realization of anatomic physiological dispositions, which grow in human potency through sensory perception sphere, through mobile actions, in which the culture is appropriated as ability (realized, my), the relations, behavior and norms of social roles, which are desired for that parents, are appropriated. I would like to emphasize that we deal not only with relations “mother-child”, “father-child” but with relations “father-mother”, “grandfather-grandmother”, “grandmother-mother”, and this adult environment acts as a constituent moment and adds a vector for development of personal expectations. First of all there occurs not the behavioral response in relation to a child but the appropriation (involuntary, absolute reflectory, at the sensory perception level yet) of those social roles, which set the intention of personal development.

So, when we think how we should move further in understanding the nature of the psychical, in understanding the personality, it becomes clear that we should push off from known mechanism, which was separated by L.S. Vygotsky, G.S. Kostyuk, O.M. Leontyev, P.Ya. Galperin and O.R. Luria – this mechanism is the interiorization as the operational content for transformation of external actions into ideal ones. Strictly speaking, the essence of concepts for learning

activity is based on this mechanism. But we tell “to push off”, as we need to go further.

Our understanding the category of the need allows speaking not only about appropriation but modeling: the psychical, enforced by the need, cause to special – *personal action* – of human.

This action at the beginning (in early ontogenesis) is solely affective (but it is still personal as unique and unrepeated in planning and execution). Meeting of this action with the object gives birth not only to satisfaction of this “site” of the need, it generates the cognition. So, there appears the cognitive need, which is further developed into intellect, finally forming the integral cognitive sphere of personality. But please, pay your attention – we tell that everything starts from expression of the need, i.e. – on own activity, and namely this phenomenon but not “pressure” and predestination to social environment causes to process of interiorization. So, V.P. Zinchenko is right in something when he writes at the exteriorization occurs earlier than interiorization. But to study it empirically we need an adequate method – genetic modeling experiment.

Western scientists – Z. Freud, A. Adler, K. Rogers, A. Maslou, other personologists worked in absolutely other paradigm (precisely speaking – in different paradigms). They rather artificially (although, sometimes genially delicately) distinguished the partial media of human basal properties, which they reduce, one, – to sexual drives, another – to domination, some – to aspiration for self-realization, existentialists saw the root one that defines the sense of life in spirituality, in problems of internal feelings of human, its expectations, aspirations, planning, etc.

Chinese philosopher Lao Ji told that existence is not born but it generates everything, it is the father of the Universe. But at certain stage of this global motion there appears a miracle – “inside” the common existence there is a personality – a being that has not only appeared in existence but absorbed, caught and outlived it cardinally. Personality is the existence – unique moment of reflection and hope.

The existential psychology pays the central attention to existence, proving that existence of human generates its inward

world, special truth I-feelings. The existence is understood as the establishment. But the existence of personality is not only the establishment, it self-appears, established, develops. This process, genesis of personality existence, as it seems to us, includes the answers for a great number of questions about essence of human nature.

It is necessary only to manage (methodologically to reflect) to form the new weighed dialogical approach to learning: not infringing the unique integrity of personality existence, to receive reliable empirical data.

We must state that we have the integral knowledge despite its diversity. And it seems to us that the cultural historical theory may “cover” its national concepts (G.S. Kostiuk, L.I. Bozhovych, B.G. Ananyev, N.K. Platonov, O.M. Leontyev, S.L. Rubinstein) and numerous foreign theories of personality (Z. Freud, K.G. Jung, G. Allport, A. Maslow, K. Rogers, etc.). So, all that are the branches of knowledge, which tell about the same because the key figure in them, as we say, the ideal object is the real spiritual physical being – a human and its conscious subjective practical activity. And all abovementioned opinions, finally, are reduced to the single meaningful and doubtless: unlike the laws of nature, the social laws and laws of psychical development are explained only through active mediation.

While solving the task for cognition of generation moment and moment for establishment of the psychical, we came to necessity in use of genetic modeling method, which is grounded on the following *principles*: principle for unity of the biological and social, principle for analysis due to units, principle for systemacity, principle for designing, principle for creativity as the manifestation of acmeological aspect for some or other sensitive period in the process for appropriation of abilities (these principles will be disclosed in the corresponding section of the book).

The central point in our research is the principle for unity of the biological and social. The opposition of the biological and the social is, in our opinion, to a certain extent correct but “adapted” to research problems of a certain scientist. In fact (in the logic of object)

it is difficult to distinguish, where in personality there is the biological and where there is the social, moreover, the social becomes the biological in ontogenesis.

We have the fundamental questions. How is the knowledge in history of culture accumulated, and which “representation” does a certain personality have in this? Why does that knowledge become the acquisition of human? And, on the other hand, why is sometimes the following expression true: “The nature rests on the children of geniuses”?

The last question may previously be explained in our paradigm. It is the specific form for “exhaustion” of the creative component of the need, which requires the pause for restoration of power just as the earth requires it after some collected harvests. Similarly a human child, inheriting the biosocial power, which leads it to the life, fails to find whether adequate social influences on its motivation demand sphere or this sphere itself or the whole integral need exists in this case in some inadequate form (May be a genius embedded his/her need in his/her creative products and it simply “lacked” for valuable and all-round dementalisation in his/her child). The creative component transforms the human need into goal in and of itself. And there occurs a multiple-vector development of abilities as the ones that realize the own need of personality in the subject of culture that leaves the personality and abilities that recreate the need itself in humankind after itself.

In general, we think that on the basis of logical psychological analysis of theories of personality and pursuant to the previous study of corresponding empirical materials, we managed to come to the separation and construction of own understanding of problem, to see “the absent chain”, which crudity and incomprehensibility does not allow moving further methodologically. And that’s why the theories of personality start as if repeating each other, not adding anything significant and only finding the new thinnest small knots, which explain some moments in human behavior, its creativity and activity but no significant cardinal phenomena have been discovered for a long time already.

Thus, the theory of activity, considering the activity as an explanatory principle in psychology of human, does not reach to the very sources. M.O. Bernstein approached to them to the nearest, who in “living motion” [27] saw the reproduction of the whole human life. Comparing his views with provisions by Z. Freud, it is necessary to mention that the later undoubtedly rather delicately “caught” this initial instinct, sexual drive (libido), which is in fact inherent to all living beings. And he studied the important phenomena on “substitutions of libido” – original symbols that somehow reminds “the instrument” and “symbol” in Vygotsky.

But what caused (and constantly causes) to creation of instruments and symbol and their appropriation as abilities in the process of activity? This question is not even raised. On the other hand, Z. Freud, explaining different behavioral responses (mainly, in pathopsychological aspect), neurotic conditions, etc., appeals to the past. But how did all that appear there, in the past? We may assume that these behavioral patterns have appeared in the process of inadequate social influence from environment on the need, which exists in the individual. If it is so, then only the analysis of this example allows telling the need is undoubtedly the alpha and omega in psychology of personality (terminology by L.S. Vygotsky). It is that unit of analysis, from which consideration the research of personality shall start. The need, I would tell, in its classical variant is displayed in the act of birth, and for the second time it “appears on the stage”, waiting for the meeting with the world, in juvenile age, where it in its real nature is shown very clearly, when the period for reproduction of the one that is similar to you occurs, when again the choice and meeting of individuals of opposite sex, who are able to generate the third one, a newborn human being, takes place. And namely in this sense a child is a demented need of two adult people of opposite sex.

Thus, the need acts as a core that runs through personality in its life, uniting the biological and the social into complex integrity. It is that vector, on which the biological and the social are met and displayed in the single initial one. It is the origins, sources, and, on the other hand, – it is an exhaustive end of life. The need always acts as a constituent – in the

social environment and in existence itself and in physical organization of human. It is really that initial, that watershed, which enables looking on all those theories in a new way, and this category as if contains all paradigms, and has that wave of the new approach to understanding the personality, which is not exhausted by motivation demand sphere and other separate parts of this tremendous and brilliant formation.

In our opinion, the introduction of categories of the need is necessary both in active and existential approach, as well as in psychoanalysis and deep psychology. But the need is the scientific fact, it is that describes the reality, which not only exists in the personality but constitutes it.

However, everything really starts from the need, which appears at connection of two fundamental vectors for social beings that generate a new biological individual – potential personality at social contact.

Making the preliminary summary, we will mention the main thing: we connect the progress in scientific cognition of personality psychology with the necessity in organization of researches, which would fix the peculiarities for the subject of learning itself (logics of object) in its integrity and unique specific complexity. The nature of personality is such that it exists as a fact only in motion, in development. So, whether genetic modeling approach or genetic modeling method will be adequate to its study. This thesis means that we shall set our vision for specificity in study of phenomenon for development in genetic psychology in order to complete a definition and clearly to open its position. Only after that it is reasonable to start to conceptual setting of our vision for problems in personality psychology.

Genetic psychology: problems and perspective (basics of concept)

Using the concept “genesis” to understand the experimental genetic method for research of psychical phenomena enables considering them in terms of origin, generation, establishment and transformation during learning and education of human.

The book considers the mechanisms for transformation of content and forms for reflection in psychics, awareness and activity of human, under which mediation the possibilities for creation of new growths – mechanisms for creativity from natural sensitivity of human will be opened. The operational transformation of external influences into psychical phenomena takes place due to the following scheme: disposition – ability – mechanism. The creation of psychical mechanisms for human activity is carried out due to the following scheme: establishment – changes- motion – development – creativity.

Key concepts: dispositions, abilities, mechanisms, establishment, change, motion, development, action, experimental genetic method, activity, creativity.

§1. Approaches to the problem

The concept “human” is the key one for psychology that sets the direction to any research or theory and at the same time the one that determines the strategy for cognitive activity.

It is considered that namely this concept will underlie the world outlook suggestion that defines the character for different subjects of psychological science, as well as the way for their deployment, as in different subjects of psychological science and in ways to design its activity.

If we assume that the object of psychology is the essence of human – totality of public relations, in which it lives and acts, then such understanding a human defines the limits of categorical vision and sets the world outlook function for construction of system on subjects of different researches for psychical phenomena. In particular, it relates to genetic psychology, which subject of research has to be defined pursuant to all methodological conditions of objectivity.

The purpose for genetic psychology of human is to study the conditions, under which in the processes for transformation of content and forms for its psychical phenomena for states of awareness and ways of action it can achieve such level of perfection

in psychical mechanisms for activity, when there will appear the ability to make discoveries, inventions or to create word pictures. It means that the purpose is to find the laws for genesis of initial content, undifferentiated sensitivity of human, for creation of mechanisms for creativity.

Genetic ideas, ideas of generation, appearance of further process of functioning, which leads the subject or phenomenon to a certain state, kind, changes of the same subject or phenomenon, were in the center of attention already at ancient philosophers and wise men, who thought about issues on origin and establishment of phenomena. Further, as a result from long research of genesis processes, long before construction of theory of genesis, the genetic method for scientific cognition was established.

As in the old days, which are characterized by mythological knowledge, under modern stage in development of methods for science, the genetic method of research anticipates the analysis for certain initial state of subject or phenomenon and construction of further transformation from that knowledge.

The historical genetic method appeared as a result from statement about idea of development in the science (starting since XVII century): in Mathematics – differentiated calculation, in geology – Lesley's theory, in cosmogony – Cant-Laplas' hypotheses, in biology – Ch. Darwin's theory, etc.

The main purpose of genetic research is to show the relations of phenomena, which are studied, in time, study of transitions from less developed to more improved forms for existence and functioning of subjects and phenomena. The genetic method in philosophy of Hegel underlies the phenomenological analysis of awareness, which aims to show the historical metamorphoses for forms of cognition and to disclose the establishment of science as a way to acquire the scientific knowledge.

The penetration of genetic analysis into sciences, which study the processes of development, caused to consolidation of genetic method as a special method for cognitions and appearance of

special spheres of knowledge: theory of evolution, origin of species, genetic sociology, genetic epistemology, genetics of behavior, etc.

We can state about certain stability in general orientation and evolution of theoretical views in psychology, which further more and more strive to involve the results from genesis of psychics, awareness and activity into their general psychological theories of research.

The child psychology paid attention to itself along with many sections of psychology, which started being intensively developed at the end of XIX – beginning of XX century. The impulse for development of this sphere of psychology was made by Ch. Darwin, who published his book “Biographical essay of one child”, which described the thorough observations for processes of psychical development. The most popular works at that time were “Soul of child” by V. Prayer and “Psychology of early childhood” by V. Stern. The use of genetic method in psychology in further development of science relates to the names of D. Baldwin, K. Gross, Carl and Charlotte Btoller, A. Bine, A. Walloon, E. Klapared, R. Zazzo, J. Piaget, etc.

The genetic method in research of problems in child psychology was widely used by K.D. Ushynskyy, P.K. Kapterev, A.F. Lazurskyy, I.A. Sikorskyy in pre-revolutionary Russia.

P.P. Blonskyy, L.S. Vygotskyy, A.B. Zaporozhets, G.S. Kostiuk, O.N. Leontyev, S.L. Rubinstein, etc. made the contribution into understanding the laws for development of child psychics, and hereby into general psychology.

Hereby we think that it is a mistake that namely the use of genetic method in psychological research, at once refers the author and his works to the sphere of genetic psychology. The genetic method, used in a certain sphere of psychology, is the way to study its subject, based on the analysis for its creation and establishment to valuable functioning.

So, when we speak about certain science, we think that it is defined by availability of reflected components: cognitive situation, subject of research, totality of psychical facts, on which basis the

subject of research is deployed. Hereby the concept “cognitive situation” includes the following elements:

- a) cognitive difficulties, stipulated by realization of contradiction between knowledge and ignorance;
- b) “white spots” in the subject of research;
- c) requirements to the product of research, which shall be received;
- d) means for organization and implementation of scientific research.

The subject of genetic psychology is more complex phenomenon. It includes: a) the reality, over which a researcher will work; b) a task or a series of tasks, which he/she shall solve; c) different scientific descriptions that contain the reflections of this reality; d) research means – available or those ones, which shall be created; e) abovementioned requirements to the product of research, which is the result from application of means and sense of task; f) product of research – elements in theory of subject and technological recommendations for its further study or practical improvement.

The practical sphere for deployment of subject of research is based directly on the methods for observation and experiment.

Unlike so-called non-specific application of genetic method, the genetic psychology has its own subject of research, in which the following processes exist along with many other psychical processes, phenomena and material formations – psychical mechanisms: process of *generation*, *establishment* and further *dynamics of its functioning*.

All this is subject to scientific study.

By the way, the concept “genetic” in wide meaning of this word, shall cover the evolutionary and historical aspects of psychology. But the thing is that in our literature only the researches, which relate to development of child, are usually defined due to concept “genetic psychology”. At the same time, in magazine “*Psychological Abstracts*” there is the heading under title “Genetic psychology”, which includes the following sections: 1. Period of infant. 2. Childhood (learning, abilities, personality, interrelations between

children and parents). 2. Juvenile age. 4. Age of maturity. 5. Gerontology.

Other, so-called “subsidiary” spheres of science are developed along with the genetic psychology. Thus, genetic epistemology, founded by J. Piaget, is a vivid example for original definition of the subject, tasks and methods that are subject to effect of laws for genesis and require to be studied. J. Piaget defined the epistemology as a science about psychological mechanisms and conditions for origin at human: a) of different forms and types of knowledge; b) of concepts; c) of cognitive operations; d) of relation for knowledge of different type and level between themselves.

The purpose of genetic epistemology is to study, in which age and how a human possesses knowledge, concepts, when the cognitive mental operations appear at it and what are their relations with other parties in their psychical life. Using the analysis of initial state of psychical phenomenon it is possible to derive the new knowledge about its next states. And this derivation is based only on knowledge about mechanism for acquisition of qualitative definiteness by psychical phenomenon that arises: it exists and does not exist until certain moment, appears or is destroyed, etc.

Afterwards, from origin of the first ideas for genetic method to formation of subject for genetic epistemology there are twisty and uneasy ways. The researchers came to the idea about genesis of psychical phenomena of human nature rather quickly but the creation of the system subject of genetic psychology occurs slowly. Probably, it will last until the time when the way for construction of system for genetic psychology, which would satisfy the logical and significant criteria for existence of subject of research, will be found.

§ G.S. Kostjuk and genetic psychology

In modern psychology there are many researches, which fix the moments for generation, origin of psychical phenomena, breaks in gradualness (insight, products of intuition, etc.), and their uneven transitions into the new state, to the new function, to the new way of actions.

In these terms the research by G.S. Kostiuk, which can undoubtedly be considered to be pure genetic due to its essence of subject of research, method and product, received as a result, is original. G.S. Kostiuk informed about results of his research in 1962, making a speech at all-Union meeting on philosophic issues of the higher nervous activity and psychology.

The subject of research was the process for creation of image at perception of subject under complicated conditions. The model of process was the image of subject, located in the dark chamber, which again and again was illuminated by flashes of electron-pulse lamp. The short duration of illumination did not enable observing and seeing a subject in full: the experimental received something, which is inaccessible to cognition in the terms of form and content.

As a result from numerous illuminations by impulses of the light there occurred the accumulation of information in field of vision of experimental and the image of subject, being perceived, was gradually building. G.S. Kostiuk came to such conclusions as a result from researches on generation and origin of image of subject when it is perceived under complicated conditions.

While constructing the image there expressly appears the complex interaction of reflectory acts, which acquire the form of specific cognitive actions (sensory, perceptual, reproductive, mental), directed to solution of perceptual task: separation of features for object, being perceived, their structuring, awareness of class of objects, its referral to a certain category. Pursuant to the past experience and fragmentary percepts the subject has the judgments, hypotheses, which influence on the course of this process, and at the same time there appear certain changes depending on results of perceptive actions. Inadequate hypotheses that are not confirmed by perceptive data are replaced by likely surmises.

The solution of task under such conditions often is the process for solution of contradictions between expectations that appear at subject, anticipations and perceptive information, when he/she receives.

It represents a complex cognitive activity, which is verbalized to some or other extent in all its stages, starting from awareness of the task and finishing with its certain solution.

It is a vivid example for establishment of “subjective image for objective world”, which cannot be understood without its psychological components. The necessity in such analysis convincingly appears at transition to more complex manifestations of cognitive and all the more to spiritual life of personality, its versatile creative activity.

Thus, the originality of the psychical may be better understood if to approach to it genetically, if to look closely at how during development of imaging work of the brain the real interrelation of living being with external world are changed, their new systems appear.

What is the gnoseological sense of abovementioned results from research? What is hidden behind the external simplicity of original experiment? Below in brief are the main components for subject of experimentalist’s activity.

First – *sensitivity* of visual analyzer, which received the energy of external influence and through its low power was not able to transform it into the fact of cognition.

Second – silhouetting the subject, being perceived, – its origin on the eye retina and *establishment* of its contour with indefinite borders and with cavities in its integral image.

Third – cognitive actions (sensory, perceptive, reproductive, reflective), which carry out the *changes* in image and fixation of peculiarities; thanks to this they transform the energy of influences into a definite image.

Fourth – *motion* of available but not complete enough information about subject. The hypotheses-images, which are changed with more probable, are created.

Fifth – *development* of image as a result from reflection of subject and its objectivation through separation of its features, structure, its referral to a certain category, verbalization and up to positive solution of perceptive task.

Sixth – *creativity*. The analysis of psychological components (characteristics of the psychical), which is necessary at transition of human to perceptive tasks to more complex manifestations of cognitive, spiritual and productive activity.

The main provision of G.S. Kostiuk was formulated pursuant to this and other researches in the terms that the development is not a consequence of learning. It has its own peculiarities, its laws that relate to the laws of learning and education but are not identical to them; its specific driving forces.

§3 Subject of genetic psychology

Thus, the object of genetic psychology is a human, spiritual physical individual, born by its own subjective practical activity, which is then transformed in some its aspects into its own activity. A normative object (a proper human) is set by program of remote purposes for learning and education. But from there arises the deep content for subject of psychology – genesis of human psychical properties. But it is turn any change in the subject of research or regulation in the practical activity of human learning or education entails to substantial changes in the ways of cognition, i.e. a human itself and the modification in way for cognition requires the substitution of initial abstractions.

All these methodological operations for subject of psychological research allow not only defining the new subject of research but anticipating the new general features for subject of research.

So, the genetic psychology, unlike genetic epistemology, shall have the following subject of research: a) appearance of psychical phenomena; b) their origin; c) establishment in vital processes; d) functioning; e) their renewal (revival) after they lose active functions.

In other words, the genetic psychology is called to study the objective processes for generation of new psychical mechanisms and knowledge about them pursuant to found perspective and/or projects for development.

more-less deep aspects of content. The first one is generated by activity of people, which they shall firstly possess in order to work

productively, using its psychical content for regulations of actions and deeds.

The second one – a totality of knowledge, acquired by humankind spontaneously in the process of manufacturing, cultural, state and artistic activities. This level of knowledge, received without applying the scientific methods of research, may be called the psychological wisdom or common sense. While accumulating such knowledge, people strive to implement into certain logical and notional schemes, transferring them to the new generations at the same time with learning and education.

And, finally, the third one – is generated by system of scientific knowledge, which is created as a result from implementation of scientific research methods and in particular experiment into psychology. The main feature for this content is the regular or programmed production of the new knowledge. Thus, the main principles were discovered as a result from the huge work of psychologists, as well as the explanatory concepts of psychology were formulated, and at the same time the branches of psychological science were extended.

It is clear, the intensive differentiation of certain branches in genetic psychology, which makes attempts to define their subjects and research methods, creates only approximate schemes. So, the systems of concepts (or conglomeration) of modern psychology constitutes rather a mixed picture.

Let's take the process for creation of concepts, for example. Within this purpose one often goes to disunion of concepts due to principle of notional distinguishing: conscious – unconscious, process – content, process – structure, patrimony – acquired, structure – function, etc. Hereby, it is characteristic that depending on direction of psychology, each from polar concepts is reduced to one of them according to tastes of researcher, and the opposite to desired – just is not taken into consideration.

Besides, many concepts of psychology suffer from excessiveness of functionality in terminological denomination: feelings, perceptions, emotions, memory, thinking, etc. Accordingly, their content is established after a model for definition of content for biological

concepts about functions of human organism, where the notion about purpose of those functions is derived from the view on organism, its biological, biochemical and physiological nature.

And when a psychologist considers the processes of thinking, feeling, perception or memory, etc., against his will he makes them absolute, transforming into independently existing essences, instead of seeing the results from actions, activity or behavior in them.

Undoubtedly, overcoming of stable functional concepts and their reconstruction in genetic plan gradually takes place in modern psychology. Thus, our researches on experimental genesis for goal-setting of pupils from junior school age (S.D. Maksymenko, 1980, 1988) showed that the stable mechanisms for acceptance of learning tasks are formed in this age, while learning of pupils due to ordinary programs enabled them coming only to notion about result or subject of actions. More impressing is the picture for genesis of goal-setting in development of personality – establishment of its independence and initiativeness. It was also proved that qualitative changes in independence are not definitely defined by age, growth in activity occurs thanks to personal attitude of pupil to fulfillment of learning tasks and formation of the skill to anticipate, to plan, to control, as well as adequately to assess the results of his work on that basis. The level of independence, formed in the experiment, may exceed the characteristic one for this age of pupil.

However, rethinking the system of concepts in human psychology in genetic plan is the problem that requires significantly larger efforts due to intensity.

So, let's say, such forms for psychical phenomena (conscious perception, free memory, active attention, volitional action, thinking), which were considered only in the form of inborn properties for psychics and awareness of human are in fact the products from long development in active vital activity of human, it still requires the special conceptualization.

Besides, although the mentioned tendency in development of new psychological concepts is in no case a simple substitution of "old" concepts, however there are attempts to establish a certain system for simpler systems of pragmatic concepts, which describe

the things that can be checked in the experiment for reality and find the roots for functional concepts of psychology in them (using logical conclusions).

There, the abovementioned problem is not as simple as its formulation.

A certain complexity in nature of psychological concepts is that they act in three different aspects: 1) axiological – as a kind of common human knowledge that precedes any scientific analysis – a means for transfer of experience from generation to generation; 2) semantic – knowledge about psychics, awareness and activity of human – product of scientific research; 3) pragmatic – it is the application of psychological knowledge about genesis of psychics, awareness and activity – a means for their practical application.

§4 Research methods in genetic psychology

The main research methods in genetic psychology are observation and experiment and the latter one is divided into two kinds: stating and forming. Contemplative stating research methods have already used up their productive forces and their place was occupied by active methods, built on the basis and in the form of experimental learning.

The researches of problems in psychical development using forming experiment provided with certain positive results. Theoretically and practically it was proved that forming experiment due to its essence is the type for *real* academic educational process.

The purpose of forming experiment is to provide with better results in comparison with those ones that are achieved in the school by traditional ways of learning and education. Thus, it is stipulated by the needs of school, is justified and motivated by necessity to improve academic educational work, to increase its efficiency.

The evolution of forming experiment may be presented in the form of some stages that characterize the spread of psychical reality, which is subject to formation: a) property, or peculiarity of psychical process; b) psychical process; c) mental action; d) integral psychical new formation under conditions of organization of activity.

The qualitatively new stage in development of genetic psychology, stipulated by transition to experimental genetic research method, is characterized by synthesis, strictly speaking, of psychological research on *designing* new forms for mastering social cultural values by human, new efficient forms for academic educational process, thanks to which it is possible to disclose the laws from psychical development of human.

The hypothesis by L.S. Vygotsky about principles for study on development of human psychics underlies the experimental genetic research method. The hypothesis received the name “Vygotsky line” and gave impetus to a number of researches – O.M. Leontyev, P.Ya. Galperin, O.V. Zaporozhets, D.B. Elkonin, V.V. Davydov, etc.

The methodological content of abovementioned “line” was the notion that the specific forms for psychics are not given to human since birth but are only set as public samples. Thus, the psychical development is carried out in the form of mastering those samples, including in the process of purposeful learning and education.

The logic of experimental genetic research on subject of genetic psychology anticipates not just fixing the peculiarities for some or other empirical forms for manifestation of human psychics but their active modeling and reproduction in special conditions during observation or forming experiment. This modeling allows disclosing their essence, i.e. the laws for origin and establishment of certain psychological functions and abilities in ontogenesis. Thus, a concrete realization of experimental genetic method in researches as their necessary element includes the forming experiment.

The theoretical level in study of psychical phenomena in experimental genetic method, unlike other psychological methods, will specially be set to the researcher through construction of content-rich operational pages of subjective activity. Hereby, the specific peculiarity for similar modeling and construction is that the model, created by researcher with cognitive purpose, corresponds to real internal structure of psychical process. Here the generic psychical process, for example, a way of thinking or memory, is reproduced by a certain individual due to those social cultural norms, which made it to be a product of spiritual culture of society.

Figuratively speaking, the experimental genetic method, fixing “the objective dialectics of things” through its own organization, generates “the subjective dialectics of ideas”, complex dialectics for psychological world of individual, which is developed due to laws of reflected reality.

Hereby, the laws for reflected reality are given to it not only in general abstract form but as a content-rich operational system of certain activity. Only in such form and capacity the laws for reality become the basis for those connections and relations that form the psychological *process*, psychological apparatus, being in the state of establishment. Thus, namely the content-rich operational system of experimental genetic method is the psychological center of research.

Here there is the essence of method: the psychological phenomenon or function under research is firstly constructed in the form of model for a certain activity and then is actualized through mediation of special means for organization of human activity. Such universal way for organization of human activity is the task, which solution anticipates the functioning of the corresponding psychological process. The criterion for psychological assessment of performed research is the degree of conformity in real conducted process for solution of task for its model.

The learning task in experimental research is the artificial means for induction and development of psychological processes, their specific model. Naturally, there is no identity between the psychological as objective and the psychological as subjective, generated on its basis but there is the adequacy one to another between them. The external social samples in the process of interiorization (appropriation) firstly become the means for psychological organization and regulation of human activity. And then they pass into internal plans, acquiring the forms of psychological processes. Further they do not remain unchanged and during course of their functioning they are enriched, acquiring the necessary variability.

So, the experimental genetic method contains the methods for construction of higher psychological processes, which are appropriated by human in the process of its reorganization of certain content.

Hereby namely the transformation unites the genetic and structural functional moments of objective reality and hereby sets the

similar structures (in the form of ways for analysis) to the psychical itself, internalizing, the ways for transformation of learning material act as psychological mechanisms for human activity. Such notion about psychical processes as regulators of activity and behavior forces to interpret the laws for psychical development as necessary and logical consequence from this line of formation process, anticipated by experimental genetic method.

The realization of genetic modeling approach may be carried out in the form of constructing school programs that allows experimentally uniting the age possibilities of pupil and process of his/her learning into single organic knot, showing the illegality of opposition, disunion of his/her education and development. The most important moment here is the moment on study of laws for process of establishment of new kinds for cognitive activity. Thus, the task to divide the principles for construction of research method and to define the optimal conditions for its realization is urgent.

The theoretical apprehension of experience from experimental learning, made within the genetic approach, leads to necessity in establishment of *system on principles* for construction of experimental genetic research, as well as detection of succession in main logical operational structures with the help of which it is realized.

Our researches (S.D. Maksymenko, 1981, 1989) give grounds to distinguish the following principles among many leading ones:

- 1) principle of analysis due to units (definition of initial contradictory relation that generates the class of phenomena as the whole);
- 2) principle of historicism (principle of unity of genetic and experimental line of research);
- 3) principle of systemacity (principle of integral consideration of psychical formations);
- 4) principle of designing (principle of active modeling, reproduction of forms for psychics under special conditions).

Undoubtedly, other approaches to study of subjects of genetic psychology are used along with experimental genetic research method.

Systematic structural and functional methods of analysis on their own cannot be sufficient tools for research and scientific explanation. Only studying *the condition* for origin and *the laws for development* of structures of psychics and awareness, we can learn their nature and laws of functioning in order to manage people during learning.

The experimental genetic method along with other functions is the methodological principle for psychological research. Depending on peculiarities for subject of research in genetic psychology, it can assist to solution of the following scientific tasks:

- a) philosophically historical;
- b) comparative psychological;
- c) functional genetic;
- d) formation of higher psychical processes;
- e) assistance to development of abilities.

Thus, the experimental genetic research method is the way to construct and to ground the system of knowledge, which unites the totality of methods and operations for practical mastery of psychical activity.

As any scientific method, it is based on actual activity of human, arises from it – on the one part, and on the other part, – it is the projection of theory on subject of genetic psychology – a totality of properties and laws for development of psychical reality, agreed between themselves, and with objective logic of subject, on which a researcher has been working.

Strictly speaking, any mature theory of subject acts as its method in organization and performance of research. It relates to associated theories, which do not have their own research methods yet. At the same time the theory as the method is able to select and to define the content and succession of research operations in the experiment. It means that discrepancies between method and theory are only functional: theoretical results from the *previous* research become the component of the method – initial point and condition for *next* experiment.

§5 Problems of genetic psychology

Transformation of dispositions into abilities and mechanisms.

Modern psycho-physiological and traditional age psychology concentrated its efforts on the preferential study of dispositions – organic bases for abilities and other psychological properties of human. Abilities were studied in perspective of only what they are.

- a) conditions of successfulness for performance of certain kinds of activity: intellectual, sensory, perceptive, psychomotor, etc;
- b) stipulate the difference in dynamics of human mastery of needed knowledge, abilities and skills.

As a result from indefiniteness for subject of abilities, the psychology became operating *a great number of* dispositions – anatomic physiological possibilities of human and abilities, which correspond to *a narrow circle* of requirements to human under conditions of concrete activity. In other words, the potential abilities, which were not planned by school program for development, their transformations into abilities and moreover into mechanisms for psychics, awareness and activity, were artificially “extracted” from real living and acting human.

Where shall we seek the abilities in this case? In dispositions? No. Dispositions are the psychobiological functions that became the result from historical development of living organisms, during which a certain differentiation of their structures and specialization of physiological organs at human took place. It should be mentioned that anywhere these functions of living organisms are inferior to nothing in comparison with artificial ones and even prevail over them. In some species of animals the possibilities for adjustment and scope of sensibilization (gain in sensitivity), as well as the width of scale, band that perceives the energy or information, – that is the unattainable dream for representatives of bionics...

So here is the problem: how many *working* abilities may be created from dispositions at human? Potentially – as many as there are communication channels with environment, human and its inward world, really – depending on organization of learning and

activity of human in its life journey. Thanks to these living devices – dispositions, transformed into abilities, a human receives, selects and preserves the energy and information to meet its needs.

Using this equipment, the multidimensional images of influences that are reflected by sense organs are formed: from subsensory – unperceived – facts, besides, real, which can perform the regulatory functions, to facts of awareness – concepts and theories, constructing a new reality.

At subsensory level of reflection a human possesses the endless possibilities for exit beyond its individuality and at the level of theoretical awareness the possibilities for cognition are unlimited. Thus, the purpose of ability is the transformation of initial content for psychical reflection into the thinnest differentiated multidimensional images by executive organs of psychics – motility and sensorics. What may become a tool for integration of psychological knowledge into a certain integrity that reflects the essence of acting human – ability to creativity?

One may consider that such integrative tool, psychical instrument is the total psychic apparatus (psychical mechanism), which is established and called to life by purposeful genetic modeling learning.

On this basis, a psychical mechanism is a new formation that provides with the action and cognition due to action at the same time. A human learns, acting, and learning – acts, solving practically unlimited (in perspective) circle of tasks.

§6. Some perspectives

Psychological laws for management of personality development

The initial idea, at least in the nearest perspective for development of genetic psychology, may serve the idea to learn the psychological laws for management of personality development along the whole life.

According to abovementioned idea it is reasonable to distinguish the following stages: pre-school childhood, institutionalized forms of study, post-learning phase of its life activity. The problems of age

peculiarities, creativity, self-management and self-control are opened ones.

Periodization of psychical development in ontogenesis

Paradoxically but in these latter days modern researches almost did not pay attention namely to the essential basis of age periodization. The periodization, still accepted in psychology (Vygotsky-Elkonin) is built due to criterion of leading activity (subjective manipulative, game, learning activity, communication, etc.). At the same time the researches in recent years give grounds to consider that the principle, which brings forward the leading activity, has a little been absolutized, and that some kinds of activity left behind its limits, which perhaps occupied the place of leading ones (in the structure of learning activity – sports, arts, music, games, etc.) – but may leave as just significant activities, defining the orientation of personality activity. The researchers also did not pay attention to such sphere of personality activity as recreational one.

The problem on development of psychology of pre-school childhood taking into consideration the national peculiarities, family surrounding, virtual influences of culture, social and economical changes that cause to changes in public and individual awareness, as well as to changes in values, is rather urgent.

It is time to study the highest psychic functions: thinking, memory, imagination and their interrelation with age psychophysiological correlates. It is time to determine what kind of surrounding and hygienic norms shall be and which social and social pedagogical influences (system of learning or education) are necessary to preserve and to develop a healthy child. Hence there arises the task of diagnostics: structure of child's personality, its orientation as a source and driving force of activity (needs, interests, world outlook appearances, sprouts of convictions), potential for abilities of the intellect and heart, genetic components of character and cultural systems of self-regulation.

The most important problem at the stage of school childhood is the psychology of learning, in particular institutionalized learning in the system of different educational establishment as namely learning acts as the social form for management of development.

The most important problems at the post-learning stage of human vital activity are the following ones: psychology of maturity – period of labor professional activity; psychology of “proper time” (pension one) – period after labor adaptation of personality to the new, personally otherwise saturate ways of being, etc.

Thus, the genetic psychology in our understanding is a principally independent branch in the system of psychological disciplines. The branch, which is the basis for dialectic unity of subjects and motives that form one open-ended perspective for learning and designing different aspects, stages and laws for human and personal (active) being.

Mechanisms of human psychics

Mechanism is a tool, device at human, thanks to which its organs and systems are united into integrity to transfer and to transform the energy and information during the processes of its activity.

I.M. Sechenov in 1878 cast the important role to concept “mechanism” in psychology and stated: the thought about machine character of the brain’s work – a treasure for naturalist. And O.O. Ukhtomskyy concretized this thought: a human is not a single uniform mechanism and is not a monotonous machine but is a set of machines and mechanisms, which kaleidoscopically change each other depending on working conditions at each certain moment.

On this basis it is possible to define the composition of mechanisms for human psychics, namely:

Reflection – designing – dementalisation.

Psychical reflection is characterized by the system of function as a regulator for human activity.

Firstly, the psychical reflection has the active character, related to search and choice of adequate conditions for environment of ways for actions.

Secondly, the psychical reflection has the leading character, provides with the function for anticipation in activity and behavior.

Thirdly, each psychical act is the result from act of the objective through subjective reflection, through human individuality that leaves the mark of originality on psychical life.

Fourthly, the psychical reflection in the process of activity is constantly deepened, improved and developed.

Designing. The main function of designing is the ordering and harmonization of contents of reflection according to the purpose of actions or human activity.

Designing process is the totality and succession of mental or psychomotor actions, as a result of which the images, schemes or sign systems are formed – theories of construction of material subjects or actions of machines, facilities, their units, as well as own actions that lead to solution of theoretical or practical tasks.

And a human has the possibility to construct, to build and to consider the subjects and phenomena from elements of the known and the conscious – within potential realizability.

Dementalisation. Dementalisation is an element in conscious and reasonable activity of human. This activity has three main forms:

- 1) material: production, physical work, etc., work, through which a human transforms and embeds himself into environment;
- 2) psychical – psychical – production and interpretation of content of reflection, selection of values, mental operations and feelings, etc., which act as the constructive elements in any production;
- 3) creation of oneself – development of soulful and spiritual potencies, as well as to remove different forms of estrangements.

Thus, the dementalisation is the process from transformation and embodiment of human soulful forces and abilities from the form of living activity into the image of frozen subjectivity. Thanks to this process, a subject, made by human, becomes a human subject. Not in vain Protagoras assured: The measure of all things – human. And that, being formed by a human then, V.I. Vernadsky will call the noosphere – a sphere of human intellect.

The psychical life of human is a complex phenomenon and has many forms of its existence. Psychical phenomena are original feelings, subjected images of reflected (realized and non-realized)

phenomena of actual reality; it is the inward world of human in its whole completeness and variety.

Psychical life of human is shown:

1. In activity that exists subjectively, internally;
2. In activity that is displayed in attitude to environment;
3. In activity that is displayed, embeds the reflected and the transformed (image, thought or feeling) outside – subject or phenomenon.

The activity of human that exists subjectively includes its reflective activity – feelings, perception, memory, thinking, imagination.

The activity, which is shown in attitude to environment, is found in the form of emotional-volitional activity, different senses, feelings, as well as display of will – volitional qualities. The important aspect in psychical life is the incentives to activity – needs, interests, persuasions, *grafts*, etc.

The special group of psychical phenomena is individual psychological properties of personality – abilities, temperament, character and mental states – restlessness, depression, anxiety, indifference, etc.

The meaning of psychics in the life and activity of human is exclusively important.

The knowledge about nature of psychical phenomena and their laws has the great importance for management of personality psychical development and its activity.

Psychics and awareness

In the process of evolution of living beings the psychics as a reflection of objective reality was developing depending on living conditions of some or other species of living beings, acquired more complex forms. The highest level of its development is human awareness.

The psychology explains the origin by social way of human being and labor activity that caused to development. The structure of

human behavior has substantially changed with transition to social forms of life.

Along with biological motives, which depended on direct perception of environment, there appeared higher “spiritual” motives and needs, highest forms of behavior, which are principally stipulated by ability to abstract from direct influences of environment.

Together with two sources for behavior – hereditary fixed program and own experience of individual itself – there appeared the third source that forms the human activity – transfer and adoption of social experience.

The language that became the form for existence of awareness was one of the determinant factors in satisfaction of this important social need.

The characteristic structural components of awareness are:

- 1) knowledge about surrounding reality, nature, society. The level of awareness is in direct dependence on the level of mastering the knowledge and experience of personality. The need in knowledge, which is the main incentive, motive of cognitive activity, was developed in human in the process of social historical development;
- 2) human individualization of itself in subjective world as a subject of cognition, distinction of subject – “Ego” and object – “Non Ego”, opposition of itself as a personality in other objective world. The characteristic feature for this self-cognition that became the grounds for self-awareness, i.e. understanding own physical and moral psychological qualities;
- 3) purposefulness, planning own activity and behavior, anticipation of its results. This side of awareness is found in self-control and correction of own actions, in their reconstruction, in content of strategy and tactics if the circumstances require it;
- 4) attitude to objective reality, to other people, it itself. The attitude of personality to its surrounding is shown in its assessment and self-criticism, where the emotional-volitional sphere plays the important role.

The individualization and human opposition of itself to subjects – world, nature and social phenomena and to itself – are the principal functions of human self-education.

Thanks to awareness and self-awareness a human becomes a subject of education, i.e. it itself puts the educational purposes and achieves them.

Human awareness is characterized by activity. During reflection of reality the information that is received by human is not mechanically reflected but is consciously processed according to the purpose, task and its experience.

The level of development and manifestation of awareness at human depends of accumulated knowledge and produced world outlook, its ideological and moral beliefs, attitude to other people and itself.

Human self-awareness is the understanding of yourself, your attitude to the nature and other people, your actions and deeds, your thoughts, feelings and different psychical qualities using language. The development of human self-awareness is shown in:

- 1) introspection,
- 2) critical attitude to yourself;
- 3) assessment of your positive and negative qualities,
- 4) self-control and
- 5) responsibility to society for your actions.

A human is also characterized by unconscious forms of psychical activity (instinctive and automatic actions, inclinations, etc.). But the unconscious is included into the conscious and thanks to this; it may be controlled by human.

Studying the forms for psychical activity, it is necessary to remember that the psychical life, awareness and human activity always arise in their unity. This unity is shown in purposeful activity of human, in its attitude to others and itself, in its different cognitive, emotional and volitional reactions.

A human interacts with environment as an integral organism. The integrity of interaction is provided first of all by the highest section of central nervous system – cerebral cortex, which integrates (unites) all activity in itself and manages it.

Concept of personality in psychology

The psychological phenomena of human in fact do not exist apart and separately. They in their totality form the unique and unrepeated pattern – psychological integrity (interfunctional psychological system). Only understanding the structural dynamic laws for this integrity may disclose to us how both understanding its components (psychological functions) and realizing the sense for existence of human and ways for optimization of this existence. This integrity and indissoluble unity of human psychics is that one that forms the personality.

Personality is the form for existence of human psychics, which is the integrity, capable of self-development, self-determination, conscious subjective activity and self-regulation, and has its unique and unrepeated inward world.

L.I. Bozhovych defines personality as “such level of human development, which allows it managing both the circumstances of own life and itself”. [38, 228]. Different approaches obligatorily define the quality of self-regulation and self-development as a fundamental feature for personality.

Let's comment our definition. It underlines the main thing: nature of human psychics is personal. As it is known to us, the highest level in development of being, allotted with reflection and thus is capable to reflect all other being and itself, is embedded and becomes a real way for existence of a certain human. The reverse statement can also be made: a human life in the world is the real way (form) for existence of the highest psychics. We find in the world no other forms for existence of the highest level of psychics, except personality. Of course, we may tell that subjects and phenomena of culture is another, especially transformed way for its existence. It is true but they are the embodiment of personality. Dementalisation, i.e. the additional transformations of psychological (ideal) into the subjective (material) are made by personalities, leaving in the subject, engraving the whole unique originality namely of that personality – author – in it.

The personhood in the nature of human psychics means, on the one part, that any certain psychological process acquires a very complex

structure. It has its own laws and qualities but at the same time it reflects the whole integrity of personality. Thus, when a psychical phenomenon (thinking, emotions, memory, etc.) is studied individually, only special and artificial abstraction allows a researcher making the conclusions about it in so-called “pure” form. In fact it is always – thinking of this concrete human, its emotions or any other phenomena. This influence of integrity (its designing) on a certain phenomenon is something “small”, outside. But if we speak about thinking, in fact its indices are defined by nothing less than only peculiarities, strictly speaking, intellectual spheres: motives of activity, purposes, values, inclinations, stable and temporary emotional states, even somatic health – all that in totality defines the operation of any psychical function. Taking this provision into consideration in the sphere of practical psychology is especially important.

Development and education of personality

The problem on development and education of personality is one of the most urgent social aspects in public life and always requires the deep scientific grounding the psychological essence of factors for this process.

The psychological theories may distinguish two directions, which consider the sources for psychical development of human in a different way – they are the biological and social directions.

Biogenetical concept for development. This concept thinks that the heredity that defines ahead all peculiarities for development of personality is the leading one in development of human. American scientist E. Thorndike states, for example, that spiritual qualities of personality, awareness are such natural blessings as out eyes, ears, fingers and other organs of our body. All those ones are hereditarily passed to human and are mechanically embedded into it after its fetation and birth. American teacher John Dewey thinks that a human is born even with ready moral qualities, feelings, spiritual needs.

The representatives of theory, known as “biogenetical law” (St. Hall, Gentchison, et al.), think that a human, being born, gradually recreates in its development all stages for historical development of

human: period of cattle breeding, grain production period, commercial industrial period. Only after that it joins to modern life.

Passing through a certain period, a human lives the life of that historical period. It is shown in its inclinations, interests, aspirations and actions.

Adherents of theory “of biogenetical law” defended the free education of children, as, in their opinion, only due to such education they can develop to the utmost and join to life of the society, where they live.

Sociogenetical concept for development. According to sociogenetical theories, the human development is defined by social conditions: in which environment a child was born and is educated, in that direction its development is occurred. The representatives of such direction as genetics underestimated the inner activity of personality as a conscious subject of activity, its inborn peculiarities.

At the beginning of XX century the methodological concept for development of personality has appeared. The pedology followed to the theory of two factors for development: biological or hereditary, and social, considering that these two factors are converged, i.e. interactions do not always found the proper grounds in the theory, leaving to a certain extent the question about driving forces for psychical development to be open.

The theory on psychical development of personality in national psychology is based on acknowledgment of the fact that driving forces for development are found in contradictions between the needs that are constantly changed (complicated) in activity of human and real (such ones that do not correspond to the new requirements) possibilities for their satisfaction.

Overcoming the contradictions in activity through mastering the corresponding ways for its fulfillment (abilities, ways, means, knowledge) leads to development and constitutes its essence. The leading role in mastering the new efficient ways for satisfaction of the needs belongs to learning and education. Selection, development and cultivation of the needs that have the public and personal value are one of the central tasks for formation of personality. This long process occurs during the whole conscious life of human and is characterized by some peculiarities.

Each age stage in development of personality (pre-school, primary school, secondary school and senior school) has its own anatomical physiological and psychological peculiarities and possibilities. The educational work in public nursery, kindergarten and school is planned and carried out according to those peculiarities.

The succession in learning and education plays the significant important role in formation of personality. Being based on the things, achieved by a child in its development at previous stage, public nursery, kindergarten and school train a child to master the public experience and knowledge at the next stage of learning and education.

Kindergarten trains a child for learning at school and the secondary school – for learning at higher school, work.

Age peculiarities for development are not something stable, static within the limits of the age that is mechanically changed for peculiarities, inherent to the next stage of development.

The development of personality is a complex process, in which the levels of development are constantly changed.

The development of cognitive psychical processes, emotions, feelings and will, needs, interests, ideals and beliefs, awareness and self-awareness, abilities, temperament and character, skills, knowledge and habits are in the complex stage-to-stage interaction.

The highest levels are generated at previous stages of development but the peculiarities for previous age stages are found at the following stages. It is necessary to know the age peculiarities for physical and spiritual development of a child in order to assist to timely generation and successful development of the whole progressive and the new at all stages of its formation as personality.

While directing the human development, it is necessary to understand that the peculiarities, inherent to a certain age, do not always coincide with the passport age of a child. There are children, who outgrow or go behind their age.

In some cases it is stipulated by inborn anatomical physiological peculiarities of organism but mainly the reason for this is the public conditions for life and education of child, which assist to development or slow it down. The tasks of school and teacher are to

find these reasons or to reinforce that one, which assists to successful development and to remove everything that negatively influences on education of a child's personality.

The child's inheritance of adults plays the important role in formation of personality. Children inherit both the positive and the negative as they still lack of experience and there is no critical attitude to actions, deeds of adults. The inheritance is especially vividly shown in children of pre-school age.

The children of that age do not show their own independence in attitude to deeds, behavior, thoughts, statements of adults and mechanically repeat them with development of personality in juvenile and pre-adult age, with growth of mental development and independence the children critically assess the deeds and behavior of adults, borrow the best, object and reject the worst.

But in the old age they can adopt the negative from adults, until the positive experience of surrounding reality becomes the dominating one in their life and the moral ethic attitude to deeds of other people and self-control is formed.

Pre-school age is the period for training of a child for learning at school and elementary self-service. During this period of life the significant changes in anatomical physiological and spiritual development of a child take place, thanks to which it becomes capable to study at school, to master knowledge, norms for moral behavior and to perform feasible public useful labor errands.

It is assisted by the fact that children already in pre-school age achieve the significant development of language and speech and at its grounds – ability to think and to make the logical conclusions under supervision of adults.

The important aspect in development of preschool children is their aspiration for knowledge, mastery of the first norms for behavior in collective, ability independently to perform easy errands by adults, to serve themselves, to help to others, to direct their actions not only to directly accepted but notional subjects and situations.

Although the emotions in preschool age are still unsettled, will is weak, the suggestibility prevails, under properly organized conditions preschool children show the persistence and attentiveness during

performance of interesting work, are capable to perform the simplest labor errands.

The life and activity of children from primary school age are stipulated by their learning activity. The psychical processes – perception and power of observation, memory and attention, imagination – are successfully developed at them during learning process, acquiring the purposeful, voluntary character.

Primary school age. Children have the possibility deeper to comprehend and can analyze the language and thinking: a word is realized as a part of speech, expressed judgments – as sentences, the parts of the sentence are realized.

It assists to extension in judgments and reflections, formation of logical conclusions, mastery of abstract mathematical and grammatical material, formation of speech culture.

Junior schoolchildren master the rules for behavior in collective, consider their deeds and behavior not only from their own positions but from positions of collective, critically assess the behavior of fellows, become demanding to them. Such qualities as self-control, persistence, purposefulness, self-possession, discipline are developed in junior schoolchildren.

The ability to manage the own behavior, to subordinate it to school tasks is formed on these basics. Junior schoolchildren successfully join to labor activity; realize their social content and meaning.

Secondary school or juvenile age attracts the attention to itself with its anatomical physiological changes in organism of a child, especially with pubescence. These changes significantly influence on psychical development of a teenager's personality, on its cognitive activity and behavior, on relations in the collective.

The cognitive activity and mental development are increased at teenagers, the curiosity, aspiration to know the unknown, to look into the future are grown. The Pupils of secondary school age noticeably show the aspiration for independence.

But this aspiration at incorrect education may be shown in distorted forms – negative attitude to errands, advice of teachers and parents, unmotivated deeds and bravado in violations of rules for behavior. It takes place when a teenager does not join to the life of

the collective, does not perform public useful errands, does not see and does not experience the result from its activity and teachers and parents do not enforce him to it, do not take into consideration the age peculiarities in its development.

The suggestibility is notably decreases at teenager and the will gets stronger, the interest to labor activity is increased, the relations in the collective are changed and moral feelings, aesthetic senses become more stable. The ideological direction, world outlook and self-awareness of personality are intensively formed in the senior juvenile age. The activity becomes more purposeful and socially motivated.

The new in relations between boys and girls is of special attention: the sexual division, the specific in friendship, interests and behavior of boys and girls are defined clearer; the intimate relations between boys and girls are generated. These peculiarities for juvenile period of development require the great attention to organization of group and learning activity of teenagers, friendship and comradeship and especially sexual education.

Senior school or junior pre-adult age is the period for extension in mental and moral development of personality. Self-knowledge and self-criticism, which at wrong education may acquire the negative features of self-confidence, self-adoration or uncertainty, lack of faith in your own strengths, become in the center of younger persons.

The cognitive interests, disposition to be engaged into a certain scientific activity, kind of sports are clearly distinguished in this age, the professional inclinations are defined. But these peculiarities are not always deep and stable if they are not directed and are not consolidated by school, teachers, experienced seniors.

Junior pre-adult age is the period for formation of stable friendship and comradeship, in particular between boys and girls, establishment of volitional qualities, features of character, and efficient application of mastered moral political positions.

The orientation to aspiration together with the collective to realize own plans, inherent to senior school age, is the important factor for moral and mental formation of personality during this period.

The whole structure of social life, achievements of science and technology, wealth of information, received from films, radio, television, books and newspapers, influence on development of personality. Therefore, do not restrict only by school means of learning and education of growing generation.

During recent decades we observe speeding up or acceleration of physical and mental development at children. The researches proved that the maturity comes by 2-3 years earlier that it used to come at the beginning of last century. And accordingly the pubescence starts earlier.

At the same time we see the discrepancy between mental development and inability to control you that causes to violation in norms of social behavior. The acceleration in development of personality requires the significant reconstruction of academic educational process in content, means, and organization of children's life.

The activity and behavior of human depend not only on age but its individual peculiarities.

Individual peculiarities of personality. The peculiarities of human may be inborn and acquired during life due to their nature and origin. The inborn ones include physical peculiarities, with which a child is born. Among them the important role is played by typological peculiarities of nervous system – strength, steadiness and liveliness that are the physiological grounds for temperament.

The inborn individual peculiarities in the process of education are changed under influence of living conditions. Among individual peculiarities, acquired in the process of learning, education and activity, the most important ones are the orientation of personality, its interests, capabilities, ideals and beliefs, features of character, individual peculiarities, inborn and acquired during life, are changed under influence of education but most of them have the stable character and thus they influence on activity and behavior of personality.

The successful management for formation of personality requires the perfect knowledge about psychological peculiarities for development of child and its use in practice of academic educational work.

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT, STUDY AND EDUCATION

The works by many national psychologists [Ananyev, 1968, Vygotsky, 1991, Davydov, 1996, Kostyuk, 1989, Leontyev, 1984, Luria, 1974] paid much attention to conditions for development of psychology and solution of key theoretical and practical tasks, set for this science at corresponding stages of its development. However, many questions remain unclear not only due to the fact that the theory may be understood in a different way, sometimes quite otherwise than its author thinks. It happens first of all due to absence of grounds that would allow a modern psychologist full satisfying his/her legal need regularly to check the maturity of his/her research through the prism of the past.

The study on establishment of the main forms for psychical activity in phylo- and ontogenesis is a classical problem for psychology. Many scientists, starting from J. Lock and T. Gobbs, who outlined the main approaches to issues about gradual (stage-by-stage) development of human abilities and properties, and finishing with classical works for modern psychology by J. Bruner, A.R. Luria, J. Piaget and B. Inelder, made the contribution into its solution. The subjective field of genetic psychology continues remaining wide and heterogeneous, first of all due to insufficient methodological reflection of content in this sphere of scientific knowledge.

The guarantee for objective and at the same time universal approach to assessment of different theories, as we believe, provides with the possibility for full, impartial reproduction for logic of thinking by some or another researcher, which start is the skill to distinguish the subject of the science itself.

The subject of the science is the key to philosophical credo of researcher and realization of empirical fact.

The purpose of genetic psychology of personality is to study the conditions, under which the process for transformation of content and forms for specific psychical phenomena, state of consciousness and ways for action will be able to achieve such level in perfection of

psychical mechanisms for activity, at which there arises the ability to make discoveries or inventions, to create artistic images. In other words, the purpose is to seek for laws of genesis from initial content of undifferentiated human sensitivity to mechanisms of creativity.

Genetic ideas, ideas of generation, appearance and next process of operation that leads a subject or phenomenon to a certain state were in the center of attention already of ancient philosophers, who were thinking about issues of appearance, establishment and development of the whole existing things. The genetic method for scientific knowledge was established after long research of developmental processes long before construction of theory of genesis.

The genetic method of research anticipates the analysis on some initial state of subject or phenomenon and forming up the next formation from this knowledge. Historically this method appeared as a result from statement of idea about development in science (starting since XVII century): in Mathematics – differential calculus, in geology – Lyell's theory, in cosmogony – Cant-Laplace's hypothesis, in biology – Ch. Darwin's theory.

The main purpose of genetic research is to disclose the relations of phenomena, being researched in time, and study of transitions from less developed to the highest forms for existence and operation of subjects and phenomena.

In Hegel's philosophy the genetic method underlies the phenomenological analysis of consciousness that aims to show the historical metamorphoses of forms for consciousness, to disclose the establishment of science as a way to receive scientific knowledge. The penetration of genetic analysis into the sciences that study the developmental processes, led to approval of genetic method as a special method for cognition and appearance of special fields of knowledge: theory of evolution, origin of species, genetic sociology, genetic epistemology, genetics of behavior, etc.

We can certify certain stability in general orientation of evolution of theoretical views in psychology that more and more often try to introduce the results from research on genesis of psychics, consciousness and activity into their theories. The child psychology

attracted the attention to itself at the same time with many sections of psychology that started intensively developing at the end of XIX – beginning of XX century. The jerk in this sphere was made by Ch. Darwin, when he published his book “Biographical sketch of one child”, in which he provided the thorough observations over processes for psychical development. The following works enjoyed the most popularity at that time: V. Prayer “Soul of child” and V. Stern “Psychology of early childhood”. Further the application of genetic method in psychology relates to the names of D. Baldwin, K. Gross, Carl and Charlotte Buler, A. Bine, A. Walloon, E. Klapared, R. Zazzo, J. Piaget, et al.

The genetic method in research of problems in child psychology was widely used in pre-revolutionary Russia by K.D. Ushynskyy, P.F. Kapterev, V.V. Zenkovskyy, A.F. Lazurskyy, I.A. Sikorskyy. P.P. Blonskyy, L.S. Vygotskyy, A.V. Zaporozhets, G.S. Kostyuk, A.N. Leontyev, S.L. Rubinstein et al made their contribution into understanding the laws for development of child’s psychics and hereby into general psychology.

Hereby it is not necessary to think that the use of genetic method in psychological research alone immediately refers its author and its works to genetic psychology. The genetic method, applied in own conceptual content in mentioned field of psychology, is the way to study its subject, based on analysis of its formation and establishment until full value functioning.

The subject of genetic psychology of personality contains:

- a) reality, with which a researcher will work;
- b) task or system of tasks, which is necessary to solve;
- c) different scientific descriptions that contain the reflections of this reality;
- d) research facilities – available or the ones, which should be created;
- e) mentioned requirements to product of research are the result from application of facilities and content of task;
- f) product of research – elements in theory of subject and technological recommendations for its further study.

So, unlike so-called non-specific application of genetic method, the genetic psychology has its own subject of research, in which along with many other psychical processes, phenomena and specific formations – mechanisms of psychics, there are the processes for generation, formation and further dynamics in functioning of psychical phenomena.

By the way, the definition “genetic” in wide content shall contain the evolutionary and historical aspects of psychology. Coincidentally, the concept “genetic psychology” in our literature usually covers only those researches that relate to development of child.

At the same time, perhaps, it is not sudden that in the journal “Psychological Abstract” there is the heading “Genetic psychology”, which contains the following sections: 1. Period of infant. 2. Childhood (learning, abilities, personality, relations between children and parents). 3. Juvenile age. 4. Age of maturity. 5. Gerontology.

The realization of genetic principle in psychological researches opens the meaningful perspectives for further deeper understanding one of the central problems in pedagogical psychology – problem on interrelations in psychical development and study. This issue has very deep historical roots, and besides it belongs to those ones that make the impression of quite vivid, even common ones.

Indeed, who will object that the development of child’s psychics occurs within the context of social surrounding and to much extent depends on the one, who surrounds a child, which knowledge and ways of actions are acquired by it, with whom it emotionally identifies itself. Both philosophers and famous teachers in the past saw this unity of development and study, considering the latter one in very wide meaning as a special involvement of child into cultural historical acquisition of the mankind through such processes as socialization, education and learning in its narrow understanding (it means own, organized, special activity of institute of adults as to provision with mastery of certain knowledge and skills by a child).

Undoubtedly, the psychical development of child is mediated by public influences, and S.L. Rubinstein was absolutely right when he mentioned that study and education is the form for development of personality [Rubinstein, 2003]. However it is only very general

solution of the problem, rather even not the solution but the view on it. Meaningful, exclusively psychological mechanisms, which to a certain extent unite these two processes (genesis of psychical structures and study), remains to be uninvestigated.

Now we can tell only about some theoretical approaches to their explanation, although, unfortunately, they all have the character of “free” generalizations and very weak base of empirical facts.

In one, rather old work, V.V. Davydov and A.K. Markov rather properly distinguish three different theoretical interpretations for ratio of study and psychical development [Davydov, 1978]. The development in the first group of theories is considered as fully independent process, which has its own laws that do not depend on study and education.

The latter ones influence only on exclusively external peculiarities for genesis of psychics, somewhat delaying or, on the contrary, accelerating the periods for appearance of its natural stages, not changing their succession and psychological peculiarities. In particular, they do not define the structures of the main forms for mental activity of human. These opinions were expressed and defended by such famous psychologists as U. James and J. Piaget.

The second group of theories considers the development as a particular consequence from some interaction of different factors that influence on child (natural-hereditary, social and educational). Study and education change and regulate the relations between neuropsychic functions, states and properties of personality, manage numerous correlative dependences, each of which exists pursuant to its own laws. The knowledge about these internal conditions is necessary for optimization of learning educational influences (B.G. Ananyev et al).

The third theoretical view is based on the fact that “development of individual is the process that has cultural historical social nature, – its stages and their psychological peculiarities are finally defined by system of organization and the way for transfer of public experience to individual” [Vygotsky, 1991]. In such interpretation of the question it is understandable that study and learning are the

internally necessary and determinant form for development of psychics. This opinion is central one in cultural historical theory of development of psychics (L.S. Vygotsky).

The abovementioned opinions concretize something but do not describe the complex psychological interactions between study and development.

It seems to us that it was G.S. Kostiuk, who came the nearest to understanding these relations in his concept of “relationship-connection” of study and development, which we will consider in more details later.

Theory of higher nervous activity by I.P. Pavlov

During last two centuries the development of psychology was closely connected with achievements of philosophical thought and successes in natural sciences.

The materialistic interpretation of nature and essence of psychological phenomena was stipulated by appearance of philosophy of dialectical materialism and development of study about nature of psychics (I.M. Sechenov, I.P. Pavlov).

The reflexive activity of human is stipulated by reflectory activity of the brain. The founder of study about reflectory nature of psychics was famous Russian physiologist I.M. Sechenov (1829-1905). In his works he mentioned that the source for psychological acts as a reflection of activity is the external irritants that influence on organism. This activity appears during interaction of individual with the surrounding world that is carried out thanks to reflectory activity of the brain.

In his work “Reflexes of the brain”, which was published in 1863, I.M. Sechenov wrote that “all acts of the conscious and the unconscious life due to the way of its appearance (origin) are reflexes”, that the psychological activity is impossible without external sensory irritation.

The study by I.M. Sechenov about reflectory nature of psychics [269] was further extended by I.P. Pavlov (1849-1936) in his theory of higher nervous activity [222]. The theory of reflectory activity is based on three main principles for scientific research:

- a) principle for determinism, i.e. impulse, reason for any action, its effect;
- b) principle for analysis and synthesis, i.e. division of the whole into parts and then creation of the new whole from elements of the old;
- c) principle for structure and adaptation of dynamics to structure.

The main moment in study about higher nervous activity is the understanding of unity of organism and environment. In organism “everything is from the external world”. The nervous system carries out the connection of organism with its environment.

As I.P. Pavlov mentions, it is the system of relations, connections. The behavior of organism is defined by those conditions and environment, in which a living being acts.

The researches proved that play the leading role in activity of the whole organism. The cortex of large cerebral hemispheres, providing the needs of organism, together with subcortical nervous centers, being the nearest to the cortex, performs the complex analytical synthetic activity. It creates the complex temporary nervous connections, using which the regulation of relations between organism and external environment is carried out, as well as the regulation of activity of the organism itself.

This activity of large hemispheres is called by I.P. Pavlov as higher nervous activity and he underlines that the behavior of living organism is a certain system of reactions or reflexes on irritants of external and internal environment.

Reflex is the response of organism for irritation, which is carried out using nervous system. The reflectory activity is the main form for activity of nervous system. There are two kinds of reflexes: unconditioned, with which a being is born, and conditioned, which are produced in it after birth, during the life.

Unconditioned reflexes were produced and fixed during the long period for biological development of living beings. They are required by animal since the first days of life for its existence. Unconditioned reflexes provide the organism with the search for food, avoidance of harmful influences, etc.

Unconditioned reflexes are caused by unconditioned irritations, i.e. such irritations, which, influencing on the corresponding receptors – taste, tactile, etc. – cause to corresponding reactions of organism. Unconditioned reflexes do not disappear and act during the whole time providing that the organism is normal, healthy. The complex system of unconditioned reflexes is the activity, which is called instinctive.

Unconditioned reflexes cannot satisfy the needs of higher organisms that live under difficult conditions. Unconditioned reflexes could provide the needs of organisms only due to absolute stability of external environment. But as the external environment is constantly changed, then it is impossible to adapt to it using only unconditioned reflexes.

It is necessary to add them with temporary connections, which are built up in animals and human during life.

The main principle for operation of large hemispheres, as I.P. Pavlov proved – is the formation of temporary nervous connections or conditioned reflexes. During his researches he noticed that the reflexes appear at animals under certain conditions and if unconditioned irritants are absent, for example, sometimes the saliva starts extracting at dog when there appears a human, who feeds it, although the dog is not given with the food at that time.

Reflexes that appear under influence of irritants are called conditioned reflexes. When two irritants act on the animal at the same time – one unconditioned, for example, food, and the other conditioned, which does not cause to reflex on its own, for example, bell, two irritations appear in the brain – from food and from bell.

As they act at the same time, the short circuits occur between irritated nervous centers, i.e. the nervous connection is established. As a result from this connection the conditioned irritant causes to the same reflectory reaction as unconditioned one. It is a conditioned reflex.

The reflexes are changed with the change in living conditions. They disappear, i.e. are slowed down if the conditioned irritant is not supported by unconditioned one, and are renewed if a conditioned irritant is again supported by unconditioned one.

Conditioned reflectory activity of human is extremely complex, diverse and refined system of connections. The new nervous connections are formed not only on the basis of unconditioned ones but on the basis of already existing, earlier formed conditioned connections, which acquired the corresponding power and stability. The factors, necessary for formation of conditioned reflexes are the optimal force of irritation, activity of cortex of large cerebral hemispheres and support of conditioned irritants with unconditioned ones. Such support in study is the interest to knowledge, curiosity, surprise in novelty of phenomena.

The main processes of nervous activity are the excitation and inhibition. A great number of different irritants influence on the cortex of large hemispheres at the same time but we response not to all irritants that came to the cortex. The organism does not response to a significant part of irritants as the excitations, caused by them, are inhibited.

The prohibition occurs at the same time with excitation. Thanks to inhibition of some sections of the cortex the excitation is oriented in some one direction and is focused in a concrete point of the cortex. Under certain conditions excitation and prohibition spread, irradiate along the cortex of large hemispheres, causing to excitation or prohibition of other sections of the cortex, or again are focused, concentrated at the point of their appearance.

Thanks to irradiation of excitations different associations appear in the consciousness – images, thoughts, feelings that reinforce or slow down the activity, performed by human.

When excitation is concentrated in a certain section of the cortex, its other sections are slowed down at that time. The spread or focus of excitation and prohibition is carried out pursuant to the law of irradiation and concentration of nervous processes. Excitation and prohibition interact between each other. Excitation of certain sections of the cortex of the large hemispheres stipulates the prohibition of other sections of the cortex of large hemispheres, and, on the contrary, the prohibition of some sections of the cortex causes to excitation in its other points. Such phenomenon occurs due to the law of mutual induction of excitation and prohibition.

Positive and negative inductions are distinguished. Under conditions of positive induction the prohibition of a certain section of the cortex causes to excitation of its other sections. The activity of organism in such cases occurs in the direction of that excitation, the attention to the content of activity is increased. The negative induction the excitation of a certain section of the cortex causes to prohibition of those sections, which used to be active before.

The negative induction occurs at attention distraction from the main activity and concentration on sudden irritations, which prohibit excitation, caused by the main irritation.

Prohibition of nervous processes can be unconditioned, or external, and conditioned, or internal. The external prohibition occurs as a result from influence of the strong outside irritant. Produced conditioned reflex, for example, secretion of saliva as a response to light striking, is suspended if a strong sound will be activated at the same time.

The external prohibition is the evidence for action of negative induction. It is shown in the form of out-of-limit prohibition, which appears when the force of excitation exceeds the possibility for working capacity of the nervous cell.

The enhancement of irritant in such cases does not cause to increase in reaction force but, on the contrary, the reaction force is decreased or almost slowed down.

Inhibitory processes that appear in the cell as a result from its overtension protect it against destruction. Thus, such prohibition is also called the protective prohibition.

The internal prohibition is also stipulated by external circumstances. One from manifestations of conditioned or internal prohibition is weakening the temporary connections. It occurs when a conditioned irritant (for example, light), for which a conditioned reflex is produced, is not regularly supported by unconditioned irritant (for example, food). The established connection in such case is prohibited and the reflex disappears.

If a conditioned irritant is again supported by unconditioned one, then the prohibited temporary nervous connection is easily renewed

and a conditioned irritant again causes to a conditioned reflex. The prohibition of temporary nervous connections causes to obliviscence.

The important manifestation of internal prohibition is the differential prohibition. If we support only those conditioned irritants, for which a conditioned reflex was produced, with unconditioned irritant, then after that a conditioned reflex appears in response for those conditioned irritants, which were supported with unconditioned ones. The excitations from other, not supported irritations are prohibited, and the conditioned reflex for them does not appear.

Thus, if a conditioned reflex is produced for sound, and then the sound only of a certain pitch or intensity is supported, the conditioned reflex will appear only for the sound with the pitch or intensity, which was supported. The differentiation of irritations takes place.

The organism precisely distinguishes the efficient, i.e. supported irritants, from inefficient, i.e. unsupported ones with unconditioned irritant. The researches found out that a dog, for example, may differentiate the sound irritants with precision of up to $1/8$ of tone. The differential prohibition assists to specification and distinction of irritants, justified and unjustified by vital experience.

It is vividly shown in learning educational activity. The distinction, specification and mastery of knowledge or acts of behavior can be efficient only when significant properties in them are supported by a certain manner and insignificant ones are prohibited.

Along with closing function the large cerebral hemispheres also perform the analytical synthetic functions.

Interacting with the surrounding world, the organism responses not to all irritations that come to the brain but only to those ones that serve to satisfaction of its needs. Distinguishing the irritants, the brain responses to some of them and does not response to the others. The analysis on subjects of external world is carried out by such a way.

The simplest analysis is carried out by lower sections of the central nervous system. The higher analysis, which is principal for acts of behavior, is performed in the cortex of large cerebral hemispheres. The essence in operation of the cortex is the analysis and synthesis of irritations in the cortex.

The analytical activity takes place, using special mechanisms – analyzers. They were developed during biological development of animals as a result from their adaptation to the conditions of existence, diverse kinds of energy in the external world that influenced on organism – light, sound, chemical, mechanical, heat, etc.

The large hemispheres are the huge analyzer both of external and internal world of organism. Analyzers perform their activity in connection with prohibitory processes that occur in the cortex of large hemispheres. Some irritations or complexes of irritations that penetrate into the cortex of large hemispheres, are separated, i.e. cause to irritations there, the animal reacts, responses to them. Other irritations are prohibited and the animal does not response to them.

Thus, the process of analysis has its own backgrounds, on the one part, in analyzing ability of our receptors, peripheral endings, and on the other part, – in prohibitory processes, which is developed in the cortex of large cerebral hemispheres and differentiate the one that does not correspond to reality and the one that corresponds to it. The process of inhibition assists to correction of analytical activity of large cerebral hemispheres.

Along with the analysis large cerebral hemispheres perform the synthetic activity, which essence is in closing the nervous connections. The synthetic activity of large hemispheres may be very complex.

The whole chains and systems of temporary connections are formed. The processes, which are called as associations in psychology, are nothing but formations of temporary connections, i.e. they are the acts of synthesis. As I.P. Pavlov mentioned, thinking is nothing but association – firstly elementary one, and then the chains of associations, each first association is the moment for generation of thought.

An animal shall for certain analyze and synthesize it in order successfully to be oriented in the surrounding world. Cognitive processes, thinking are the complex analytical synthetic activity of the cortex. Specific human thinking appears on the basis of the most complex analytical synthetic activity of the cortex of large hemispheres, based on language.

The activity of large cerebral hemispheres is the signaling activity. The large cerebral hemispheres always act in response to different irritations, which signalize about the things that are very important for the life of organism. For example, light or sound may signalize about available food, danger, etc. to a living being.

The signals that cause to them, things and their properties or natural phenomena are the first signal system. It is inherent to animals and human.

The first signal system is the physiological background of feelings, perceptions, and imaginations. The reality for animals is signalized almost exclusively by irritations, which directly penetrate into special cells of visual, auditory and other receptors in organism, and their reflection in the large hemispheres.

The higher nervous activity of human as a social being is qualitatively different from the higher nervous activity of animals. People in the process of work, in the public life produced the acoustic language as a way for connection, a way for communication between themselves.

The language function caused to appearance of the new principle for activity of the large hemispheres. A word in human life became an original signal. It is the second, exclusively human, signal system of reality. Each word as a name of a thing, property or action replaces the corresponding signal of the first signal system.

If our sensations and perceptions of things and phenomena from surrounding world are the signals from the first signal system of reality, concrete signals for us, as I.P. Pavlov mentions, then the language, first of all kinetic irritations that come into the cortex from organs of speech are the signals from the second signal system, signals of signals.

A word through previous life experience of adult is connected with all external and internal irritations that come into the large hemispheres. It signalizes them, substitutes and as a result from it may commit all those actions, reactions, which cause to concrete irritations.

The second signal system appears on the basis of the first signal system and cannot exist without it. It acts only in connection with the

activity of the first signal system, entering into the most complex interactions with it.

The second signal system in interaction with the first signal system is the physiological background for the highest, abstract thinking of human and its consciousness, a way for self-cognition. Some other psychological processes (perception, memory, imagination, formation of skills, etc.) at physiological level are also the result from interaction of the first and second signal systems. The participation of the second signal system in these psychological processes transforms them into conscious processes.

Large cerebral hemispheres are extremely complex dynamic system. The new conditioned connections are constantly formed during activity. They unite into certain systems. The systemacy of connections provides with the success in activity of animal and human.

The processes, which take place in the large cerebral hemispheres, constantly strive for unity, stereotyped uniting activity. A great number of irritations that come to the large hemispheres both from outside and inside of organism collide, interact, are systematized and finish with formation of dynamic stereotype.

The dynamic stereotype is necessary for successful interaction of organism with environment. The repetition of similar motions and actions, similar acts of behavior, similar reactions of organism provides it with the success in activity, in satisfaction of the needs.

It is well-known that a human gets used to a certain way of actions, produces a certain way of perception, memorizing, thinking.

Automating its actions, it produces the skills and habits, which facilitate the performance of consciously directed activity. The dynamic stereotypes play the main role in all this direction.

The new dynamic stereotypes are constantly formed in the activity. The old ones do not disappear, they interact with the newly formed ones, assist to their formation or, on the contrary, enter into contradiction with them, as a result of which the successful formation of new stereotypes is prohibited. The production and alteration of dynamic stereotype requires a great work of the nervous system. It may take place during a long time and depends on complexity of

activity itself, as well as on individuality and state of animal or human. The production and support of dynamic stereotype are always linked with certain experiences.

The nervous processes, which are reflected in the cerebral hemispheres at establishment and support of dynamic stereotype, are the backgrounds for feelings; they stipulate their character and intensity. The feelings of difficulties, cheerfulness and tiredness, satisfaction and despondency, joy and despair, etc. have the changes, violations of old dynamic stereotype or complexity in establishment of the new one as their physiological background.

The dynamic stereotype is better formed when the irritants act in a certain system, a certain succession and a certain order. The dynamic stereotype is supported through observance to a certain external order, system and mode of activity.

Genetic epistemology by J. Piaget

The idea about genesis of psychical phenomena appeared at researchers rather quickly. The formation of systematic subject of genetic psychology occurs slowly. It will last until a way to construct the system of genetic psychology, which would satisfy the logical and significant criteria for being of subject under research, will be found.

The key figures, who defined the establishment of genetic psychology, undoubtedly include Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget. He established Geneva school of genetic psychology, within which limits the numerous processes, related to development of child, are studied.

In opinion of J. Piaget, the genetic psychology concerns the individual development of child, its ontogenesis. Analyzing Piaget's concept, L.F. Obukhova mentions "The expression "genetic psychology" cannot be used as a synonym for child psychology, psychology of child development, as general psychology is also called genetic one, if it considers the psychical functions in the process of formation" [Obukhova, 1981].

The analysis certifies that Piaget something artificially narrows the subject of research of genetic psychology, directing the efforts to

study exclusively of child's intellectual development, namely the process for formation of fundamental concepts, key notions about natural and social phenomena, in the whole, the formation of mechanisms for cognitive activity of child.

The significant achievement by Piaget should be considered his establishment of a special research method – clinical conversation – which application allows studying not the external manifestations (symptoms) of psychical phenomena but to disclose and to deploy the internal processes, which are in their product and stipulate their appearance and operation. It is seen that this method is not used up itself, it remains very urgent and potentially heuristic: in any case, although this method does not allow modeling and designing further development of psychical structures, it is significantly more fruitful than testing tools that records exclusively external indices, leaving the fundamental issues about genesis and operation of internal psychical mechanisms without answers.

We think that the thought about original unity of J. Piaget's clinical conversation with experimental genetic method is perspective one. This unity has to overcome with shortcomings of both methods in the new synthesis.

Clinical conversation is exclusively a diagnostic procedure but, as the whole experience in development of genetic psychology certifies, it cannot answer the key questions about origin, receipt and further development of psychical structures.

Instead, this method has a huge advantage that the procedure concerns not a separate process but the integral individuality, as a result of this there appears the possibility to reproduce the unique pattern for inward world of each personality.

On the other part, it is known: experimental genetic method causes to development that allows studying it. However, this method at modern stage has only separate psychical functions as its direct subject and not the personality in the whole.

So, the individuality is not studied here. We see the combination of those two procedures in organization of special clinical conversation, which has not diagnostic but learning character. Modeling and forming psychical structures of a certain personality in

contact with psychologist-researcher may not only significantly specify the notions about general mechanisms for psychical development but to open the possibility to study the genesis of integral individuality.

Of course, in this case we are not talking about mass examinations as they are not necessary if we mean exclusively scientific purposes. The establishment and realization of such synthetic research procedure will enable approaching to performance of old idea by G.S. Kostiuk (expressed by him in early pedagogical works) about necessity in study of dynamics and structure of each unique individuality (a bit later G. Allport wrote about it, creating his concept for psychology of individuality).

The main tasks, which the genetic psychology, established by Piaget, solves, concerns the development of mental sphere: essence of transition from some forms of mental activity to others, from simple mental operations to more complex ones, as well as reasons for those structural transformations.

Due to recognitions by researchers that analyze the works by Piaget and his school, the genetic psychology, established by him, is developed pursuant to the following main directions: methodological analysis and specification for subject of research, development of research procedures, accumulation and interpretation of actual material. In opinion of Piaget himself, the genetic psychology has to take the special place between philosophy and biology. It is difficult to object, however Piaget and his followers, unfortunately, do not specify this thought, so, the specificity for position of genetic psychology remains doubtful.

The methodological idea by Piaget is that the genetic psychology has to become a background for development of specific field of knowledge – genetic epistemology, which is designed to explain the peculiarities for genetic cognition, based on its history, social genesis and psychological sources for those concepts and operations, underlying scientific cognition.

The confidence of Piaget in the fact that the research on nature of scientific cognitions is impossible beyond the use of psychological data may be only assumed.

At the same time it should be mentioned that it is difficult to accept the whole logics of the author, so it appears that the study on peculiarities for psychical development of personality is important not in itself but only within the limits of further task – to understand the process for scientific cognition, which Piaget thought to be the top ability of human.

In fact, the existence of unique personality is the top of life and scientific cognition is only its component, moment (which, by the way, is inherent not to all people, because of that most of them do not stop being a unique personality). Hence the genetic epistemology should be considered not as a final purpose and refined quintessence of genetic psychology but as its part, “subsidiary” field.

Based on notion about activity of subject in scientific cognition, pursuant to numerous empirical materials Piaget postulates some main principles for this process. Let’s mention here the main principle for equilibrium of intellectual process for Piaget, according to which the intellectual development is directed to achieve the stable equilibrium, i.e. – to form clear logical structures. It means that the logicity is not an inborn quality but the topic, which is constantly being developed.

The conclusions by Piaget about interaction of human thinking with activity that surrounds it are important. Piaget acknowledged that an object exists regardless of a subject and in order to learn an object it is necessary to commit a system of actions in its relation, and thus – to undergo it to transformation. The idea of transformation, as most researchers think, is one of the central in Piaget’s theory. It means that, although an object and a subject exist separately, the border between them is not finally defined, as a subject and an object are specifically united in any action.

In particular, in order to realize own peculiarities, a subject is just forced to act with objects (S.L. Rubinstein at his time fundamentally grounded and developed that thought).

The idea of transformation leads Piaget to real fundamental conclusion that the source for cognition is not in the object and not in the subject but always – in interaction between them, where a subject is active. Hence we have the following conclusion –

objectivity (in understanding by Piaget – reality) of knowledge is developed during the whole time following to development of child intellectual possibilities.

Numerous experiments as though confirmed this thought and even allowed establishing the clear and as though stable stages in child intellectual development (we will show later that one of those “as though” became the key one and undermined very much Piaget’s concepts after theoretical and experimental works by L.S. Vygotsky and his school).

As the objectivity of cognition is not inherent to a child since the very beginning, it is necessary to have the system of successive constructions, which gradually approaches it. Hence there appears one more central idea by Piaget, the idea of construction. Piaget thinks that knowledge is always subject to certain structures of actions. The latter ones are the consequence of construction (i.e. procedural “pattern” of activity), as they are not set either by object or subject on their own.

The surrounding is structured thanks to activity of subject-object interaction and intellect is a component of this structure. The development of intellect is defined by the fact that as a result from activity a subject “introduces” the new objects, which penetrate into existing structures, into itself. It occurs there that Piaget called by the term “assimilation”. If a new object cannot fully be “caught” by old structures, there occurs their reconstruction to the side of larger adequacy to object, and in the whole – to external world. Piaget called this process for adaptation of schemes-structures of subject to object as accommodation.

Thus, the structure (scheme of action) is the central concept for Piaget. The structure is the “mental” system or integrity, which principles for activity differ from principles for activity of parts, which constitute this structure. The structure is the system that is self-regulated. The new mental structures are formed on the basis of action” [Piaget, 1969].

The disunion of comprehension of psychical functions and structures is principal for Piaget. Functions as dynamic processes are

unchanged and hereditarily fixed. They do not depend on content of activity and experience.

The structures are formed during life, depend on content of experience and are qualitatively different at various stages of development. Such correlation between functions and structures provides with continuity, succession of development and its qualitative originality at each age stage.

The most important initial principle of research for Piaget is to consider a child “as a being that assimilates things, selects and learns them according to its own mental structure” [Piaget, 1969]. The cognition of the world depends first of all on mental structures. It should be mentioned that Piaget understands that mental structures are built on the basis of subject’s actions, and a thought is a folded and concentrated action.

The important stage in establishment of Piaget as a theoretician of genetic psychology was his works, devoted to phenomenon of child egocentrism. They are very famous researches in the science, thus, we will not stop on their analysis, just mention: Piaget managed to answer the fair critical remarks by L.S. Vygotsky and Sh. Buler, and it was found out that everything is not as definite as it was considered.

He mentioned that egocentric speech does not cover the whole spontaneous speech of child and is only the external expression of deeper intellectual and social position. Piaget specifies the term itself: egocentrism for him is the totality of pre-critical and pre-objective positions to cognition of things, other people and itself. It is the original illusion of cognition, form for previous centration of intellect, when the intellectual diversity is still absent.

Thus, “late” Piaget yields more to the term “centration”. According to Piaget, the development means that decentration as more perfect position comes to change egocentrism. The transition from egocentrism to decentration characterizes the process of cognition at all levels of development. Piaget called this transition as the law of development.

The concept for socialization takes the important place in the system of opinions by J. Piaget, which he understood as the process

for adaptation of individual to the conditions of social environment. Socialization means that achieving a certain level of development a child becomes capable to cooperation with other people thanks to possibility to coordinate and to share its own point of view and points of view by other people.

Piaget thought that socialization stipulates the transition from egocentric (centered) position to objective (decentered). The process of socialization was one of the key moments in discussion between Piaget and Vygotsky (later – Galperin). Although the opinion of the latter one is more grounded and corresponds to reality, it should be remembered that Piaget studied the process of socialization itself yet and defined very interesting moments.

Pursuant to significant empirical material J. Piaget defined the stages in development of child's intellect and developed the classification for these stages. He divides the entire stage since birth and until 14 years into three periods: period of sensory-motor intellect, presentative intellect and concrete operations, representative intellect and formal operations.

The first period includes two subperiods (centration on own body and objectivization of practical intellect) and six stages: exercises of reflexes (since birth until 1 month), first skill and first circular reactions (4-9 months), coordination of vision and grabbing, differentiation of means and purpose (8-12 months), differentiation of schemes for actions and appearance of new actions (11-18 months), start for interiorization of schemes and solution of some problems through deduction (18-24 months).

The second period also consists of two subperiods and five stages. Subperiod "pre-operating intellect" consists of the following stages: appearance of symbolic function and start for interiorization of schemes for actions (since 2-3 until 6 years), intuitive thinking, which is based on more differentiated notions (since 5 up to 6-8 years). Subperiod "concrete operations" consists of the following stages: simple operations (classification, series, mutual simple conformity) – since 8-9 until 10 years; system of operations (since 9-10 until 11-12 years).

The third period includes two subperiods. First one "establishment of formal operations" consists of the following stages "hypothetic

deductive logics and combinatorial analysis” (since 11-12 until 13-14 years) and stage “structure of “grate” and a group of four transformations” exceeds juvenile age and is not studied by Piaget.

The background for separation of abovementioned stages was the concept “grouping”, developed by Piaget. According to Piaget groupings are closed and reverse systems, such as – logical operations, simple and multiplicative series, symmetry, etc. Piaget thought that intellectual development may be described in the form of grouping that consistently arise one from another.

It allows studying the process for development of psychics empirically at the same time (using observation and experiment) and theoretically (through logical deduction using axiomatic models).

Piaget thought that it was possible to explain the delays, which sometimes occur in the process of development, also in terms of groupings. These phenomena depend on decentration of actions, as a result from which there appear different concepts. Hereby, the more serious obstacles, related to external picture of things, the more expressed the delay in development of concepts is.

Thus, Piaget characterized the development as a motion from egocentrism to intellectual decentration, and he imagined its run in the form of successive groupings that arise one from another. It is the external characteristic for development. Its internal content is equilibrium. Piaget at each level of development characterized equilibrium due to volume of its sphere, mobility and stability.

Piaget thought that the mechanisms for development, discovered by him, in general, and established intellectual stages also relate to the whole psychics. Further scientific researches within genetic psychology tell that this last statement is rather doubtful.

In general it should be mentioned that Piaget’s theory remains one of the most grounded systems for conceptual methodological notions about genesis of psychics. The fact that it is built on the basis of numerous empirical data that unfortunately is rather exclusion for modern psychology is of special importance.

As it has already been mentioned, genetic psychology, unlike genetic epistemology by J. Piaget, shall have the following as a subject of research:

- a) appearance of psychological phenomena;
- b) their origin and revival of lost efficient functions for these phenomena.

The diversity of concept "genetic psychology" is that it covers three more-less deep aspects of content, which interpenetrate into each other:

1. Psychological development of human occurs during its life: firstly it masters it in order to work productively, using psychological ability, regulating actions and deeds.
2. Complex of scientific knowledge, acquired by the mankind in the process of productive, cultural, public and art activities. This knowledge may be called the psychological wisdom.
3. System of scientific knowledge is created through implementation of scientific methods and especially experiment into psychology, as a result from which it acquires the status of science for production of new knowledge. Thanks to such work of psychologist the principles and concepts for genetic psychology are offered.

Behaviorism, Gestalt psychology and Wundt's structural approach

The philosophy of pragmatism caused to appearance of behaviorism or science about behavior in American psychology (G. Watson). If the introspective psychology had the consciousness as a subject of its research, then the behavioral psychology had behavior as a subject of its research. Behaviorism ignores consciousness as a subject of psychology.

The subject of behaviorism is the study of behavior as external reactions of organism on stimuli that influence on it. In opinion of behaviorists, behavior is formed as a result from unrestrained selection of physical motions as reactions on stimuli.

This kind of human activity was described by the following concepts: "stimulus – reaction", "formation of skills", "integration of skills", "intermediate variable", "potential of excitation and prohibition", "intention", "expectation", "knowledge", etc., and the

solution of tasks is carried out by single way – “trial and error” method, “blind” selection of motions, performed without thinking.

The main thing in behavior is the skills. Thinking reduces them to language and speech habits. The leading method of study is learning, during which process the necessary skills are acquired. Behaviorists underestimate the necessity in understanding the purpose, content and process of study.

The laws of behavior only fix the ratio between the one that occurs at the “inlet” of human (stimulus) and its “outlet” (reactions), and the one that occurs inside, in opinion of behavioral psychology, is not open to scientific analysis as it is beyond possibilities of direct observation. The laws of actions and behavior were formulated due to results from tests with animals (mainly white rats) and were transferred to human.

We cannot state that behaviorism does not almost touch the problem on development of psychics. But this “touch” is very specific and is fully inside the integral theoretical scheme for psychology of behavior.

Thus, Uatson considers people as such ones that are preset with a certain structure by nature. Individual changes, which enforce people to react on stimuli by a certain manner, occur within this structure. The totality of similar elementary reactions is the inborn behavior of human. Some from inborn forms for behavior are shown a bit later.

Inborn behavior forms relatively small list of human reactions, each of which is transformed into stipulated one at once after birth. According to Uatson the concept of instinct is unnecessary for psychology as it is what is always called an instinct is in fact the result from learning or stipulation, and, in such capacity, is a part of acquired behavior.

Uatson developed the idea and stream of activity – continuous stream of activity that arises at the moment of ovum fertilization and becomes more and more complex in the process of organism development [Uatson, 1931]. Inborn onset underlies any human system of actions. Systems become complicated with time thanks to stipulation.

Skinner followed to the opinion, according to which human behavior may be changed during life. However he did not agree with

the opinion of most psychologists-evolutionists about conditions and factors, which cause to those changes.

According to Skinner, human behavior during life may be changed under influence of environment, being changed: as the peculiarities for support are different, different behavior is formed under their influence.

Skinner rejects the opinions about stadiality of development, and, unlike E. Erickson, explains the vital crises by changes in environment, which an individual into situation when its set of behavioral reactions is found to be inadequate to receive support. So, we should state that behaviorism considers the changes, absolutely rejecting development.

It is rather original position, which, in our opinion, has the global consequences but we should remember that behaviorism is until now the dominant theory of psychology in the USA.

Unlike behaviorists, German psychologists (M. Wertheimer, V. Keller, K. Koffka, K. Levin), pursuant special researches, suggested the program to study the psychics in terms of integral structures – gestalts (images, shapes). Image and shape of reflected subject is a functional structure, which arranges the diversity of certain reflected phenomena according to effect of its laws. Gestalts are primary images in relation to their components. It was proved that the internal, systematic organization of the whole (image, shape) of subject defines the properties and functions of the parts that form this whole.

The idea about primacy of integrity over structure simplified the notion about principle for division of consciousness into elements and construction of complex psychological phenomena on these elements due to laws of associations or creative synthesis.

The application of principle for integrity in psychological researches enabled to study the important psychological properties for reflection and its products of images, namely: constancy, structuredness, dependence from perception of subject image (“figures”) on its environment (“background”), etc. The role of sensory image in organization of motivational actions was studied, and the construction of this image was carried out through special

psychical act – “insight” – momentary coverage of relations in reflected situation.

The important achievement in Gestalt-psychology was the discovery of laws of images: a) gravitation of parts to establishment of symmetrical whole, b) grouping of parts due to principle for maximum simplicity, equilibrium; c) “pregnancy” – aspiration for psychical phenomenon to acquire a definite, clear and complete shape.

Studying the processes of human thinking, the researchers were mainly concentrated on transformation of image (reorganization, new centration, etc.) that provides it with productive character, unlike formal logical operations, algorithms, etc.

The main ideas about development in genetic psychology are based on notions about integrity and homeostasis. The need in homeostasis (balance with external world and world of inward experience) is one of the leading in terms of Gestalt-psychology. The absence of such experience generates the state of frustration and general psychological discomfort. In opinion of theoreticians of direction, these states are overcome when a human has the feeling of integrity from environment and itself as its part. The harmony of integrity (gestalt) is the driving force for development of psychical structures and personality in the whole. Using the terminology of direction, it should be mentioned that the essence of development of Gestalt-psychologists is the aspiration to complete (harmonize) the gestalt, which, however, will never be completed. It stipulates the infinity of development.

The founder of structural psychology V. Wundt considered the study of structure for consciousness to be the main principle. The concept of structure for consciousness anticipates the available elements in it and connection between them, so, the efforts of psychologists were directed to search for components and ways for their structurization. It was considered that the psychology shall solve three questions: “what?”, “how?” and “why”.

Thus, the procedures of all researches were built so that to answer the questions: from which elements the subject under research is built, how these elements are combined and why there appears such but not another combination of elements.

Three elements were distinguished in the structure of consciousness: feelings – the simplest element, its quality, intensity, accuracy and duration; image and sense in its elementary form.

Until that time the subjective character of perception was rejected and considered to be a mistake of stimulus that caused to substitution of feeling itself by knowledge about stimulus that caused it.

This integrity is not the sum of certain psychological processes but the original structure with its inherent specific properties, which do not arise from properties of certain elements in psychological life. On the contrary, the properties of the whole define the properties of separate parts.

Psychoanalytical theories of development of personality and psychics

So, we see that the problem on psychological development of child's personality in the world psychology and influence of study and education on development in different directions and approaches has its own interpretation. The most acknowledged and authoritative is the depth psychology, within which limits the process for formation and development of personality is described rather fundamentally.

The main framework of notions about development of personality and psychics was formed in works by Z. Freud and his followers, added and transformed in theory of object relations (M. Klein, M. Maler, D.V. Vinnikott), ego-psychology (G. Freud, H. Kohut, E. Erickson), individual psychology A. Adler and Jung, structural psychoanalysis (J. Lakan, J.-A. Miller).

The researches in the sphere of psychopathology and psychiatry stipulated the need in study of the role and actions of unrealized factors that define the needs and inclinations of personality, its behavior. Thus, the psychoanalytical direction in psychology was established (Z. Freud).

Z. Freud's concept about subconscious [Freud, 1998] included many different observations, suppositions and assumptions.

As it is known Z. Freud distinguishes three components in the structure of personality:

1) Id (it) – center of instincts, sexual or aggressive drives that must immediately be satisfied regardless of human relations with environment. These aspirations, penetrating from the subconscious into consciousness, become the source for activity of human, originally direct its deeds and behavior. Psychoanalysts pay the special attention to sexual drives;

2) Ego (I) – a regulator, which perceives the information of environment and state of own organism, keeps it in the memory and organizes actions within the interests of self-preservation;

3) Super Ego (over I) – a totality of moral standards, prohibitions and encouragements, mastered by personality mainly unconsciously, during education.

In opinion of Z. Freud, the secret war between unconscious psychical forces, hidden in the depths of psychics, and necessity to survive in the social environment, being hostile to human, always takes place inside a human.

The prohibitions on the part of social environment and “censorship” of consciousness, colliding with unrealized drives, lead to psychical traumas, suppress the energy of aspirations. The requirements to Ego on the part of Id, Super Ego and society, to which an individual shall adapt, cause to a great internal tension.

As a result of secret war inside the personality (its main driving force is sexual drives – libido), the latter one inevitably constantly is in the state of conflict between itself and social environment. And this energy does not disappear to anywhere and is forced to seek for the ways to enter outside. As a result from collisions and struggle of components for personality there arise neurotic symptoms, dreams, faulty actions (slips of the tongue, parapraxes (faulty actions), etc.), and forgetting unpleasant things.

So, the task of psychologist is to find the experiences that traumatize a human and to release personality from them through recollection, conscious analysis of displaced drives, understanding the reasons for neuroses. In fact, Z. Freud touched the most important components for psychics of human. He put forward the

issue about motives as a real factor for regulation of behavior, dynamics in relations between its different (realized and unrealized) components. But the explanation of received facts led to the situation when motivation was interpreted as psychical energy that circulates in the organism and has one vector – orientation to dispersion and discharging.

The development of psychics and personal growth in classical psychoanalysis are considered as the differentiation of Ego – consciousness and self-consciousness, as well as the process for establishment of stable network for interrelations of Ego with surrounding reality. Ego (I) is developed from Id (It) and the increase in the level of consciousness for any psychical process is considered to be the progress, while the decrease in consciousness is the regress, decline.

The consciousness is developed from the unconscious through its differentiation – complication and disintegration, division into parts. This process is specific at different stages of development that differ with definite form for development of drives, according to Freud, mainly sexual and aggressive.

Namely the early stages of psychosexual development are the determinant factors for the whole human life in psychoanalysis.

The impressions from the first five years, naturally, are almost completely referred to the sphere of unconscious; hereby the ratio of forgotten and excluded material (descriptive and dynamic unconscious) is the basis for constitutional disposition of human to appearance of psychical disorders.

The first stage of personal development is the separation of child from mother, birth and psychical birth (term by M. Maler) of human. Birth is the significant physiological and psychological trauma that further serves as universal sample (prototype) for situations, related to sufferings, discomfort and anxiety. The most impressive descriptions of influence from birth trauma on further life of personality are contained in the works by Otto Rank (“Birth trauma”, 1924) and Shandor Ferenczi (“Experience in theories of genitality”, 1924).

The development of feeling for reality and ability to distinguish own Ego and surrounding reality is carried out gradually. Mother plays

the main role in this process that reasonably interchanges the satisfaction of needs and partial frustration. If mother is too much careful, a child does not need to develop the contacts with reality, if insufficiently – there appears the fear for threatening hostility of the world. The following object schools in most details describe the relations of child and mother [Wallon, 1967; Zinchenko, 2002, Vinnikott, 1998]. The basics for object theory were formulated by Freud and it received its further development in works by M. Klein, U.R. Bayon, M. Balint, D.V. Vinnikott, O.F. Kernberg, R.A. Spits, V.R.D. Firebern and many others.

The oral stage in development of personality that occupies the first year of life is characterized by gradual development and differentiation of feeling for Ego.

At first the psychics of infant is represented by unconscious drives and instincts, which satisfaction shall be immediate, and feeling of satisfaction is spread over the whole body of child. Ego is firstly formed as an instance, capable to postpone satisfaction, as well as to choose the way to achieve pleasure and to realize it. The ability to refuse from drives or ways to receive satisfaction, not accepted in the society, is developed later; this function usually correlates with Super-Ego.

Hanna Freud in her work “Norm and pathology of child development” [Freud H., Freud Z., 1997] in details describes behavior and deeds of infantile (fixed at oral stage) personality in comparison with matured one.

Next stage in development of object relations is called depressive. M. Klein thinks that the main result of this period is the ability of child to cope with anxiety that prepares it for contradictions and difficulties of Oedipus complex. A child learns adequately to react to external aggression (understanding the content of punishments), finds the ability to transfer the negative stimulation or absence of positive one, masters the notion that the way to satisfaction of drive does not always lie along the line of least resistance.

The transition (overcoming) of depressive position contains the feeling of gratitude, stipulated by ability to love but not blame. It

relates to formation of notion about stably “fine” object that later is the basics for integration of feeling for own Ego.

Other periodization is accepted in classical psychoanalysis.

Object theory deeply studied the process for formation of interrelations with the ones like you, systems of social relations of individual, distinguished and described different forms for destructive and pathological interaction of people. Thus, Hanna Freud considers that schizoid and schizophreniform symptoms are developed at persons, whose psychical development stopped at the stage of infantile autism while the disorder of symbiotic relations with mother may result in serious forms of depression.

M. Klein links two main types of anxiety that personality may suffer with object relations. Persecution anxiety (i.e. fear for pursuit, fear for hostile attitude on the part of surrounding people) is developed in persons, who are characterized by higher paranoid-schizoid confusion, and the depressive anxiety (fear for loss of favorite object) is inherent to those ones, who failed to form the notion about positive and stable own Ego (to overcome the depressive position).

In the first case a human cannot separate positive and kind features and properties from negative ones and feels a strong fear that an object (sweetheart, chief, and friend) in any time may become hostile, aggressive.

The relations with people frighten it because of unpredictability in behavior of the latter ones. If a subject is not sure that it deserves the attention, approval and love, it is difficult for him to response to sympathy of other human.

M. Balint offers the interesting dichotomy for basic types of object relations. In his work “Tremble and regression” [Balint, 1959] he suggest the concept of oknophilia that means the need to hold on reliable, stable object, which guaranties the protection and safety, and philobatia – joy from leaving an object, “tremble of pleasure, mixed with anxiety and satisfaction” that a personality feels in deprived object but in friendly (not hostile) space.

American psychoanalyst Fillis Grineykr considers the formation of feeling for own identity as the process that completely depends on

development of object relations. In her opinion, understanding own Ego of subject is development through understanding how it is imagined and assessed by other people. Children and adults on introjection basis appropriate the image of own personality that is formed in their relatives. Other authors, for example, Theodor Reik and Josef Sandler think that object relations influence first of all on formation of Super-Ego.

The second important side of phallic stage, closely related to Oedipus complex, is the formation of Super-Ego. It is rather complex psychological formation that controls desires and drive of personality and the whole behavior of human in the whole. It is accepted to consider that development of Super-Ego is the result from internal conflict between feeling of blame and ideal notion about itself that relates to mastery of paternal prohibitions at this stage of personal development.

Usually Super-Ego includes the moral norms and rules, including religious ones, conscience, principles and different prohibitions, as well as ideals and values of personality – in one word, everything that allows it distinguishing the good from the evil (in the widest meaning) and behaving according to notions about the bad and the good, the proper, admissible and not permitted.

The latent period that finishes with sexual maturity occurs after Oedipean stage in psychosexual development of personality. The mature genital organization, unlike infantile, but with tracks of earlier stages is formed at adult human.

Thus, the main line of normal development in classical psychoanalysis is defined by triad of “autoeroticism – latency – genitality”.

According to A. Adler’s theory (1870-1937), the leading motive in human activity is the natural aspiration for supremacy, for power. The sources for this aspiration are the feeling of inferiority, inherent to each human, and attempts to compensate their weaknesses and to develop inferior functions. A human strives to raise itself in the eyes of environment and in own notion about himself in order to cope with the feeling of inferiority.

According to A. Adler the structure of personality is formed in early childhood (until 5 years) and experienced as a prototype,

original embryo, “style of life” that defines the whole further psychical development. The purposes of life are formed from realized feeling of inferiority, attempts to cope with it and self-affirmation.

If a personality has a realistic purpose – its life is normal and if otherwise – a personality becomes neurotic and asocial. These states activate the mechanisms for compensation and hypercompensation. The activity of human is directed to achieve the personal power over others, domination and is accompanied by deviations of behavior from social values and norms. Thus, the task of psychologist is to help a human to realize that its purposes and aspirations are unreal and to direct the force for compensation in creative acts, self-improvement, manifestation of itself in science, philosophy, arts.

The founder of analytical psychology Carl Gustav Jung [Jung, 1994] considers the process for development of personality a little otherwise. The purpose of psychical development is the self-realization. This process in Jungian is called individuation and is the main task for human life, its content. The process for individuation is the restoration and deployment of initial potential integrity of individual. Individuation forms a certain human as a being, unlike general, collective psychology, thus, it is also a process of differentiation.

However, it is wrong to understand individuation only as an extension of sphere of consciousness, as development of conscious psychics at the expense of decrease in unconscious – on the contrary, it is the integration of unconscious contents that forms the basis for personal growth.

The purpose of individuation process is the establishment of Selfhood, finding of integrity and harmony by personality.

Selfhood is the central organizing archetype of personality that expresses its potential. The penetration into own unique nature assumes cognition of unrealized sides and properties of own soul, integration of certain archetypes for its structure. Jung refers Person, Shadow, Anima in men and Animus in women to them. The realization and unity of those archetypes around Ego, conscious I of personality is the main content for individuation process, hereby the definite stage of the latter corresponds to each archetype.

Besides, the activity of lower (inferior) psychical function that is perceived by human as a certain irrational side of psychical life is mastered in the process of personal development. Individuation takes place with active participation of unrealized (compensatory) mindset; it allows the identification and integration of complexes for personal unconscious. Human learns to control its instincts, releases from power of their dark, archaic side.

The personal growth and development of young human are significantly different from development in the second half of life. Jung writes: "The life of young human, as a rule, passes under sign of general expansion with aspiration to achieve the purposes that are on the surface and its neuroses are, perhaps, grounded mainly on indetermination or digression from this direction.

The life of old human, on the contrary, passes under the sign of contraction, consolidation of the achieved and reduction of external activity. Its neurosis is as a rule based on fixedness on youthful instructions, unusual for its age. If a young neurotic is afraid of life, then an old one shrinks before death. The one that used to be a normal purpose for a young man becomes a neurotic obstacle for an old man, likewise as indetermination of young neurotic is firstly the normal dependence on parents that later is transformed into relations of incest.

It is natural that neurosis, resistance, displacement, fictions, etc. in young human have the opposite meaning in comparison with old man despite of affected external similarity" [Jung, 1997].

Thus, the development, different from idea of "growing-up", with age becomes less healthy even if it is not accompanied by expressed neurotic manifestations.

The main thing that differ Jung's psychology from Freud's psychoanalysis is the various views on nature of libido. If Freud characterizes libido, resorting mainly to the terms from the sphere of sexuality, then Jung thinks that is the vital energy in general, in which sexuality is only one of its components. According to Jung the primary vital energy of libido shows its influence depending on the fact what is the most important for a concrete human at a certain period of time.

Jung rejects Freud's understanding of Oedipus complex. He explains the sympathy of child to mother as a necessary vital need of child and ability of mother to satisfy them. When a child grows up, the sexual needs that lay on those ones, which dominated in the childhood, appear at it. Jung made the assumption that energy of libido acquires the heterosexual forms only in adolescence.

He does not reject in full the available sexual motivation in childhood, however he reduced the sexuality only to one of many drives in psychics.

The significant difference between scientific positions of Freud and Jung relates to the issue about direction of factors, determinant for formation of human personality. From the point of view by Freud, a human is a product of its child's experiences. A human personality for Jung is formed not only by its past but, to significant extent, own purposes, expectations and hopes for the future. In his opinion, the formation of personality is not absolutely finished until five years. A human may change and sometimes rather significantly during its whole life.

The next thing that differ the scientific opinions of Freud and Jung is that Jung tried to deepen into the field of the unconscious more than Freud could do it. He provided one more measurement to understanding of the unconscious: inborn experience of the mankind as species, inherited from their ancestors-animals (collective unconscious).

Jung distinguished two types of the unconscious: personal unconscious and collective unconscious. Personal unconscious in the sphere of the unconscious that contains the formations, which used to be in the consciousness but later were forgotten or displaced.

Collective unconscious is the deepest level of psychical activity that includes inborn experience from past generations of people, as well as ancestors-semi-animals.

Personal unconscious that consists of recollections, impulses and desires, not clear perceptions and other personal experience, displaced or just forgotten, is directly under the level of consciousness. This level of unconscious is not very deep; events, which are there, may easily be renewed in the consciousness. The

contents of personal unconscious are emotions, recollections, wishes, etc., grouped into certain thematic complexes. These complexes are shown in the consciousness as certain dominating ideas – ideas of force or ideas of inferiority, and thus they make their influence on behavior. Complex is as if a small personality inside human.

Collective unconscious is below personal unconscious: it takes deeper level, it is unknown to individual and contains the accumulated experience of past generations, including semi-animal period in the history of the mankind. Collective unconscious is a universal evolutionary experience that is the basis for human personality. It is important to mention that the experience in the collective unconscious is in fact unconscious. We cannot realize it and somehow to recollect as it is possible at deepening into personal unconscious.

Archetypes are inborn tendencies inside collective unconscious. They are internal determinants for psychical life of human as they direct the actions of human to a certain channel, somehow resembling how our ancestors-animals behaved in similar situations. Archetypes reveal themselves in the consciousness in the form of emotions and some other psychical phenomena.

Usually they relate to the moments of vital experience (birth and death), life journey (childhood, youth), as well as reaction to deadly danger. Archetypes of form for collective unconscious play the constructive role in culture. Thanks to them the connection of epochs and generations, preservation of spiritual integrity of cultures is possible.

No matter how we interpreted the unconscious – either positively or negatively – it is a significant component for general system of consciousness.

The conscious and unconscious add each other. Thus, the conscious is discrete: we may distinguish the perception, impression, thoughts.

The unconscious, on the contrary, is continual. The ceaselessness in stream of meanings dominates in it. The acts of realization are subject to control, check, repetition, coordination in

time. The unconscious is deprived of those features. The conscious is better shown in oral form and the unconscious – in the language of images-symbols.

Jung researched the mythology and art work from the oldest civilizations, finding archetypical symbols in them, and analyzed them. It was found out that there were symbols, inherent to all archaic cultures (common for them), hereby even to those ones, which were so remote in time and space that the direct contact between was impossible. He also managed to find in the dreams of patients something that he defined as traces for similar symbols. It much strengthened Jung's ideas about collective unconscious.

Jung thought that the most important archetype was Selfhood. Uniting and harmonizing all aspects of the unconscious, "I" forms the unity and stability of personality. The task of Selfhood is the integration of different subsystems of personality. Jung compared Selfhood with passion or aspiration for self-actualization that defines the equilibrium and integrity, fullest disclosure of possibilities for personality.

According to his belief, self-actualization may be achieved only reaching the middle age (between 35 and 40 years). Jung considered this piece of human life as a critical period in personal development – border, crossing which the personality undergoes deep and positive transformations.

Jung's ideas made the significant influence on wide spheres of anthropology, religion, history, arts and literature. His works for many historians, theologicians and writers were the real source for aspiration. However in general the scientific psychology a little ignored his analytical theory. Many his books have not been translated into English until 60-ies of XX century.

Jung's ignorance of traditional scientific methods seemed to be impudence to many psychologists- experimentalists. Jung's theories with their mystical and religious basics for them were less accepted even than Freud's concept.

In general, the reproaches, set to possibility of Freud's system, may be referred to Jung's works. He also relied much on clinical observations and interpretation than on controlled experiment.

One of the most resonant works is the structural analytical research on processes for establishment of psychical structures and new formations as the system of cultural codes for determination of solely biological categories due to nature, started within the limits of postmodernism. The development of human psychics is considered as a limiting social process and a process, socializing its essence. These principles are mostly fully described in works by J. Lakan [Lakan, 1998].

He separated two main types of speech: full and empty in psychoanalytical discourse of subject. The author of full speech is the subject of the unconscious (“Other”), and its content is stipulated by psychical traumas that displace the drives and other unrealized aspects of personal functioning that results in appearance of neurotic symptoms. Thus, it was proved that a client during most time at psychoanalytical session turns to empty speech and thus masks unconscious reasons for his/her problems while the task of analyst is to catch the moments of full speech, and, thanks to this, to start the dialog with Other.

J. Lakan’s concept about three main registers of psychics – Real, Fancy and Symbolic – is based on the fact that development of human (conscious) forms for reflection of reality is completely defined by the sphere of society and culture.

Firstly psychics (Real) is the chaos of impressions, senses, states, drives and feeling, inaccessible for denomination, where a newborn child lives until under control of adults, using influences of culture and participation of language, it learns, finally, to express its feelings using special mastered semiotic (symbolic) means: gestures, meaningful compositions, words-denominations, words-concepts and cultural patterns of behavior.

The establishment of connections between organism and its reality occurs at the age of half and a year (stage of mirror), and the register of Fancy, I as an instance, in which a subject alienates itself, is formed. According to Lakan this primordial alienation means the primary experience underlying fancy narcissistic attitude of subject to own I.

The notions about Fancy and Real in Lakan correspond to clearly non-classical concept of subject. Instead of Descartes’ principle of

cogito that postulates the identity and full coincidence of subject of thinking and subject of existence, he introduces other formula: “I think there, where I am not I, and I am there, where I do not think”.

The following task for development is to unite the planes of thinking and existence that is possible only “in the field of language and speech”. The latter one is presented by the third subsystem of psychics, register of Symbolic.

Symbolic is formed at Oedipean stage of development. The determinative moment is the family situation, which sets the structure for the first forms of social interactions of child. The nature of symbolic is that it is the solely structural onset, certain order, place of culture, where the portions of individual wishes are realized and disentangled.

Structured, ordered unconscious (desire for Real) finds the symbolic forms for its expression, or, due to terminology of Lakan, inexpressible reality of the unconscious, being meant, finds the denotative for itself. According to Lakan, symbolic order is the condition for existence of subject.

According to Lakan, a subject is a human, subject of psychics and at the same time an individual personality, subject of activity, perception and conceptualization of reality. A subject is a certain sphere, from each point of which, being equidistant from the unconscious (Real) center, two lines, formed by crossing the plane of Real and Symbolic, come out. The concept that is opposite to it is not an object but Other.

Other is the other, otherwise-minded that sees, and that feels. This category is used everywhere in European philosophy in the second half of XX century, concept of Other is inherent to phenomenology, existentialism, personalism – practically to all modern schools of anthropology. In Lakan Other is defined exclusively on psychoanalytical basis as a source (and at the same time as a result) for processes of displacement and resistance.

I and Other are dialectically linked between themselves and the sources for this connection – in impossibility of subject to exist in the field of realization of its truth. Lakan writes: “The referent of own “I” is Other. Own “I” is determined in reference to Other. It is its correlate.

The level, at which the experience of Other occurs, precisely defines the level, at which, literally for subject, own “I” exists. [Lacan, 1998].

One more important addition that concretizes the essence of human was the concept for subjective practical activity, human practice, during which a human transforms both its surrounding reality and itself. Establishing the conditions for its being, a human confirms its gender essence at the same time.

The process for this confirmation is its self-affirmation, self-formation. Undoubtedly both these concepts that are considered to be the significant characteristics of human do not use up the whole diversity of its substantial properties and features. At the same time the abovementioned concepts lead a human out of ontological limits and in this connection transform the concepts about human into the core of any philosophical anthropology.

The works by J. Lacan launched the linguistic interpretation of the unconscious, according to which the latter is interpreted as “that part of transindividual discourse, which a subject lacks for restoration in continuity of its conscious discourse”. This notion is the background for structural psychoanalysis as a psychotherapeutic means.

Thus, the psychical development of personality is considered as establishment of consciousness by deep psychological schools and the dynamics of relations between realized and unrealized parts (sides, aspects) of psychics constitutes the own psychical development. This point of view in some or other form may be considered to be general for most psychoanalysts, even if they follow to different views on the nature and essence of the unconscious and degree of its influence on personality.

Personalistic directions in study of development

The personalistic psychology concentrated its efforts on study of personality and its internal structure. Thus, V. Stern thinks (1871-1938) that “psychology is the science about personality (person) that undergoes to experiences, each of which is interpreted in terms of its own matrix” [Stern, 1986]. According to V. Stern a human personality

establishes the highest way of life. And its acts psychophysically are neural – neither psychical, nor physical.

According to V. Stern the highest way or modality of life has three levels: the first one – vital activity or biosphere of individual, the second one – experiences and the third level – system of cultural, social, moral and religious values, which a personality masters through so-called introception – internal perception.

The core of personality is in the character of human, which is determined by its features that have the stable and purposeful acts.

“The development of personality, – mentions V. Stern, – is not only the successive chain of events but realized self-deployment of personality as the whole”. [Stern, 1925]. Each concrete achievement in this process is the success in integral individuality of human at the same time.

Three structural peculiarities – growth, differentiation and transformation – are inherent to personality, being developed. In its development it passes through a number of qualitatively original stages. V. Stern formulates the theory of convergence and explains the development of personality by its interaction with the world: the development means “the increase, extension of human inward world that occurs through its unity with external world (convergence).

We see how closely Stern approaches to the idea of interiorization. The personality has its own potencies of development, which at the beginning of life are not directed and only as a result from convergence are specified and transformed into dispositions, which later become simple. The availability of dispositions restricts much the pedagogical influences as it is “impossible to form the personality due to any external model but within the limits of self-definition, inherent to personality, it (pedagogy – S.M.) shall help it to choose the only meaningful way” [Stern, 1986].

I. Shpranger (1882-1963) [Shpranger, 1980] called his psychology of personality as structural and came to conclusion that its orientation and originality are defined by those purposes and spiritual values, for which a personality strives for. At the same time the purposes and values depend on society, in which a personality lives and acts, on the level of spiritual culture. The definition of six

fields of culture in the society provided with the ground for classification of personalities.

I. Shpranger among six main spiritual spheres of society distinguishes: science, aesthetics, economics, religion, politics, and interrelations with other people. And accordingly he calls the types of personalities: aesthetic, esthetic, economical, religious, political personality, etc.

The personalistic directions of psychology also include theory of individuality by F. Allport (1897-1969) [Allport, 2002], concept of self-actualization by A. Maslou (1908-1970) [Maslou, 1997], concept of relations in structure of personality by K. Rogers (1902-1990) [Rogers, 1994], etc.

It should be mentioned that the main subject of research by personologists is mentally healthy, mature and creative talented representative of the mankind. Their main peculiarity from other people is in the continuous development and active attitude to surrounding world.

Thus, F. Allport in the structure of personality distinguishes the central motivational stimulating sphere, which consists of two levels of activity: motivation of need and highest motives – aspiration for development. So, the search for constant tension, resistance to balance, and homeostasis are the characteristic features for motives of development. The motives for development stipulate the system of purposes, directed in the future, which realization requires and assists to development of new possibilities at human.

So, personality is a process for continuous establishment of human, directed to the future. Namely: formation of new motives is the process for transformation of ways for activity, its purposes and motives. The condition for self-development of human namely is in the mechanism for transformation of motives into the ways of that activity.

A. Maslou proves that the sociality of human – requirement of its nature that people have the need in communication, love, respect, interconnectedness, which due to their nature acquire the form of “instinctoid similarity”. That is they are solely “humanoid” needs. The basal needs include physiological drives, need in safety and

protection, love, respect and self-actualization of human. Dissatisfaction of basal need causes to diseases: neuroses and psychoses.

Meta-motivational level – needs in the truth, good and beauty, justice, unity – is built upon the level of basal needs. In opinion of A. Maslow the needs in self-actualization start functioning only after all other needs are satisfied.

The study of creative peculiarities gave the grounds for important conclusion: the leading property among different properties of people, inclined to “self-actualization”, is the instruction for concentration not on own person, not on solely individual interests but high public purposes.

Such people are characterized by feeling of guilt, anxiety but they worry not about their own destiny. The external freedom is less important for them than internal one.

The central idea of K. Roger’s concept is that the ratio of:

- 1) real content of personality,
- 2) notion of human about itself – about own “I” and
- 3) about own ideal “I”, about the type of personality, which it wishes to become, reflect the real structure of personality.

The discrepancies in these notions result in neuroses and sufferings of people. It has the uneasiness, feeling of anxiety, vulnerability, which becomes as painful as the need to change the opinion about itself for better ripens. K. Rogers, while studying the discrepancies of real possibilities, wishes and feelings of human and its “ideal I”, called this state as “a condition of value”. It is the conformity to public assessment, social significant of personality.

Theory of human behavioral growth by P.P. Blonskyy

In our country the founder for systematic study on a circle of phenomena that constitute the subject of psychological research is P.P. Blonskyy [Blonskyy, 1964]. He wrote “Essay on scientific psychology” that represents a stenographic course on psychology, read by P.P. Blonskyy to students in Academy of social education in

1920-1921. We briefly formulate the main, principal provisions of the new course on scientific psychology, suggested by P.P. Blonskyy.

The long and uneasy prehistory for spiritual (philosophical) development of author stood behind the position, formulated in the "Essay". "A circle of reading on social science for advanced youth in my time, – remembers Blonskyy about students' years, which spent at historical philosophical faculty in Kyiv university in 1902-1907, – was rather uniform, i.e. everyone read approximately the same materials.

First of all they were books on sociology" [Blonskyy, 1964]. Let's start from the main things.

What constitutes the subject of the new psychology, which excluded the concept of soul (as a game at fantasy of metaphysical psychology) and consciousness as a recurrence of rational psychology that dragged all the same spiritual structures about soul in veiled form of so-called "spiritual" abilities, the highest of which is "intellect" under this term, from the sphere of its scientific research?

The subject of psychology is "behavior of living beings". What differs a living being from non-living one? Originality of motions. The totality of these original motions constitutes the behavior of living being. The behavior consists of elements as the main motions of this being. The connection of motions expresses what it is accepted to call "deed", "character", "action", i.e. behavior.

As psychology cannot be limited by description and its task is to determine the causal nexus, it contains the task for determination of source, dynamics of behavior depending on some or other conditions for its realization. The concept of function, accepted in Mathematics, is the way to express this dependence.

Thus, the study on behavior of living being in its functional dependence is the subject of scientific psychology.

What prompts a psychologist to study the behavior? The role of the latter in the whole vital activity of human is obvious. The study on determination of behavior opens the wide horizons of understanding, management and self-management of human psychics. The scientific psychology hereby prepares the ground for "establishment of real philosophy for correct behavior".

The study of this issue is not reduced to the field of only human behavior. It contains the behavior of animals (animal psychology), child (pedology) and insane person (Pathopsychology). To counterbalance the former psychology that studied a human in its static, the scientific psychology considers the behavior as a variable phenomenon and thus its task is to disclose the reasons for this variability.

As any phenomenon is a function of time, then human behavior shall also be studied in its time succession, starting from child behavior. But it is not enough.

Putting the question about origin of human behavior, which is included into social life, the answer for it should be sought in the treatment of society that surrounds it, which function it is.

But the social behavior is changed with time, so, the behavior of a certain human may become understandable only in the terms of historical development of social development (“We substitute the sky with the society, and the God – with the ancestors”). Having put the study of human behavior into connection with its history, psychology, hereby, assimilates to natural science: having the behavior of living beings as its subject, it becomes a part of natural science.

Hence, similar to evolutionary method in natural science, psychology defines its way for study of behavior in time – genetic one – and becomes thereby a genetic psychology.

Thus, “scientific psychology studies the behavior as a process that is changed in time as a totality of motions, original for living beings” [Blonskyy, 1964].

How is the development of behavior represented in ontogenesis according to accepted genetic (evolutionary) point of view?

The initial peculiarity for any living being is the excitability (irritability). The excitability as the inner source for behavior is the result from active processes (“fermentation”) that take place in human organism using original substances (enzymes). Their activity stipulates the activity of living being.

Having the physiological (biochemical) grounds, the concept of activity completely rejects archaic notions about soul as a source for self-activity of organism.

The genetically initial form (kind) of activity is the biochemical regulation at the level of tropisms (“motion from” and “motion to”); successive complication in organization of living being (development of analyzer systems) leads to appearance of distinction in mechanisms for unconditioned-reflexive level and conditioned connections that appear (conditioned reflexes), provide with functioning of instincts (inherited mechanism) and habits (as a result from repeated motions and exercises), accordingly.

More complex behavior (in the form of groups of motions) arises at the stage of public connection (communication of two individuals during acquisition of food, hunting, act of reproduction) in the form of parasitism, toadyism, symbiosis.

The highest form for behavior of living being in community is the regulation of behavior through inheritance and coordination.

What is the difference, how is the originality of human motions as a living being expressed, what is the place for its behavior in the abovementioned evolutionary row? Where does the discrepancy in treatment of human and animal starts if the human society is only the highest form for animal society? The answer to this question is complicated by Blonsky's understanding of human essence.

“Human is an animal. As any animal, it differs with excitability and activity. As an animal, it distinguishes the impressions, reacts to some of them in a different way, the behavior at humans, as at animals, consist mainly of instinctive and causal motions, hereby the first place is occupied by instincts of nutrition, protection and reproduction. As an animal, a human is a social being and its behavior differs with imitateness and social mutual adaptation. At last, the highest mental acts at human, as at animals, are reduced to conditioned reflexes [Blonsky, 1964].

And further: “In behavior of human there is the same regularity as in treatment of any mechanism, any machine” [Blonsky, 1964].

Where the border (or its mark) between a human and animal is if the evolution of individual is represented in the uniform stream of organic life: deployment of genotypic features pursuant to biogenetical law and assimilation of environment through

displacement (change, suppression, disappearance) of inborn impulses (tendencies)?

Is not it a very large price for the third place – immediately after sheep and monkey, – re-conquered by Blonsky for human in evolution at the expense of consciousness that indulgently yields to the former psychology? Was Blonsky so naïve when he imagined that the initial point for education of child is its consciousness and the content of learning is the development of the same consciousness?

The originality of human is in upright posture and developed first finger that adds the content to definition: “Human is an animal that has hands with developed first finger. Hence, human is an animal that uses tools” [Blonsky, 1964].

Further the development of breathing organs led to appearance of voice and then distinct language. “Human became an animal that speaks”.

In addition to more expressed mimicry, pantomimicry and gesticulation than at animals, a human is distinguished from the world of animals with distinct language! The production of tools and their use in cooperation with the ones like itself puts the mark on human behavior, hereby to that extent, to which it corresponds to the character of divided work (farming, hunting, etc.).

The concretization of provision about social conditionality of human behavior (“weighing from social point of view”) contains the definition for: a) place of individual in public production, b) its social class and group, c) work, d) entertainment and games, e) conditions (technical, economical, legal and ideological), f) place and time of its activity. If you want to learn and to understand a human behavior, find out first of all about its social status”.

Thus, at the same time the scientific psychology is the social psychology and the behavior is transformed into function of organism and surrounding (social) environment.

So, “studying the behavior, which is changed in time as a process, and extending the limits of that time to history of the mankind, and, further, to history of the whole animal world, the psychology expands to the social psychology and biopsychology.

Psychology is the special science which in a wider meaning is a part of biology (science about life)” [Blonskyy, 1964].

We will finish the line of theoretical reconstruction for main positions of author of “Essay about scientific psychology” with that definition as a kind of resume of abovementioned program for construction of the new psychology, and we will return to our initial statement of question about conformity of logics of ideas to logics of things or subject and research method.

What sphere of reality is represented in this subject of psychological science, or otherwise – acts as an object of psychology as an independent scientific discipline?

P.P. Blonskyy formulates it maximally clear – “life as a social phenomenon”. Social phenomenon, as we see above, is the act for communication of two individuals – from rotifers to human – that is carried out using natural mechanisms for regulation.

The object of psychology, thus, becomes the definite sphere of research of physiology, by a known stretch – physiology of the higher nervous activity.

The projection of this object into the sphere of subject is added only with the feature that points out to the activity (“living being”) of object and the level of its organization, which is expressed in the form of single or complex motions (“behavior”). Motion becomes the main unit for analysis of behavior and its explanatory principle.

Thus, P.P. Blonskyy transformed the provision about motion as a way for existence of substance into subject of psychology. Having correctly distinguished the form for motion of substance – from self-motion to social form, Blonskyy did not see any qualitative originality between them and transformed them in strict accordance with evolutionary scheme, into successive number of changes, which are complicated from single muscle motion to motion of thought.

P.P. Blonskyy did not exceed the limits of mechanical determinism in interpretation of substance exclusively as a natural scientific category. Thus, the concept of substance is restricted by its substantial (biological) prescription with inherent properties of living substance to the latter, located in continuum from simple to very high excitability. The sample for “very developed substance”, or, the same,

“very excitable living substance”, is nerves. It is not important to whom they belong – a womb or human: “From this point of view it is surprising to speak about contrast between psychics and substance: the nervous-psychical namely is the developed substantial, if we can tell in such words, substance in cube” [Blonsky, 1964]. There is in fact nothing surprising in this definition at such understanding the substance and motion.

As in research methods that seek for solution of the first task in psychology – description of main motions (elements) and relations between them “in their functional dependences on different conditions”.

Let’s follow how and using what means the solution of abovementioned task is achieved, by the way, by general scientific methods that do not pretend to special psychological sovereignty and oneness. Simple observation. What is observed?

Elements (actions) of external behavior (motion) that are stipulated by internal processes (internal motions), which appear, in their turn, as reactions to peculiarities of surroundings. The data about frequency, amount and main elements of motion may be received with absence of prejudice and with availability of elementary attentiveness and premeditated plan of observation.

What does the observation experiment (active, experimental, experienced)? What constitutes the subject of experimental observation, or simpler: to which questions does the experiment answer? There are two of them: “How many times and how long”. No matter it would be: tiredness, memory, attention, game, sleep – everything will be measured and expressed in the form of correlative relation. Mental working capacity (mobility, speed of thought) and tiredness (number and intensity of motions), internal language (as internal motion) and motion of internal organs because “there are no such short-lived thoughts and motions, which, generally speaking, could not be changed chronologically: only technical complications are possible” [Blonsky, 1964].

The registration of motion of head, shoulder, body, hands, fingers and motion of internal organs – heart, breathing organs, vascular reactions – shall lead to the integral picture of behavior through their

correlative relation, and further the discovery of “relation of different relations” provides what we call “I” of human.

The limitedness of experiment shall be added by questionnaire method but are only added because any scientific meaning is not given to questionnaire method except the function for specification of results from individual observation by collective judgments of experts.

The portion of questionnaire method shares the method of self-analysis. Rejecting “wild study about infallibility of self-observation”, we leave only “a drop of truth” for us from this method. What does it represent? It represents that “internal motions, characteristic for human behavior, for example, so-called internal language, are difficult of access for objective observation” [Blonskyy, 1964].

And although these internal motions always find their expression – as a change in color or face in words – the question about use of self-observation is not removed. Moreover, Blonskyy did not specify the content that remained after introspective method of “drop” with the simultaneous acknowledgement of function for regulation of behavior due to internal language.

He compels the attention to this mysterious “difficultness of access” that got up on the way for objective process of registration and measurement of all motions that were met until this moment.

This problem is solved through transformation of internal motions into relation, produced once again by organism. All external influences (impressions) and the one that makes them “most essential” for regulation of behavior – the one that we “understand” as their “meaning” are transformed into organic relation. Attributing the function of attribution to states of organism and the role of transponder of feelings, produced by these states – to a subject, P.P. Blonskyy had only to divert suspicions in use of “old concepts” – and he makes it. “There is nothing more erroneous than to identify comprehension with so-called consciousness” [Blonskyy, 1964].

In a like manner he interprets thinking that “at closer consideration is found to be a usual mixture of visual excitations (periphery and not periphery), “internal words”, motional reactions and tensions, internal excitations.

To think means to see (by eyes or only by center), to speak about yourself, to test internal excitation, to strain yourself and to react. Comparing thinking with comprehension, where there are also usual visual impressions, motional reactions and words, we find out that these processes are homogeneous. To think means to comprehend the meaning of any impression.

“A thought is the excited thinking”. Thinking is “one of varieties for conditioned reflex”. The problem on method of self-analysis is removed, the way to objective analysis of behavior is again straight, and the perspective is in fact cloudless.

There is one more to mention. To mention the way for research of our “I”. Let’s remind that human “I” is the social “I”, it means a human that lives in the society. A human individual is the social product but not an abstract social unit and is not abstract as extra social individuality but rather a concrete product from active and variable human environment that influences of it, on which it reacts with adaptation and assimilation, “inheritance” [Blonskyy, 1964].

We will not be attracted completely by modern content of this provision that however requires the adequate research approach to it. Personality is in fact the same organism, the same living being that posses its inherent biophysical characteristics (stature, weight, bodily structure, mimicry, etc.), and a set of motions, produced by nervous centers.

Hence there appears the hope by Blonskyy that at the time of full bloom of science for psychologist there will occur the moment when he/she will be able to describe (i.e. forecast) all actions of human pursuant to comprehensive information about localization of corresponding centers of excitation. The motion of scientist’s thought is directed to the side of frank naturalism, supported by irreproachable logics and methodical procedure for psychological (!) research. The reason for this is the refusal from consciousness.

Notwithstanding the necessity, with which Blonskyy came to distinction of the core – consciousness (comprehension and meaning) in the structure of human behavior, the scientist did not consider the influence of those transformed (socio-symbolic) forms for activity on regulation of behavior and activity of personality.

Having entered to the problem in psychology of consciousness (due to objective content of those central concepts in psychology and philosophy) and stopped to the problem of “reasoning”, Blonsky failed, even with support on the correct reference point (“opposition of meanings and contents in consciousness of individuals” [Kopnin, 1974], to work out the heuristic presentation about nature and essence of consciousness as the highest form for the psychical.

The essence of specific human ability to change and to transform the reality relates to the consciousness but not to “internal cerebral transformations”, no matter how important they would be.

The role of consciousness and sign-symbolic forms for representation of reality in establishment and development of specific human forms for interaction with reality was disclosed by another famous psychologist, contemporary of P.P. Blonsky, now recognized classic of national psychology – Lev Semenovych Vygotsky.

Cultural historical theory of development by L.S. Vygotsky

The principle for development was the methodological foundation for national psychology in 20-30-ies of XX century. The leading role in formation of paradigm for historical cultural development of human psychics was played by works of M.Ya. Basov, P.P. Blonsky, L.S. Vygotsky. The contribution of the latter into theory and history of world and national psychological science is difficult to overestimate.

Lev Semenovych Vygotsky is a key figure in psychology of XX century, his creative influence extends to a great number of humanitarian sciences: from psychology and semiotics to study of art and linguistics. Among many theories and concepts, created by scientist, we are interested in theory of cultural historical development of higher psychical functions, which basics were developed at the very beginning of his career [Vygotsky, 1991, 1982, 1983, 1982a, 1983a, 1991a].

The Second all-Russian congress of psychologists (1924) was also marked by discover of “Vygotsky’s phenomenon”. At this

congress L.S. Vygotsky made the report “Methodology of reflexogenic and psychological research” (published in 1926), with which, according to the words by A.N. Leontyev, “made the strong impression on N.K. Kornilov” (until that time N.K. Kornilov was already the director in Psychological institute). The latter one invited Vygotsky to the staff of scientific workers in the largest psychological establishment in the country.

How did a reporter, unknown to psychological audience, who had rather a modest list of publications with obvious humanitarian orientation, fascinate the head of the new psychology? First of all by initial position for theoretical reasoning of subject of reflexology as a science that firmly believed that it had found the key to secrets of human behavior. Namely:

- a) registration of data from laboratory experiment with all diligence;
- b) objectively irreproachable fact in terms of requirements, accepted in natural science’
- c) production of conditioned reflex relation in human at known number of irritations in some or other areas of reflex apparatus. The name of fact is connective reflex, sphere of fact’s action – behavior, principle for explanation of fact – closure.

The relation is universal, comprehensive and indisputable. The relation is visible, accessible for observation, reproduced, quantitatively described. The dynamics and number of connections, multiplied by unit of world energy constitute the mechanism for human behavior and say last “farewell!” to the gravestone of agonizing psychology, solemnly erected by reflexologists.

What prevented the reflexology to pass from declarations to demonstration of samples from scientific (i.e. reflexogenic) study and explanation of mechanisms for human behavior “as an active figure in the environment?” impossibility to show the original procedure for reflexogenic experiment that would not include the traditional methods of psychology (instruction, survey of experimental subjects, correction for verbal report, etc.). What is the principal difference in reflexogenic method of cognition and the analogous one at

psychologists, if the methods of the former, no matter how they would be hidden in stockade of reflexogenic terminology, the essence of method of others? The same subject, the same methods but there are two sciences.

What prevents them from merging?

The answer to this question may be found only if to address to initial theoretical postulates of reflexology. It seemed that a certain difference in methodology of experimentation in both sciences is insignificant for reflexology but determinative for psychology, is transformed and passed by L.S. Vygotsky into its initial point – to question about nature of the psychical.

The reflexogenic research shall acknowledge and legalize the psychological methods (surveys), if it wishes to remain within the subject (human behavior). The speech act is the secondary reflex (super reflex); human behavior is defined not only by external motor (complete, finally defined) but delayed (half-inhibited, broken) reflexes. The latter ones constitute the significant form of behavior. According to definition by L.S. Vygotsky the inhibited motions are the psychics.

Hence the task for scientific psychology of behavior is to research the mechanisms for establishment and forms for interaction of reflexes that join into integral systems.

The interaction of those systems is based on mechanisms for mutual reflection, according to which the effect part at the same time becomes the affect part (a word, being heard – irritant, a word, being told – reflex that creates the same irritant).

Being objective, i.e. following to the laws for formation of conditioned reflexes, the mechanism for this relation opens the possibility to understand the verbal reports by test person. The means for objective fixation of the psychical (not detected group of reflexes) is the indirect method (“lightning” as the association for word “thunder” is the objectivation of non-detected reflex) providing that, in fact, if possible there is the comprehensive recording of the whole procedure for survey up to “recording of each sound”.

When the possibility for registration (delayed reflexes) is proved by indirect method, the reflexology has the dilemma: either to

acknowledge the psychics as the reality that is achieved by objective (indirect) method, and, thus, providing that there are social (linguistic) irritants, to transform in psychological science, or to acknowledge the psychics as epiphenomenon and to get to position of agnosticism.

As V.M. Bekhterev assumes, even if in the faraway future with a great number of warnings, the possibility for reflexology to master the subjective sphere, then the occupied positions is the expression of dualism.

According to L.S. Vygotsky the way to overcome the dualism is in merging of reflexology and psychology into one science about behavior as “it is impossible to study a human behavior without psychics as reflexology wants to do it, as well as to study the psychics without behavior. So, here there is no place for different sciences” [Vygotsky, 1991a].

Which theoretically possible premises could constitute the basis for such merging?

They are the interrelations of basis and superstructure. Hereby the consciousness as real, doubtless fact, being available for objective (experimental) study, should be considered of top priority in superstructure as “the consciousness is the correlative activity inside the organism itself, inside the nervous system, correlative activity of human body with itself” [Vygotsky, 1982].

Thus, the synthesis, even if at the expense of acknowledgement of consciousness in the form of function for nervous tension, but only to return the trampled by reflexologists is the consciousness. The naïve reviewer from the camp of reflexologist saw the insolent attempt of psychologist for its (reflexogenic) subject in appeal by Vygotsky for merging. In 1924 reflexology received perhaps its most talented apologist into its rows.

The first attempt by L.S. Vygotsky to resuscitate the problem of consciousness for psychology turned out to be unsuccessful. However the resolution and fearlessness of the first speech in presence of reflexology master predicted much. The main task, on which Vygotsky worked, was to understand the psychics, which is developed as a process. Vygotsky deeply realized the restriction,

“methodological infertility” and practical helplessness of his modern psychology.

The nature of development, growth and formation of child’s psychics, peculiarities that move the mechanisms for this evolution, essence of educational influence, as before, remained not described and dark, bypassed with silence in the psychology, or opaque, empty words were used to tell about them.

Vygotsky thought that the reason for such situation was the dogma of traditional psychology, according to which the only way to study the psychical phenomena was their introspective comprehension and the only possibility for scientific understanding their psychical was its direct prescription.

However, all psychologists saw the shortcomings and defects of psychological concepts that existed. Namely such situation defined the realization of available deep crisis in psychology.

But the peculiarity for Vygotsky’s scientific approach was that he was not limited by analysis of psychological theories or concrete facts and made the special methodological work for definition of philosophical basics for each theory. The analysis for philosophical concepts, realized in some or other theory, allowed him not only making the critical analysis of crisis in psychology but performing the constructive work in establishment of psychological theory.

The special great role in development of Vygotsky’s opinions was played by his polemics with concept by famous Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget that until now is the classical sample for constructive criticism.

We will not fix upon all aspects of this polemics but will pay the main attention to movement of Vygotsky from methodology to theory and method.

Having analyzed the works by Piaget, Vygotsky mentions that “extraction of new facts, scientific culture of psychological fact... constitutes undoubtedly the strongest side in research by Piaget” [Vygotsky, 1983a] and that the main role in this direction was played by new method of research – clinical. Namely the clinical method, in opinion of Vygotsky, connects all researches by Piaget together and allows imaging their integral picture.

While analyzing the philosophical methodological positions by Piaget, Vygotsky mentioned that “his (Piaget – S.M.) initial idea for concept is the provision that the primary form of thinking, stipulated by psychological nature of child itself, is the autistic form” [Vygotsky, 1983a].

Further L.S. Vygotsky distinguishes the methodological roots for this position, mentioning that the main idea is the expression of methodological instruction of researcher, as well as the instruction is the manifestation of his philosophical concept. The inner logics of philosophical concept implicitly contain the logics for construction of psychological concrete psychological theory and the logics for construction of research method, i.e. ways to receive empirical material and its theoretical execution.

Having revealed the main methodological position by Piaget as the aspiration “to study a substance of child that assimilates the influence of social environments and deforms them according to its own laws” [Vygotsky, 1983a], Vygotsky further discloses “the philosophy of the whole research by Piaget” and shows how logics of this philosophical concept defines the method of research, i.e. functional genetic method, developed by Piaget [Vygotsky, 1983a].

Vygotsky’s analysis of Piaget’s theory includes some stages:

- a) definition of philosophical concept, initial idea and methodological approach;
- b) analysis of inner logics for theoretical approach in terms of initial philosophical concept;
- c) analysis of research method in terms of its adequacy both as a subject of research and philosophical methodological basis;
- d) interpretation of received empirical data in terms of methodological principles within theoretical construct, and, hereby, establishment of scientific fact.

This scheme is universal for Vygotsky because it was only the means for analysis but the way for construction of own theory. As Vygotsky saw his task not just in construction of any concrete psychological theory but in establishment of principally new psychology on the basis of philosophy, then he considered the

necessity in definition of philosophical position and development of methodological instruction as a top priority task.

The initial moment for conscious suggestion that defines all theoretical constructions by Vygotsky was the desire to create the psychology on the basis of dialectical materialism. Almost all researchers mentioned this fact.

We pay our attention to this suggestion by Vygotsky in order to emphasize that before him it meant not only that conceptual apparatus of psychology shall be built on the dialectical logics. Psychology as independent science for Vygotsky acted as the one, interwoven into philosophical knowledge, as experimental philosophy. He himself expressed this position very clearly: “The approach of psychological researches with philosophical problems, the attempt in the process of psychological research directly to develop the issues that are of top priority for a number of philosophical problems, and, on the contrary, the ones that depend philosophical understanding due to their statement and permission, runs through the whole modern research” [Vygotsky, 1983a]. The conscious address to philosophy and dialectical logics defines the theoretical and experimental researches by L.S. Vygotsky.

The top priority and vital task for establishment of Marxist psychology at that time put Vygotsky to necessity in definition of philosophical suggestion for development of concrete psychological theory. It was the concept for practice of human. This philosophical suggestion in relation to concrete psychological research acts at him in the role of explanatory principle.

In the structure of a single act of human activity Vygotsky saw “the subject that plays the role of object, to which the act of behavior is directed that solves some or other task, set to personality” [Vygotsky, 1983a], “the subject that plays the role of means with the help of which we direct and perform psychological operations, necessary for solution of the task” [Vygotsky, 1983a], and result from solution of the tasks.

The act of behavior may be directed to the behavior itself as an object. The result from such act will be the mastery of own psychological operations.

Vygotsky called this act of behavior as “the instrumental act”. Mastering own behavior is carried out at the expense of the fact that there is a new middle member – psychological tool that became a structural center of the new method, being adequate to this problem, between the object and psychological operation, directed to it.

The general analysis of the work by Vygotsky about establishment of causal genetic method is described in literature rather weakly. We paid attention to some key moments in Vygotsky’s concept, which may be formulated by his words in the following manner:

“The history of personality development may be covered by some main laws that have already been prompted to all by our previous research. The first law of development and construction of the highest psychical functions... may be called the law of transition from direct, natural forms and ways of behavior to indirect, artificial psychological functions, arisen in the process of cultural development...

The second law may be formulated in the following manner: considering the history on development of the highest psychical functions ... we find that the highest psychical functions appear from collective social forms of behavior. The third law is connected with the second one and may be formulated as the law for transition of functions from outside to inside” [Vygotsky, 1982a].

And further Vygotsky mentions: “Not stopping on further process for this transition from outside to inside, we can tell that it is the general destiny of all highest psychical functions and we saw that namely this transition to inside constitute the main content for development of those functions...” [Vygotsky, 1981a].

Let’s distinguish the main ideas for psychological concept by L.S. Vygotsky that relate, in particular, with abovementioned statements.

Firstly, it is the suggestion as a central problem in formation of the highest psychical functions.

Secondly, the study on origin of the highest psychical functions, their genesis (“in order to melt each dependence and petrified psychological form, to transform it in such one that moves, current stream of individual moments that replace each other”).

Thirdly, instrumental set, i.e. recording how the mastery of psychological tools and (through its mediation) by its own psychological function occurs.

Fourthly, advancement of interiorization as the most important mechanism for reconstruction of psychological activity.

Fifthly, understanding interiorization as a process for transition from joint to individual activity [Vygotsky, 1981a].

These five main moments allowed Vygotsky constructing the principal scheme for method, which he called “instrumental one” that could not only perform the descriptive genetic analysis but to fulfill “causal genetic” analysis, i.e. to disclose the real determination for establishment of psychological processes despite further removal of intermediate stages of formation in finite forms.

In this connection Vygotsky wrote: “The instrumental method provides with the principle and the way for psychological study of child, it can use any methodology, i.e. technical method of research: experiment, observation, etc.” [Vygotsky, 1981a].

It means that the author for concept of forming experiment himself considered his developed method as a theoretical principle for construction of concrete research methodologies. Along with L.S. Sakharov L.S. Vygotsky, based on provisions, suggested by him, developed the concrete methodology of research for such highest psychological function as thinking.

L.S. Vygotsky indicated the main purpose of such researches, which starts from idea about development of word meaning as a unity of language and thinking. The basis for formation of concepts in Vygotsky-Sakharov methodology was the mastery of course for own psychological processes using the functional usage of word or symbol.

The forming experiment in the form, used by Vygotsky, allowed revealing the essence of genetic process for formation of concepts in scientific form.

For the first time the psychologists received the key for true understanding the real process for development of concepts, how it occurs in real life of child.

Thus, the merger of ideas about development with idea about experimental formation of psychical process took place in creativity of L.S. Vygotsky.

Methodologically grounded provisions about activity as an explanatory principle for cognition and evolution, as a general law about development, were intersected in psychological method (as theories) and methodology (as realization of this theory). Thus, there appeared the method that received the name of forming experiment.

The forming experiment, or, as Vygotsky called casual genetic instrumental method, allowed describing the genesis of psychical formations using the study about establishment of activity, preset in the experiment. Hereby Vygotsky's causal genetic method was not the derived method of research, suggested by N. Akhom.

The merit of L.S. Vygotsky was in organization of subjective "instrumental" action of test person. It provided with the key for explanation of the act, developed due to composition, construction and way of activity. According to words by A.R. Luria, Vygotsky "put forward the problem of means that organize the psychical processes to the foreground of psychological research", having grounded that "the main subject of psychological research ... is the study for construction of human psychical activity in its development and disintegration" [Luria, 1974].

The forming experiment is in fact the realization of pragmatist approach to research of procedural part for formation of psychical functions. That's why this method firstly and later found the wide application in educational psychology in those cases when it is necessary to "look into" inside educational activity or separate mastered actions or their ways.

Unlike traditional view on the psychics, Vygotsky puts forward the historical approach that was mostly vivid shown already in his idea about mediacy of psychical function by so-called "psychological tools".

Understanding psychics as a historical product defined the necessity in establishment of adequate – historical – method of its study.

Thus, it was found the instrumental method, defined by Vygotsky himself as historical genetic one. “The instrumental method is a way for research of behavior and its development using the disclosure of psychological tools in treatment and structure of instrumental acts, established by them” [Vygotsky, 1981a].

Characterizing the instrumental method and emphasizing its peculiarities from “monoatomic”, “elementary” way for study of psychics, Vygotsky puts the analysis of process to the first place; hereby the main task of this analysis, in his opinion, is the genetic renewal of all moments for development of this process. The new opinion on nature of the psychical and its research assumes the new method.

The object and method of study closely interrelate in theory by L.S. Vygotsky. Hereby, the search for the method simultaneously becomes the prerequisite, tool and result of research. Historians of psychology noted Vygotsky’s opposition of genetic method, directed to cognition of casual dynamic basics for behavior, to phenomenological (descriptive) method.

The structural unity of genetic approach was established by three most important directions: analysis of process but not of a thing, disclosure of real causal dynamic connections and relations and, strictly speaking, genetic analysis.

The instrumental method by Vygotsky is not in the same row with usual psychological methods of observation or experiment; in fact it is an original approach to study of the psychical that arises from understanding the nature and essence of test person itself. First of all it is the methodological principle and it was developed by L.S. Vygotsky namely in such capacity. The author himself, characterizing the instrumental method, mentioned that he “provides with the principle and the way for psychological study of child, this method can use as the methodology, i.e. technical way of research: experiment, observation, etc.” [Vygotsky, 1981a].

We cannot tell that Vygotsky was the first and the only psychologist, who offered to study the psychics in its development. However before and in addition to Vygotsky the study on

development of psychics was made in the form of actual mortification of development itself.

In particular, the level for development and behavior of child, state of certain psychical functions was measured in different age, and then they tried to renew the general picture of development due to separate results that provided with discrete meaning on age axis. In opinion of Vygotsky, the hypothesis about mediacy of psychics by psychological tools allowed overcoming with shortcomings of this method.

On the one hand, the hypothesis about mediacy, on which basis the historical genetic method (in modern formulation – experimental genetic or genetic modeling method) was based, was nothing else but the form for introduction of dialectical method into psychology, or speaking by Vygotsky's words, the system “of mediate, concrete concepts, applied to the scope of this science” [Vygotsky, 1983a].

On the other hand, the explanatory force can receive only such method, which allows as if duplicating the development. The origin of such method became possible as a result from mutual assimilation of two most important theoretical ideas for Soviet psychology – genetic principle and principle for objective experimental study of psychics.

In opinion of Vygotsky, the principle of development became the initial one for explanation of process in the whole and its each separate moment. The key to full understanding of real process for development is the experiment that allows disclosing the essence of genetic process.

The method that allows studying the development at Vygotsky is his experimental stimulation that at the same time does not reflect the real genetic process for development in mirror-like form. The ratio between actual, real development and development of test person (through its recreation) is the same as between the logical and historical: the logical is the historical, released from its historical form and from historical cases that infringe the coordination of statement, and in this connection it enables studying any moment for development in its classical form.

Thus, the only methodologically correct way to study the psychical development, according to Vygotsky, is the experimental

genetic study and the main task for separate psychological discipline – psychological study – is the task for approach of the morphological and the functional, experimental and genetic analyses.

The instrumental method by Vygotsky, which is interpreted as the methodological principle, has the meaning far beyond any concrete sphere of psychology. In its essence it is the basis for so-called “general psychology” – an average chain between philosophy and partial psychology. It was put namely in such function into basis for research of educational psychology.

The experimental genetic method, grounded by Vygotsky as the methodological principle for study of psychics, appeared to be a constituting factor that united a number of researches by Soviet psychologists, in so-called “line of Vygotsky”. As K.A. Budilova, it existed and was developed in three plans: philosophical theoretical, ontogenetic and educational psychology [Budilova, 1979].

We may leave aside the conditionality of such structural division (development of psychics is impossible outside study – in the wide content), thus, the ontogenetic plan and plan of educational psychology are connected, they both receive the scientific psychological status, only being theoretically grounded.

Let’s consider now the study about stage-by-stage formation of mental actions, which was developed by P.Ya. Galperin and forms the core for “line of Vygotsky” in educational psychology.

The main task for theory of stage-by-stage formation of mental actions was to study the construction and interiorization of activity. “We assume that, – wrote P.Ya. Galperin, – all psychical functions are the final products... from mastery of a certain number of actions at solution of definite kind of tasks. These actions in their initial and main form are in fact practical, subjective ... the development of psychical functions always start from formation of corresponding external actions” [Galperin, 1976].

Such theoretical suggestion meant the acknowledgement of process for formation as the main means for both of development and study of the psychical.

The characteristic feature for understanding the process for formation of mental actions is its identity with pedagogical practice.

“The pedagogical process is the actual reality for formation and development of psychics: outside this process it cannot be understood due to its origin or its content or its nature” [Galperin, 1976].

Here we may have double interpretation for such identification of pedagogical practice and scientific psychological method:

- a) formation should be understood so that it shall be built due to type of real pedagogical process, being the method for scientific study of psychics in its primary meaning;
- b) the pedagogical practice itself, not stopping performing its primary learning educational functions, is interpreted as a method.

Both these explanations are equal in terms of possibility for their use in scientific research activity in psychology. But their peculiarities in terms of theoretical searches by researcher in the first case are observed in internal peculiarities and laws for development of psychological knowledge, and in the second case – in the needs of the social (in this aspect – pedagogical) practice and their determinative influence on development of science. Thus, the object of formation in researches by Galperin and his colleagues were mental actions.

In opinion of P.Ya. Galperin, the main line for psychological study of mental actions “shall consist not only of statement how different individuals perform actions in different conditions and of clarification and construction of such system for conditions, which recording not only provides but compels ... to act correctly and only correctly, in necessary form and with preset indices” [Galperin, 1963]. This defines the main task for researches by P.Ya. Galperin – to clear out how it is necessary to perform the formation of actions in the process of study “in order to achieve a preset sample with the least expenses and with the best indices” [Galperin, 1963].

This task at its consideration in the plane of research method is transformed into the issue about structure and organization of experimental formation of mental actions.

The process for formation of mental actions, in opinion of Galperin, passes through five stages:

- 1) clarification of oriented basis for action;
- 2) formation of action in material or materialized form;
- 3) formation of action that is expressed in vocal language;
- 4) formation of action that is expressed in external language about itself;
- 5) formation of action that is expressed in internal language.

Thus, the formation of mental action is the successive interiorization of action that testifies to the fact that the main line of changes, which are observed at transition from previous stage to the next one. The main thing in formation of mental action, according to Galperin, is the formation of its oriented part, on which the character and successfulness of action itself directly depends.

One of the main results, received by Galperin and his colleagues, was the detection of three types for oriented basis for action.

The oriented basis of the first type includes the samples or action itself or its product. Hereby, a pupil does not receive any instructions how to perform a certain action and the search for correct way of actions is carried out through trial and errors.

The mental action, formed by such manner, is characterized by relative instability, disorganization under new conditions of activity. And the main index for mental development – ability to use available knowledge under new conditions (transfer) – in this case is approached to zero.

The oriented basis of the second type, in addition to samples of actions and their products, contains the detailed instructions how correctly to perform an action. The transfer to the new tasks is possible for the action, formed by such manner, however only in that case when they contain the elements of old ones. The ability of independent action in the new situations does not appear here as at oriented basis of the first type.

The oriented basis of the third type is directed not to the learning with the way of action under a certain situation but to analysis of the task itself. Separate objects, with which a pupil deals, are considered as separate cases of more general structure. The actions, formed at reliance on the third type of orientation, are characterized not only by stability to change conditions but virtually unlimited ability to transfer.

Numerous concrete researches showed that the stage-by-stage formation of mental actions may be considered as the management of learning process as its formation is almost completely determined. The determinants may include: succession of operations of which a new action consists, a full set of reference points for each of these operations, system of indications about how and in which order to use these reference points, and how to perform each operation.

As a result from stage-by-stage formation of mental actions, the regular learning to independent analysis of new task and conditions for its performance, based on some samples, as well as to establishment of necessary oriented basis for actions, is carried out.

There is no doubt that this significant step forward to the way to teaching pupils with independent performance of some operations; however the circle of the latter ones is to some extent limited by their similarity with that operation that is mastered at the beginning (on a certain sample), with exact performance of all instructions, received at work with sample in finished form.

Besides, until now it is not clear what the width of transfer of independently performed operations, mastered due to the third type of learning, is, as they are mastered according to concrete samples, suggested at the beginning of learning. Thus, it is the logical conclusion that the stage-by-stage formation of mental actions results in establishment of certain actions and in the plan of psychological new formations – in development of local abilities.

These researches were made within the framework of Vygotsky's main ideas, according to which the specific forms for human psychics since birth are not given but only preset as social samples. The development of those forms is carried out in the process for mastery of samples that occurs, in particular, during purposeful learning. The third type of orientation, according to Galperin, assumes such organization of learning activity, which is based on deep analysis of the phenomenon under research, understanding its place in the system of family phenomena, presentation about this concrete action as a variety of general way of action.

In opinion of V.V. Davydov [Davydov, 1996], it is necessary to have learning to generalized ways for mental actions of meaningful character, introduction of concepts from theoretical type.

The meaningful generalization, made by pupils, allows them discovering some laws, connections of some partial processes and phenomena inside a certain whole and disclosing its genesis.

The analysis of genetically initial, essential relation inside a test person in totality with abstraction and generalization of meaningful type leads to formation of theoretical concepts. The enrichment of pupils with theoretical knowledge is expressed in appearance of different ways for mental activity that are structurally united in learning activity. Here the historical genetic method by L.S. Vygotsky is concretized as genetic modeling one, where “a unit” of modeling is not a certain operation or action but the integral learning activity.

The conceptual principles for formation of integral activity are the ideas, according to which the general form for psychical development of child is its mastery of socially produced abilities through the special activity. The psychical development is here interpreted as the origin and formation of special activity of individual on reproduction of socially preset abilities in itself.

If the active actions of a school pupil with material under research played the main role in researches by P.Ya. Galperin, D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davydov put the independent setting of learning tasks by a pupil to the first place, and in this connection – those internal changes that occur in the psychics of pupils during learning activity.

It was reflected in the characteristics for the purpose and result of activity first of all as a change of acting subject, a pupil itself, given by D.B. Elkonin. “In the most general kind one can tell that this change is the acquisition of new abilities by child, i.e. new ways of actions with scientific concepts” [Elkonin, 1989].

The orientation of subject in learning not to the change of surrounding things and people but to self-change allows it mastering qualitatively new methods of orientation in the world, new abilities and, as a result, to develop own creative thinking, personality itself.

The learning activity may appear only when a child starts mastering the principles for theoretical attitude to reality, content of theoretical knowledge, and they are introduced into its life by modern school.

As V.V. Davydov [Davydov, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1997a] showed in his fundamental work “Kinds of generalization in learning”, the traditional learning in modern school leads to formation of empirical thinking at pupils, significantly slowing down the establishment of learning activity as a tool for self-development of pupil, its personal growth.

Thus, the possibility for formation of integral activity (learning) using theoretical generalization pursuant to convergence principle from abstract to concrete is proved by D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davydov in researches, built in the form of genetic modeling experiment or experimentally developing learning.

The experimental learning is the applied realization of historical genetic method by L.S. Vygotsky. The essence of this method, as we have already emphasized, is the study of conditions for origin of some or other psychical phenomenon and the experimental establishment of conditions for this origin.

The transition from methodological developments to concrete experimental researches, strictly speaking, the concretization of achievements in methodology at the level of separate researches is made in the form of original synthesis of psychological research with search and designing of efficient forms for learning educational process.

The practice of school learning educational process, becoming experimental, acquires the additional function – role of method for psychological pedagogical research that realizes the thought by S.L. Rubinstein about necessity “to learn a child, teaching it”.

Thus, the basis for the new method in developmental and pedagogical psychology is the original symbiosis of psychological research with pedagogical practice. At present moment this method has some names, among them we can remind of such ones as experimentally genetic or genetically modeling method, learning experiment, forming experiment, method for active formation of psychical qualities of personality, experimental learning, etc.

With some discrepancies, related to the level of research due to line methodology – method – practice, with accentuation of some or other moment in research, it should be acknowledged that in fact these names reflect the same. We, following to V.V. Davydov, think that the most adequate name that expresses the orientation of this method to designing and modeling the genesis of psychical phenomena, is “genetically modeling method of psychological research”.

This method in researches, which are based on concept about learning activity, is used in the form of designing experimental school programs and further long learning under these programs.

Experimental school programs are created according to such principles. The learning material is organized in the form of systematic (not concentric) courses, which content is subject to logics of discipline but not narrow requirements that arise from necessity to form the defined practical skills.

The content of academic subject is approached to modern state of science and the organization for mastery of knowledge by school children is built in the form of activity on solution of special learning tasks using specific learning actions.

The experimental learning due to systematically built curricula allows actively forming the psychical processes in school children. The systems of experimental tasks for diagnostics and control of stages and mechanisms for formed psychical phenomenon are developed in parallel.

Learning due to experimental curriculum, allowing approaching to more complete management for separate parts of learning activity, enables to study it as the mastery of not isolated concepts themselves but their system, tracing the tendencies in mental development of school children.

But the genetically modeling method is not reduced to designing experimental school programs. It is only its logical theoretical part, in which the designing of academic subject is carried out through reproduction of logics for its establishment and construction of system of concepts due to principle for their derivation from undeveloped concept (abstract) to developed one (concrete).

The special place in research of psychical development using genetically-modeling method is occupied by rendering of the corresponding system of actions and operations, adequate to generic activity, directed to form these concepts in the history of culture and generic ability as a result of their mastery during learning process, to logically built system of psychological concepts.

The establishment of composition for normative generic activity, on which basis the corresponding concepts are used, is the special research task, which general methods of solution have not finally been developed in psychology.

Some examples for concept about number and action of multiplication, researches on detection of content about phoneme and morpheme, concept about syntactic relation are provided in works by V.V. Davydov [Davydov, 1972, 1990], D.B. Elkonin [Elkonin, 1989], A.K. Markova [Markova, 1990], L.I. Aydarova [Aydarova, 1983]. The works of this cycle describe the structure of normative mental activity for solution of simple mathematical tasks through composition of symbolic formula formulas and equations.

The experimental construction of program stipulated the introduction of new methods for its mastery, which main peculiarity is that a teacher teaches children to do such actions with learning material, such its changes using which pupils on their own discover the properties under research. The tasks for availability, descriptions and use of such actions in school practice are the psychological didactical part of genetically-modeling method of research.

Thus, two main components may be distinguished in the structure of abovementioned method – let's call them conditionally preparatory and main. The work on designing of experimental curriculum is carried out at preparatory stage that in terms of psychology is the model of psychical abilities and their formation and development is the purpose of study. We call this work as the logical psychological analysis.

The real formation of those psychical abilities is carried out in experimental learning, being structurally organized as a modeling (forming) experiment. In the whole the process for formation of psychical abilities (which are intimately-psychological equivalent of

integral activity) consists of two stages: designing models for these abilities and implementation of their formation in learning (experimental) material into learning activity for mastery of this material.

In such case the psychological pedagogical research, which task is to study the formation of integral activity and its psychical equivalents – abilities is possible only with its construction by method of genetically-modeling research.

Theory of experimental learning

The formation of personality requires the significant extension of scientific psychological analysis for this process, as well as detection of potential possibilities for corresponding psychological methods. While solving these tasks, in particular, the correct notion about essence and possibilities of experiments plays the important role.

The fact that methods of developmental and pedagogical psychology have lost the character of contemplative stating ones and acquired the forming orientation is the tendency for further development of this sphere of psychological knowledge. As V.V. Davydov emphasized, “child and pedagogical psychology entered the new stage, at which the study of laws for psychical activity occurs on the basis and in the form of experimental learning” [Davydov, 1996, p. 5].

The circumstances (conditions of life and activity), which are used by education to achieve pedagogical purposes, become the means for education and the part in system of educational (forming) influence on personality. It relates to the requirement for purposeful influence not only on a pupil itself but on circumstances of its vital activity.

The concepts “learning”, “education” and “formation of personality”, traditionally used in national (Soviet and post-Soviet) pedagogy and psychology, from the remotest times set high positive interpretation of influence on personality of child.

Foreign psychological theories prefer semantically neutral term “psychological conditioning”, emphasizing that the assessment of such influence is made for values that prevail in the society.

The issue about efficiency of conditioning is not connected with meaningful part of influence and is defined only by psychological price of the latter. This problem exceeds the limits of pedagogical psychology in relation to necessity in learning (or conditioning).

It is clear that virtually all national theories of learning, education and psychical development originate from a priori value of influences that socializes. It is necessary to remember about it during assessment of philosophical aspects of abovementioned theories.

Hegel's dialectics considers the availability of functional object as the necessary prerequisite for process of development. The laws of development in it exist and act not on their own but only through laws of operation. Thus, it is impossible to understand the laws of development without study of laws of operation.

Thus, it is not surprising that the scientific cognition starts from study of laws of operation for objects in the corresponding field and only when they are studied, there arise the possibility to research the laws of development [Maksymenko, 1990, p. 229-230]. In the whole the process of cognition of object occurs due to the following manner: we pass from laws of operation to laws of development, and then we explain the former on the basis of the latter ones.

The metaphysical thinking closes the object in fixed state. Fixed state is not static (the latter excludes any changes in object); it assumes different functional changes in object (that's why it is also called as functioning).

However the changes in fixed object, unlike developing one, have the reverse character and do not lead to origin of something principally new [Maksymenko, 1990, p. 3]. The main characteristic for fixed object is its fluctuation – variation, mobility within relative invariability. Fluctuations act as sudden moments in relation to laws of development.

As it is known, the method of cognition shall be adequate to object, being learnt. Hence the availability of corresponding functional and genetically-historical methods of research is logical in sciences.

The functional methods disclose the stable (structural and fluctuating – strictly speaking, functional) relation inside the

organism, characterize the essence of systematic object in the plan of its stability, invariability, on the one hand, and in the plan of its dynamicity, internal mobility of its organization during this limited period of time – on the other hand.

The genetically-historical methods are directed to cognition of main tendencies, driving forces and mechanisms, possible ways for transformation of available essence and transformation of considered systems into qualitatively different one but associated with it. In other words, the genetically-historical methods are directed to study the system in its development and formation.

The necessity in existence of such methods in relation to psychology is expressed in realized demand to study the psychical phenomena under conditions of formation, moreover – using, strictly speaking, the formation itself. The formation as a specific way for development of psychical phenomena is the method for their study at the same time. Hereby the concept “formation” acquires the function of system formation and becomes one of fundamental in explanation of essence for psychical establishment and development of personality.

The formation in psychology means “the totality of methods and ways of social influence on individual, which are aimed to create the system of defined social values, world outlook, concept of life in it, to bring up certain social psychological qualities and way of thinking” [Antsyferova, 2002, p. 5].

The process of formation acts as an external process in relation to individual, as an influence of social agents on it. However the content of formation is not reduced to this, and, as L.I. Antsyferova rightly emphasizes, the formation is also “the process for creation of a certain type of systematic relations inside integral psychological organization of personality under influence of different social factors” [Antsyferova, 2002, p. 5].

The formation as intimately-psychological, internal process is the process for creation of organized personality by defined way, speaking tautologically, its defined form. The internal formation in terms of developmental and pedagogical psychology is the establishment of psychological new formations.

As it is known, the psychological new formations gradually acquire the corresponding logics of development, thus, the formation as an internal personalistic process to some extent does not depend on formation as an external social influence on personality.

This provision does not contradict to social determination for development of personality but only requires the coordination of knowledge about this determination with acknowledgment of some autonomy (relative independence) for personality.

As G.S. Kostiuk, who developed the theory of specific driving forces for development, underlined that the development itself is not the result from learning, it has its own peculiarities. “The history of child mental development, formation of its consciousness and self-consciousness occurs in the process of learning and education. However it has its own peculiarities, its laws, related to the laws of learning and education but are not identical with them and its own specific driving force” (our italics – S.M.) [Kostiuk, 1930, p. 12].

Thus, the formation as an external influence and formation as an internal psychological process are similar. Such their correlation underlies the concept about forming experiment.

However, before starting to consideration of this concept, let’s mention some peculiarities for traditional experiment that, in our opinion, to a certain extent may be determined as indirect prerequisites for origin of forming experiment.

The traditional experiment to a great extent is historically characterized by analyticity and defined abstraction. The process under research is taken independently, inside one defined system of conditions (preset by experiment). (It is necessary to apply the additional analytical means, for example, genetic method, in order to disclose the interrelation of different functions and laws for run of psychical processes).

“Further, the experiment in psychology is usually held under conditions, which are far away from those ones, under which the practical activity of human runs. Thus, the laws that disclosed the experiment were of very general abstract character, they did not enable to make any direct conclusions for organization of human activity in production work or pedagogical process.

The attempts to add these abstract laws to the practice were often transformed into mechanical transfer of results, received under some conditions to other, often quite different ones.

This abstraction of psychological experiment forced to seek for new methodological ways to solve the practical tasks". [Methodological and theoretical problems of psychology, 1969, p. 38].

Taking into consideration the difficulties of traditional experiment, S.L. Rubinstein suggested the following measures to overcome them: firstly, to transform the experiment from inside in order to overcome with artificiality of traditional experiment, and, secondly, to add the experiment with other methodological means. If we consider the experiment from inside, then the totality of factors, on which an experimenter influences, can conditionally be divided into two groups – factors of environment, or conditions, under which the activity under research runs, and factors of subject, or, strictly speaking, activity of test person.

As S.L. Rubinstein fairly observes in natural experiment by A.F. Lazursky "the conditions, under which the activity under research runs, undergo to experimental influence, the activity of test person itself is observed in natural course" [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 39].

The necessity in appearance of forming experiment as a way of psychological pedagogical researches is described mostly complete and logically in another statement, made by S.L. Rubinstein. "We introduce another variant for natural experiment into our researches on child psychology. Lazursky avoided the direct influence on child within the interests of "naturalness".

But in fact a child develops under conditions of education and learning, i.e. to a certain extent undergoes to organized influence on it. Thus, following to natural conditions for development does not require removing any influence in general. The influence, built due to the type of pedagogical process, is quite natural. We introduce it into experiment, thereby realizing the new variant for "natural" experiment that shall, in our opinion, occupy the central place in the methodology for psychological pedagogical research of child.

We study a child teaching it. We do not refuse from experimenting for this purpose in favor of observation for

pedagogical process and introduce the elements of pedagogical influence into the experiment itself, building the study due to the type of experimental lesson.

Teaching a child, we seek not to fix the stage or level, at which a child is, but to help it to move forwards to the next stage. We study the laws of development of child psychics in this progress” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 40].

Thus, the forming experiment is the method for scientific psychological pedagogical research. But it is the original method that roughly differs from other ones. Its originality is as it follows. The traditional methods are purely scientific formations, which from outside are overlapped with the subject under research. If, for example, such subject is the formation of mental actions at pupil during learning process, then the use of traditional methods (let’s call them academic ones) allows a researcher to judge about the subject that interests him/her by indirect manner.

In fact, if a researcher is interested in formation of mental actions during the process of school study and he/she offers a pupil with test tasks not from program material and transfer the received data to possible actions with program material, such experimenting cannot be called as direct.

Not considering here in particular the issue about lawfulness of such transfers, we will mention only the specific peculiarity for forming experiment as a psychological pedagogical method in comparison with “academic” methods.

The research, performed by method of forming experiment, has the form of experimental construction for process of school learning itself. The forming experiment is not a purely scientific formation; it is a type of real learning educational process, experimental in its non-traditional character.

The forming experiment is the process of school learning itself, it is first of all the practice of school learning and education, and only then, in the second turn, it may be considered as a scientific method. The practice of school learning educational process, becoming experimental, acquires the additional function – function of scientific method for psychological pedagogical research.

Repeating once more the provision by S.L. Rubinstein that while studying a child we teach it, let's mention that this provision is the most compressed and capacious definition for essence of forming experiment.

The forming experiment as a method for study of psychical and personalistic development in learning is the specific organization for learning activity of pupils, in which the experimental pedagogical influence is directed to its main structural components.

Methodologically forming experiment is carried out as it follows. The stating experiment, during which the state of "subject under research" is cleared up, is added to experimental learning. As a rule, the latter one shows that "the subject under research" for special learning is presented in learning activity of pupils (or in peculiarities for their personality) in the form of potency.

Some components of learning activity, which are set to pupils as a subject of mastery are provided for organization of experimental learning, i.e. are formed in them. The experimental learning (forming experiment) is usually built by such manner that a researcher manages the process for formation of necessary "parameters" for learning activity. The successive introduction of those parameters into forming experiment (or their successive formation) in fact realizes so-called scheme of factorial planning [Teplov, 1953].

The transformation of scheme of factorial planning into special subject for mastery of structural characteristics for learning activity by pupils and organization of active learning actions with them is, in our opinion, the condition for productive independent construction of own learning activity by pupils and corresponds to pedagogical purposes of forming experiment.

The kinds of forming experiment may conditionally be divided into laboratory and class ones, hereby it is possible to distinguish individual and group forms for performance of experiment inside each of abovementioned two groups. Using the individual forming experiment, the laws for formation of peculiarities for learning activity under conditions of individual learning are discovered.

It is not necessary to think that the data from individual forming experiment may be considered as the true ones in last instance –

they shall be specified and deepened during class (group) forming experiment.

The specific peculiarities for mastery of some or other learning material by pupils and formation of components for learning activity under conditions of learning in class collective in them, in active cooperation with a teacher and its age mates shall be opened through class forming experiment.

The forming experiment allows studying and assessing not only the things that already exist but the ones that shall exist as it allows studying phenomena under most favorable conditions for their development (we can even tell under the most natural conditions).

The research in the form of forming experiment acquires active learning and educational character. Forming experiment in its basis is designed to receive the positive results in teaching pupils. It is directed to provide with the best results in comparison with teachers-practitioners. Forming experiment arises from the needs of school practice – necessity for improvement of learning educational work and increase in its efficiency.

Forming experiment in its development passed a certain way. At first the forming influence was directed to certain psychical processes and their properties that allowed detecting the laws in functioning and development of those processes and properties. For example, it was found out that the mnemonic activity and its formation passes through two stages: firstly the mastery of mental operations as independent actions occurs, then – as means of mnemonic activity.

Further development of forming experiment was connected with realization of general theoretical provision about indissoluble relation of psychical and external subjective activity in concrete psychological researches. The experimental formation of mental actions cleared up in particular that their basis is the actions with subject that substitutes it, the latter ones become the psychical reality in the course (or as a result) of interiorization.

The qualitative improvement in application of forming experiment took place as a result from study of psychics under conditions of rebuilt, transformed learning pursuant to designing of curricula due to convergence principle from abstract to concrete.

Here not separate psychical processes or properties but learning activity in the whole underwent to formation pursuant to meaningful generalization of knowledge.

This forming experiment consisted of two stages: firstly the curriculum was built and it was cleared up how its peculiarities define the structure of learning activity, then the psychical new formations were studied under conditions of formation of learning activity.

The study of psychical development of pupils through purposeful formation of their learning activity is the most successive and adequate use of forming experiment. Hereby it is the formation of learning activity that is transformed into original method for study of psychical development.

Thus, the evolution of forming experiment may be presented as a number of stages, which are characterized by extension in sphere of formed psychical reality (property or peculiarity of psychical process – psychical process – mental action – integral psychical new formation under conditions of formation of learning activity).

These theoretical provisions are determinative at definition of possibilities for forming experiment in development of personality under conditions of modern school learning. They are determinative as the forming experiment itself is the learning process – experimentally organized, performing the function of scientific research method and way of learning at the same time.

Neither method, which is not a way of influence on personality and a way of its formation at the same time, can serve as an adequate tool for cognition of laws for formation and development of personality. This provision stipulates the necessity in further analysis of possibilities for forming experiment in study of problems for formation and development of personality in the process of school learning.

The problem for formation and development of pupil's personality requires applying its adequate methods.

Forming experiment mostly perspective and successively describes the essence for formation of psychical processes of personality, as we have already mentioned. Its adequacy and perspective arise from needs in real school learning educational

process. A teacher-practitioner, realizing the real formation of pupil personality, is interested first of all in knowledge about peculiarities and laws of formation itself but not the spontaneous development of psychological phenomena.

If we want to know how a certain psychological phenomenon was formed, we shall clear up its origin, i.e. to recreate this formation, to form the psychological phenomenon by experimental way.

Forming experiment, setting the way for appropriation of “mechanisms for thinking” by individual, hereby allows a pupil creating (forming) own energetic activity.

The necessity in formation and development of personality under conditions of modern school learning requires the reconstruction of learning itself so that it, as Ye.V. Ilyenkov wrote, “would recreate the real historical process for generation and development ... of knowledge in compressed, shortened form” [Ilyenkov, 1992, p. 13]. Forming experiment, acting as the most adequate and perspective method for psychological pedagogical research, at the same time in fact is such rebuilt, experimental learning, which is capable to solve the task for formation of learning activity and personality at pupils in the whole.

Associative reflectory theory of learning by N.O. Menchynska

On the basis of L.S. Vygotsky's idea about experimental genetic method research S.L. Rubinstein in the middle of the 30-ies in XX century formulated the main methodological provisions of Soviet psychology, in which the principles of determinism, unity of consciousness and activity are followed and concretized in the principle for formation of psychics in activity.

During next two decades the main direction of works with application of forming experiment, which were based in researches by S.L. Rubinstein about study and formation of thinking, is linked with the names of N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues – D.M. Bogoyavlensky, O.M. Kabanova-Meller, etc. Their works, however, used the concept “educational experiment” that precisely reflected

the specificity of methodological suggestions and methodic ways, which were applied in research.

Works by N.O. Menchynska [Menchynska, 1967, 1970] and her colleagues were devoted to study of process for mastery of concepts, their use at solution different mental tasks and fulfillment of mental operations, interconnection of “scientific” and “vital” concepts, formation of mental activity at pupils, interrelation of the concrete and the abstract at different stages of study, problems of individual discrepancies in acquisition of knowledge, realization of individual approach in study.

The received results allowed introducing some specifications into methodology for study of pupils (it is here, where N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues saw their main task, unlike, for example, D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davydov, who thought that the main condition for development of mental activity was the content of knowledge, and, accordingly, curricula).

The central problem in researches by laboratory of N.O. Menchynska is the issue about peculiarities for “ability to study”, stipulated as the ability for acquisition of knowledge and ways of learning activity. The property “ability to study”, in opinion of N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues, has the dynamic character, and her study enables not only stating the actual state of psychical development but to some extent forecasting the character and rates for further progress of pupil.

The main directions of researches were linked with the study of structure for “ability to study”, division of its components, correlation with mental development and other psychical qualities of personality. The indices that define high or low “ability to study” were distinguished, the reasons for bad success through insufficient “ability to study” of pupils were analyzed.

While analyzing the correlation of concepts “ability to study” and “mental development” it was found out that these concepts were very close between themselves but not identical. In particular, the most important indices for mental development – storage and degree of systemacity of knowledge, acquisition of ways for mental activity – are the components of “ability to study” but with very

significant comment: “ability to study” is characterized by degree of easiness and rapidity, with which the knowledge is obtained and the ways of activity are acquired, thus, the peculiarities for learning are linked with peculiarities in the whole.

The facts that confirm these provisions were found in particular at study of pupils with long unproficiency, which significant part, as the researches by colleagues of N.O. Menchynska showed, may be referred to category of children “with developmental delays”.

Some educational experiments, held under supervision of N.O. Menchynska, were directed to find the criteria to divide pupils into groups depending on their typical peculiarities that are found during learning process. Two complexes of features (or two substructures of personality) were chosen as such criteria:

- a) peculiarities for mental activity that characterize the level of mental development and degree of “ability to study” (i.e. susceptibility to acquisition of knowledge and ways of activity);
- b) orientation of personality that includes motivation, attitude to study.

Further it was found out that different sides of personality (motivational sphere and intellect) have different degree of “compliance” to pedagogical influences (motivational sphere is more labile).

Let’s mention that N.O. Menchynska considered that principally important at development of typology for pupils in learning process are the indices that characterize not only the intellect but other sides of personality (first of all – motivation) as the illegal division of psychology of learning and education was in her opinion, overcome.

The works by N.O. Menchynska paid the special attention to research methods. Using the traditional scheme for their classification (observation – experiment), she distinguishes and applies some transitional forms in each from these two groups of methods. Besides, her works mention that some methods (used, in particular, in pedagogical psychology) cannot strictly be referred to some or other group as the observation and experiment in them are indissolubly linked between themselves.

Such methods, for example, include monographic method, analysis and generalization of pedagogical experience, etc. Speaking about psychological peculiarities for experiment, N.O. Menchynska and D.M. Bogoyavlenskyy [Bogoyavlenskyy, Menchynska, 1960] mention that it is the degree of experimentalist interference during psychical process that forms different types of natural experiment.

Hereby, if the task for research is set rather widely, the experiment partly merges with observation (“experimental observation”, or, due to expression by P.P. Blonskyy, “test experiment”). If the task for research is defined relatively clear, the possibilities for active interference during experiment are limited.

If the hypothesis for research is defined, one can anticipate different variations of conditions for experiment (“check” experiment according to P.P. Blonskyy). In particular, the central place in experiments, held under supervision of N.O. Menchynska, is occupied by methodological technique “variation of tasks” [Bogoyavlenskyy, Menchynska, 1960, p. 29].

The main scheme for these theoretical experimental researches: experiment that states, educational and control experiments, and further – analysis of results from experiments. Let’s mention that N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues distinguished two main kinds of educational experiment: “check” and “test”.

It was anticipated that in the first case the experimentalist applies the defined method of study in order to clear out how the latter influences on process for acquisition of knowledge; in the second case a researcher applies different methods and techniques, varies them, trying to determine which of them are the most efficient.

The experiments by N.O. Menchynska are characterized by analysis of a great number of cycles of experience, variety in material of research, frequency in repetition of researches, duration of experiment, etc., in particular, it is O.N. Kabanova-Meller’s study of process for formation of skills to read topographic map, G.F. Govorkova’s study of process for generalization and abstraction at acquisition of geometric concepts, O.M. Orgova’s study of process for acquisition of grammar concepts, A.Z. Redko’s study of historical concepts, etc.

Addressing to the problem on interrelation of education and development, D.M. Bogoyavlenskyy and N.O. Menchynska mention that the mental development, although being closely connected with the process for acquisition of knowledge, however is not reduced to it: not only that one that is reflected in the consciousness is changed but the process for reflection itself, those psychical processes that carry out it [Bogoyavlenskyy, Menchynska, 1960].

Being in solidarity with L.S. Vygotsky in criticism about solution of problem on study and development by associanists and behaviorists, N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues thought that he, declaiming against classical associanism, illegally ignored the concept of relation in its primordial understanding (in the terms of reflectory theory by I.P. Pavlov and I.M. Sechenov as conditional relations or associations).

The support on associative reflectory psychological theory (which had been formed, strictly speaking, already in XVII century, stated that the foundation of learning is associations, sensational visualization that is united with the word, derivation of part from the general, exercises) significantly restricted the possibilities for experimental research and formation of psychical new formations.

However it should be remembered that such conclusion cannot be made in terms of today when associative reflectory concepts are opposed by the most adequate and efficient pragmatist interpretation of study. Within concrete historical context – in the middle of the 50-ies in XX century – researches by N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues played the important role in development of psychological pedagogical science, in particular, it is difficult to overestimate their contribution into statement of educational experiment as an efficient method for study and influence on psychics of pupil.

It is also necessary to take into consideration that the sympathy to ideas of I.P. Pavlov and reflectory conditionality of psychical phenomena during that time was considered by many researchers as a certificate of competence and “scientific reliability”, and thus not only N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues but some other scientists at that time had the apologetic way for argumentation, at which each deviation or inexact (approximate) interpretation of ideas by

Sechenov-Pavlov was considered as the reasons for errancy and incapability of corresponding provisions.

Giving the generalized assessment for realization of ideas about formation of psychics and activity in works by N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues, let's emphasize that this realization was rather empirical pedagogical than, strictly speaking, scientific one. The researches by abovementioned authors not always took into consideration the main psychological characteristics of activity, to which at his time L.S. Vygotsky pointed: active organization of activity, its meaningful peculiarities.

The main stress was made to final result that is set completely from outside, empirically but not to procedural side in formation of some or other formations (knowledge, abilities and skills).

The essence of researches, held by abovementioned authors, was that the idea about forming experiment was realized on the basis of associative reflectory understanding of psychics.

The development of classification for associations and analysis of psychical processes namely on this basis were also found in the center of theoretical experimental researches by V.O. Shvyryov. The direct subject of study in his works was the generalized (variative) relations, unlike usual recollected single, stable associations.

Generalized relations in interpretation of V.O. Shvyryov were "rule-agreed" associations, i.e. corresponded to a certain rule. They stipulated the possibility for practical application of the corresponding rule to those concrete cases that suit to this rule [Shvyryov, Dzhumondurdneva, 1988].

V.O. Shvyryov gave the detailed classification for generalized relations, studied the psychological prerequisites for origin of correct and incorrect associations. It allowed him grounding the ways of study that permit avoiding incorrect associations and thereby improving the efficiency of educational process.

Finishing the brief review of scientific opinions on problem of study and development and contribution into development of methods for its research by those authors, who in the whole occupied the positions of associanism, let's mention that their works played the significant role in further theorization of pedagogical psychology.

And the most significant stage in transition from empirical phase of research to theoretical one relates to the theory of learning by N.O. Menchynska. The new methodological means are developed within its limits, first of all educational experiment, the theoretical typology is applied to arrange and to systematize the empirical material (for example, typology of abstractions by O.N. Kabanova-Meller, let's remind of classification for associations by Yu.O. Samarin and classification for generalized relations by P.V. Shevaryov, although they failed to work within the context of theory of learning by N.O. Menchynska), the corresponding relations – causal, functional and genetic ones are included for interpretation of psychological peculiarities for educational activity.

As theoretical basis, the larger place is occupied by hypotheses (called as partly empirical ones by Madson), in which the hypothetical variables appear. The educational experiment started acquiring the great weight within this theory. Here the basics for variety of functions for this experiment are laid, the detailed characteristics for so-called “check” and “academic” types of educational experiment are provided.

The first one is applied with the purpose of verification of a certain method of learning that influences on acquisition of abilities, knowledge and skills, and the second one – for approbation of different methodological techniques during study in order to define the most efficient knowledge for successful acquisition.

In the educational experiment there are varieties that testify about its achievement of a certain level in development as a research method and are illustrated by expansion in the sphere of its application (for example, as a way to detect individual discrepancies in thinking due to K.G. Gavlov, A.F. Govirkova, as well as a way to define the learning with different subjects according to Z.I. Kalmykova).

The researches as if felt the possibilities for forming experiment. D.M. Bogoyavlensky and N.O. Menchynska distinguish one more variety of educational experiment – so-called “pedagogical experiment”, which means “active change in pedagogical process”, which is realized under real conditions of school learning at the

expense of variation in individual didactic components (methods for teaching of material, ways for organization of pupils' activity at the lesson, etc.).

At the same time here there is more vivid influence of empiricism. It is most vividly found at consideration of function for main components of experimental method (stating, forming and control experiments). It is the empiricism in abovementioned content that constitutes the essence of research. "What will we have?" –the main issue may be formulated in such a way, the answer for which was sought by researchers, who applied the forming experiment in such its understanding (i.e. problematic, conscious learning).

There are many reasons for such empiricism. And, as it has already mentioned, the main role was played by general associants' positions in understanding the learning itself, according to which the formation of set properties, first of all skills, in addition which are set not in the exact content of registration of their parameters but as a approximately described standard, was described not from inside, not in the terms of psychological mechanisms for this formation but from outside, i.e. as a finished result.

The demonstrative ones are critical remarks by N.O. Menchynska to the address of other research schools that studied the problem of learning and forming experiment. They allow specifying her own theoretical position.

Thus, N.O. Menchynska made the special remarks to the thesis about interiorization as a main way for formation of mental actions in relation to theory of stage-by-stage formation of mental actions: "If the process for acquisition of knowledge is defined by many variables, is it rightfully to restrict "psychological model" of process for acquisition as it happens according to the theory of stage-by-stage formation of mental actions that acknowledge the change of stages only in one direction – from the external to the internal" [Menchynska, 1970, p. 140].

It is natural that the statement about efficiency in management of learning activity using curricula, built on the basis of theory of stage-by-stage formation of mental actions, was also subject to doubt by N.O. Menchynska [Menchynska, 1970]. Developing the criticism

of ideas about interiorization, she pointed to errancy of their argumentation by thesis of C. Marx that “the ideal is nothing but the material, replanted into human head and transformed in it” [Menchynska, 1970, p. 1], as, in her opinion, Marx meant here the material, subjective world, reflected by human but not its practical actions. The practical activity of human contains the psychical processes that as the highest forms of thinking have the relation with practical activity [Menchynska, 1967, p. 139].

The logical completion for this line of considerations by N.O. Menchynska is “leveling the status for laws of transition from external plan of actions into internal one, and, vice versa, the statement that the manifestations of laws in the process for acquisition of knowledge are characterized by extraordinary lability, related to material conditions” [Menchynska, 1967, p. 206].

The theoretical position was concretized in the content of directions of researches by N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues that were connected with variation of different conditions for learning process (problematic situations, organizational forms, ways for presentation of learning tasks, etc.) and detection of complications, errors and inaccuracies in activity of pupils.

The purpose of researches is pursuant to analysis of empirical data to introduce the corrections into already existing, learning methodology, applied by school, to remove defects that there are in acquisition. Within this plan, for example, during ten years they held the researches on study of concepts, including their use at solution of different mental tasks and fulfillment of different mental operations.

Thus, the significant attention was paid to interrelations of vital and scientific concepts, their mutual influence. The study of peculiarities for formation of concepts and their acquisition in the process of learning allowed discovering some laws of general order: about role of sample and word in acquisition of concepts, about development of process for generalization and concretization at children. However, the main purpose was to introduce changes of different kind into existing curricula.

The analogous research of mental operations on material from different sections of Mathematics at school (Arithmetics, Geometry and Algebra) allowed making some conclusions of general plan (for example, about necessity in “intellectualization” of skills, laws of “arithmetic thinking”, acquisition of numeration system by children).

The conclusions by N.O. Menchynska concerned mainly individual corrections and specifications in methodology of formed study at school (about inadmissibility of learning with counting without numeric figures, appeal to “struggle” with numeric perception, related to the form for location of subjects, and for transition to counting using numerals, etc.). It is also necessary to mention the works by N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues on study of laws for formation of mental activity at pupils.

The main direction here is linked with study on formation of techniques for mental development in learning process.

And, naturally, such position was opposed to concept by D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davydov due to some key sections.

Thus, objecting to the wide implementation of generalization and abstraction in school children in junior classes, N.O. Menchynska stated that the qualitative changes in the concrete and abstract thinking took place under influence of learning (as well as in the forms of their interaction), and thus “it is not right to think that the development only of abstract thinking is important under conditions for improvement in theoretical level of formation” [Bogoyavlenskyy, Menchynska, 1960, p. 22].

Moreover, in opinion of N.O. Menchynska and D.M. Bogoyavlenskyy, the definition of the concrete and the abstract itself is very relative: the one that is abstract at early stage of learning becomes more concrete for pupils thanks to more perfect acquisition of this material, and, thus, the main purpose of researcher shall consist not of accentuation of the theoretical and abstract in learning but in study of correlation of the concrete and the abstract at different stages of learning and at different levels of pupils’ development [Bogoyavlenskyy, Menchynska, 1960].

These objections are agreed with N.O. Menchynska’s criticism for expediency in complication (i.e. its theorization) of learning material.

In her opinion, one-sided prevalence of the abstract already in junior classes at school is not necessary and while solving the issue about content of the program it is not necessary to take into consideration first of all what a child can master. “The aspiration to accelerate child’s passage through later stages in development of thinking is not justified: it is necessary to demand the other, namely so that the thinking, inherent to child at definite age period, would receive stronger development” [Bogoyavlenskyy, Menchynska, 1960, p. 24].

Thus, if the main factor for development of thinking at child in the concept by D.B. Elkonin and V.V. Davydov is the content of knowledge and the main way is in designing curricula, built on deployment of initial relation in this (designed) academic discipline, then the change of school curricula in N.O. Menchynska means first of all the improvement in learning methodology.

It is natural that the functions of experimental learning and ways of its organization are found to be different.

Further we will fix on principles for construction of forming experiment in concept of learning activity in more details; here we will only emphasize the most significant things that characterize the approach of N.O. Menchynska.

The main task is to study the mental development in learning process. The main ways for its solution are connected with detection of hidden reserves for mental activity of pupils, not used intellectual possibilities yet. The concretization of those ways is found in methodological improvements of formed school learning, i.e. the logic of motion “from the exact to the proper” is realized (unlike the concept of learning activity, in which the motion is carried out “from the proper to the exact”).

Accordingly, the educational experiment in works by N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues has no projecting and prognostic functions: it is first of all a way of experimental detection of the most efficient techniques for formation of mental activity, technology for registration of peculiarities for problematic situations, ways for their presentation, individual differences in acquisition of knowledge, in mastery with school skills and in the level of mental development of pupils for achievement of certain educational purposes.

The main research strategy was to state the existing defects in school education in the process of stating experiment, detection of the most efficient way in series of learning experiments in order to remove the defect and to build the methodological recommendations on this basis, which add or modify the traditional methodology.

It is not surprising that the theory of stage-by-stage formation of mental actions and the concept of learning activity that realized the pragmatic approach to learning and were built on the basis of defined psychological models, underwent to criticism by N.O. Menchynska and her colleagues.

In terms of today this criticism may seem to be not very convincing, however this criticism in a certain historical situation, at initial stage of elaboration of problem on learning and development in psychology played its positive catalyzing role and assisted, in particular, to deeper apprehension of the main principles and functions of forming experiment as a method of psychological pedagogical research.

Theory of specific drivers for development by G.S. Kostiuk

The formation as internal psychological process is the creation of a certain way for organization of personality, its certain form. In terms of developmental and pedagogical psychology the formation is nothing but the establishment of psychological new formations. The psychological new formations gradually acquire their own logics of development, thus, the formation as internal personalistic process to some extent depends on formation as external social influence on personality.

The psychological analysis of learning process is important for determination of purposes and means of learning and education, for development of ways to improve the learning educational process itself. In terms of achievements by pedagogical psychology in the 50-70-ies of XX century, the most efficient method of psychological research that is of direct pedagogical importance was the forming experiment, which may be defined as a way of research for learning

process, aimed to complex solution of theoretical and applied issues in psychology.

In modern psychology there are many researches, which fix the moments for generation, appearance of psychical phenomena, interruptions in gradualness (insight, products of intuition, etc.), their salutatory transitions into new state, new function, new way of actions [Kostiuk, 1979, 1989, 1988].

In these terms the research by G.S. Kostiuk, which may literally be considered as purely genetic one due to its essence, is original. G.S. Kostiuk informed about results of his work in 1962, making a speech at all-Union meeting on philosophical issues of the highest nervous activity and psychology.

The subject of research was the process for creation of image at perception of thing under complicated conditions. The model of process was the image of a thing, being in the dark chamber, which was illuminated from time to time by flash of electron-pulse lamp. The short duration of flash did not enable examining and seeing a thing completely: the experimental was given with something inaccessible for consciousness in terms of form and content.

As a result from numerous illuminations by light pulses the accumulation of information in field of vision by experimental occurred, and the image of a thing, being perceived, was gradually built.

And G.S. Kostiuk came to the following conclusions as a result from researches of generation and appearance of image of a thing, when it is perceived under complicated conditions.

The complex interaction of reflectory acts vividly appears in the process for construction of image, which acquire the form of specific cognitive actions (sensory, perceptual, reproductive, mental), aimed to solve the perceptual tasks: separation of features of object, being perceived, their structurization, realization of class of object, its reference to a certain category. The judgments, hypotheses, which influence on the course of this process and at the same time undergo to certain changes depending on results from perceptual actions, appear at subject pursuant to past experience and fragmentary percepts. Inadequate hypotheses that are not

confirmed by perceptual actions are replaced by more believable suppositions.

The solution of task under such conditions is often the process for settlement of discrepancies between expectations that appear at subject, anticipations and perceptual information, which it receives. It is the complex cognitive activity, which is verbalized to some or other extent at all stages, starting from realization of the task and finishing with its certain solution.

It is a vivid example for establishment of “subjective image of objective world, which cannot be understood without its psychological components. The necessity in such analysis persuasively appears at transition to more complex manifestations of the cognitive and especially spiritual life of personality, its various creative activity.

Thus, the originality of the psychical may best of all be understood if to approach to it genetically, if to look closely at how the real relations of a living being with external world are changed during development of reflecting work by the brain, their new systems appear.

What is the gnoseological sense in abovementioned results of research? What is hidden behind the external simplicity of original experience? Here, briefly speaking, there are the main components for subject of experimenter’s activity.

The first one – sensitivity of visual analyzer, which received the energy of external influence and due to its insignificant power was not able to transform its into a fact of consciousness.

The second one – silhouetting a thing, being perceived, – its origin on the eye retina and establishment of its outline with indefinite borders and cavities in the integral image.

The third one – cognitive actions (sensory, perceptual, reproductive, mental) that perform the changes of image and fixation of peculiarities, thanks to which the energy of influences is transformed into a definite image.

The fourth one – motion of available but not complete enough information about thing. The hypotheses-images, which are changed with more probable ones, are created.

The fifth one – development of image as a result from reflection of a thing and its objectivation through separation of features, structure, reference to a certain category, verbalization – until a certain solution of perceptual task.

The sixth one – creativity. The analysis of psychological components (characteristics of the psychical) that is necessary at transition of human from perceptual tasks to more complex manifestations of cognitive, spiritual and productive activity.

The main provision by G.S. Kostiuk, formulated pursuant to this and other researches is that the development is not the consequence of learning. It has its own peculiarities, its laws, related to laws of learning and education but are not similar to them; its specific drivers.

The problem of developing learning cannot be analyzed deeply and thoroughly, not addressing to the main sources for learning and mental development of personality. It is high time to look at a certain theory in the terms of another, associated one, as only with such approach it is possible to receive the comprehensive and really scientific judgment.

Taking into consideration the circumstance, mentioned in this section, we will consider the problem pursuant to analysis of leading concepts – concepts for development of personality, which author is G.S. Kostiuk, and pragmatic approach, which was followed by L.S. Vygotsky, V.V. Davydov and P.Ya. Galperin.

G.S. Kostiuk was the head in scientific direction, which, due to successful expression by Ukrainian historian of psychology V.A. Romenets, is called “psychology within its own limits”.

This approach defined his main problematics – correlation of learning and development of personality.

Aiming to receive, so to say, “pure culture” of psychical reality, G.S. Kostiuk chose the thinnest, hidden plan of consciousness – development as internal progress – as the subject for his search. He considered the mental development to be a system with specific own contradictions. It is natural that the development was considered as a spontaneous process within these limits.

The philosophical psychological world outlook enabled the scientist to remain on his feet under powerful influence from J.

Piaget's opinions in this issue. G.S. Kostiuk, regardless of his opponent, proves that spontaneity as the manifestation of internal contradictions finally is the set orientation, as the function for sources of human development was given to external conditions (learning).

According to G.S. Kostiuk, the effect of own development is not all psychological acquisitions (different ways of actions) but only some of them, which are kept at further stages of personality activity. The logical conclusion was that the main index for development is the ability to permanent goal-setting but not the skill to operate the ways for achievement of some or other purposes. Namely this section became the original watershed between opinions on development by G.S. Kostiuk and representatives of pragmatic approach – first of all P.Ya. Galperin. The latter one, as it is known, definitely united the development with the process of interiorization. In his opinion, it is the transition from the external, social to the internal, psychical is the manifestation of developmental process.

Hence it becomes clear why the accent is that the learning is the form of development. Hereby the artificial barrier was put on the way of genetic approach to development, although it was recognized as the main principle of interiorization.

The thing that according to P.Ya. Galperin was the end of development was only its start according to G.S. Kostiuk. Ukrainian scientists with all persuasiveness proved that the interiorized form of external reality has qualitatively other structure and functions, which ignorance deforms the process for mental development.

G.S. Kostiuk was interested mainly in mechanism for mental development, i.e. the way of its existence itself – here he saw his direct psychological task.

For a long time it was the existence of the psychological itself was considered an unguessed secret, not speaking about its deployment. It was an original “black box”, which could be opened not by many people. G.S. Kostiuk, in our opinion, was working over the thinnest layer of reality, where it was very easy to fail. But he managed to follow to dialectical approach with all its heuristic power in this specific psychical substance due to structure and functions.

Assessing the theoretical searches by G.S. Kostiuk in terms of modern theoretical positions, we can bravely state that the scientist left his time behind in many things. As when the ideas, suggested by him, were generated, the national psychology had no sufficient theoretical methodological base for similar work. That's why many theoretical conclusions by G.S. Kostiuk were not timely included into psychological methodological paradigm. He intuitively felt that the disrespect of even thinnest peculiarity between processes of learning and psychical development will inevitably lead to original simplification.

It is as if an academic question for G.S. Kostiuk acquired the great practical importance. The destiny for construction of new didactic systems and creation of new forms for academic educational process depended on its correct solution. The scientists emphasized that it is significantly difficult to manage the course of mental development that acquisition of knowledge. It seemed to him that the identification of those two processes is unjustified in many things. He was troubled mostly about the question in which correlation the learning and development in their real functioning shall be. Thus, he insisted that we cannot definitely approach to learning within the context of its real products – empirical and theoretical knowledge.

The assessment of learning within its “own limits” virtually has no sense. The impartial assessment of learning may be received only in connection with motion of mental development. Thus, the scientist critically treated those didactic systems, which were directed only to a certain circle of knowledge and skills. In his opinion, they could be only the stimuli for actual micro development.

And their influences were restricted by strict limits, i.e. sphere of action of transient purposes, entry outside which limits deprives these psychological new formations of any sense.

G.S. Kostiuk was dissatisfied not only with traditional principles of learning but with those ones that were hastily formulated within pragmatic approach. During recent years the scientist with his scientific activity expressed rather productive idea, although being not materialized in the form of scientific publication, about relations, in which the processes of learning and development are – he meant

their combination. Hereby the learning is to most extent adapted to laws of development and assists to its further progressive change and the development itself naturally activates the processes of learning.

The aspiration by G.S. Kostiuk to disclose a very complex structure of mental development overshadowed the issue about its level, about value of those changes, which are observed in the process of vital activity of growing personality.

This means the content of internal material, on which the process of development is deployed. The statement of problem within this perspective naturally requires to move away from the credo that was stated by G.S. Kostiuk as “psychology within own limits”. There arose the need in entry to the sphere of human culture, where the psychology of human in its phylogenesis was objectively launched. Namely this direction of psychological research was embedded into ideas of cultural historical concept, into consideration of human activity as a source, from which the material for deployment of processes for mental development at individual level is taken.

In this connection we have a very complex problem: theoretically and experimentally to add the chain, which was left insufficiently deployed in the concept by G.S. Kostiuk.

The thing that was considered only the condition for development acquired the new function – function of determination; however the determination, being not direct but mediated by own laws of mental development. Such approach, in our opinion, is the adequate application of philosophical laws to psychological form for existence of materia.

It is known that the cultural historical concept requires the transformation of general, gender abilities into specially built academic subjects.

Such creative work is made by experimental genetic method (EGM), which anticipates the formation of theoretical thinking and other psychological new formations.

Marking this provision, G.S. Kostiuk wrote that “the main task for pedagogical psychology is to leave pedagogical researches behind”

[Kostiuk, 1989, p. 177]. The forming experiment is the methodological means that acts as the only way for realization of its scientific advanced function by pedagogical psychology.

Thus, the necessity in psychological study of peculiarities for formation of psychical and personalistic qualities of pupil in academic process is logical. The forming experiment, founded on dialectical approach to understanding of drivers for psychical and personalistic development of pupil, allows disclosing the basics, relying on which, it is possible really increasing the efficiency of school learning and education, raising it to the level of requirements and tasks, set by society.

The psychic of human in its all forms is the dynamic system. There are complex interactions between its subsystems, as well as elements (indivisible parts), which cause to formation of new elements, new subsystems, new types of interactions and interrelations. The dynamic system is changed quantitatively and qualitatively. Not only the content of relations and types of interactions between subsystems and elements in it but the elements themselves are changed quantitatively and qualitatively. Some of them disappear, others appear and develop.

Thus, for dynamic system it is necessary to know not only its initial elements and components (subsystems) but the type of transformations, existing in it. At system analysis of psychical phenomena at the first stage of its realization it is necessary to determine, what psychical phenomenon is taken as integrity. The latter one shall compulsorily be restricted and defined.

If we consider an individual human as an integral system beyond the relation with objective world, it becomes obvious that there is no such information. Only introducing a human into a system of society, it is possible to explain the availability of such information, received in the process of appropriation.

The development of human psychics in phylogenesis is defined by the main contradiction that arises between the world and human. "Thus, it is found out that a human stands before the contradiction: on the one hand, we have the task to learn the system of the world comprehensively in its total relation, and on the other hand, own nature, as the nature of

world system, does not allow us to solve it completely. But this contradiction is not only in the nature of both factors of the world and people; it is also the main lever for the whole mental process and is solved everyday and constantly in infinite progressive development of the humankind..." [Kostiuk, 1989, p. 36].

G.S. Kostiuk in the issue about psychological development of human assumed that a human individual is the part of biological system (its physical development) and social system that stimulates the establishment of personality. "The personality in relation to the society is the "subsystem" but at the same time it is a complex system itself, integral system of systems, internally related between themselves, being hierarchical" [Kostiuk, 1969, p. 166].

And thus the drivers for mental development of child (and the source for its self-motion), in opinion of G.S. Kostiuk, are the internal contradictions that appear in the life, activity, interrelations with environment.

They are for example, the contradictions between the new needs, aspirations of child and level in development of possibilities for their satisfaction, between requirements and degree of mastery, abilities and skills, necessary for their fulfillment; between new tasks and habits, ways of thinking and behavior, formed earlier.

The same contradictions are between growing internal capabilities of child that leave behind its life style, and objective position in the family, collective. There are other derivative contradictions. They are stipulated by attitude of personality to environment, its successes and failures, imbalance between individual and society. But the external contradictions that acquire even the conflict character (for example, conflicts between child and parents) do not become a driver for development.

Only interiorizing, external contradictions cause to opposite tendencies at individual itself that enter the field between themselves, they become the source for its activity, directed to solution of internal contradiction through production of new ways of behavior.

The contradictions are solved using the activity, leads to formation of new properties and qualities of personality. The

determinant for internal contradictions is the learning. The learning and education assist not only to successful overcoming with internal contradictions, which appear in the life of human and their origin itself.

The central moment in understanding the psychical development is the issue about its laws. The psychical development, as G.S. Kostiuk considered, has its own specific peculiarities and laws, which registration is significantly important for improvement of learning and increase in its leading role. They characterize “internal logics of ontogenetic establishment of personality as a conscious public being, its orientation, abilities and other properties” [Kostiuk, 1989, p. 168].

“Internal logics of ontogenetic development” means internally necessary motions of personality from the lowest to the highest levels. G.S. Kostiuk specifies that in this rising motion “external reasons always act through internal conditions”. He explains this motion from the lowest to the highest levels otherwise as an inevitable succession of main stages for mental development.

The stages of mental development are qualitatively different levels and forms of mental activity in structural and functional plan – visually acting, verbal imaginative, concrete and abstract conceptual.

“It is quite natural that the learning cannot change this succession in stages of intellect development, as more complex structures cannot genetically precede simpler structures but it can and shall assist to acceleration of transition from higher structures, their full value formation” [Kostiuk, 1989, p. 6]. Thus the registration in learning of specific laws for development is reduced to registration of succession in stages of intellect development.

As the laws of mental development are the successions in change of abovementioned stages, G.S, Kostiuk connects the concept of self-development with succession in their change. “The establishments of personality are a stipulated process and at the same time the process, being self-developed.

It is internally necessary motion from the lowest to the highest levels...” [Kostiuk, 1989, p. 13].

Let's discuss "internal conditions", through which the external reasons are always overcome. Let's specify that the succession in changes of stages for intellect development occurs in the process of established interaction between external reasons and internal conditions.

It is possible practically to manage the psychical development of child, in opinion of G.S. Kostiuik, only using the registration of its laws (which are reduced to succession in intellectual stages and age peculiarities) and establishment of "internal conditions for mental development" in the process of learning. The power of education is not that the education as though cannot change the laws of development but purposefully manage this process, being grounded on knowledge of those laws.

What are "internal conditions", which are necessary to establish in the process of learning?

Internal conditions should mean the individual peculiarities for higher nervous activity, its internal laws that are disclosed by physiological researches; needs and instructions of human, feelings and abilities, all system of skills, habits and knowledge, in which the individual experience of human and acquired experience of humankind is reflected.

G.S. Kostiuik agreed with S.L. Rubinstein that "internal conditions, forming under influence of external ones, is not, however, their direct mechanical projection. Forming and changing in the process of development, internal conditions on their own stipulate the special circle of influences, to which this phenomenon may yield" [Kostiuik, 1989, p. 174].

S.L. Rubinstein saw the internal logics (in other words – laws) of development as a property for selectivity of internal conditions, despite the fact that it is stipulated by external influences.

What are internal laws of psychical development stipulated by?

First of all here it is necessary to establish the correlation between abovementioned laws and age and individual peculiarities for development of children. There is the conformity between concrete age and individual peculiarities and some or other stage of development in the concept, developed by us.

Each period is a section of life journey of growing individual and at the same time the defined degree of its development as personality with its characteristic relatively stable qualitative peculiarities.

We will speak only about age peculiarities as age peculiarities as the general laws for age development of personality are concretized in its individual peculiarities. Age peculiarities (and capabilities) are defined not only by previous learning but the level of maturation, working capacity of the nervous system that is the successive establishment of all systems in organism, stipulated by genotype.

The learning assists to maturation of the nervous system. These internal processes are also connected by interrelations of child with environment, its education. But they are deprived of some relative independence, which, as G.S. Kostiuik mentions, is necessary to have in mind at consideration of those issues.

Thus, the genotype side of maturation defines the highest limit of age capabilities as the influence of study on development is mediated by age and individual peculiarities of children.

The theoretical approach by G.S. Kostiuik to problem of learning and development led him to the conclusion that the management of development – specific forces of development, being moved, – is a more complex task than management for acquisition of knowledge. Setting more and more new purposes to a child, putting forward more and more complex requirements and trying to perform them, the education directs the life and activity of pupils, and, thus, manages the development of object (subject).

Concept of personality self-development

How to provide not only a strong acquisition of knowledge by pupils and to develop the mental abilities in the process of learning at them? These questions bother the pedagogical community.

The main problem, being developed in national (L.S. Vygotsky, S.L. Rubinstein, O.M. Leontyev, G.S. Kostiuik, N.O. Menchynska, L.V. Zankov, P.Ya. Galperin, D.B. Elkonin, V.V. Davydov, O.V. Zaporozhets) and foreign (J. Piaget, A. Vallon, R. Zazzo, J. Bruner, etc.) psychology,

is the interrelation of learning and psychological development of personality.

The main aspect in solution of this problem is the issue about correlation of learning and development. There are two opposite points of view in relation to description.

The first one is linked with the name of famous Swiss psychologist J. Piaget, who states that the learning shall be adapted to available level of development. The second point of view, presented by national scientists, considers the process of learning as the factor that leads the psychological development, i.e. defines it.

J. Piaget considers the development of the highest psychological functions on abstract basis, beyond the social and cultural environment, beyond concrete conditions for life of personality. He thinks that a child only gradually and rather lately joins to the system of social relations, its mental development occurs as a spontaneous process, being independent on learning. The environment, due to his theory, may delay or accelerate the process of mental development at individual, whose Piaget considers in the system "subject-object). This system is characterized by ratio of balance between elements and the tendency to balance is the very mechanism, which provides with its development.

In opinion of J. Piaget, the existing system of learning for pupils reflects the laws and he researched the development only in the terms of its origin without taking into consideration the final result. "To consider by such a way, – state P.Ya. Galperin and D.B. Elkonin, – means to define the development as a process, not caused by strict unity of conditions but only set, being directed, managed obvious or hidden (under certain circumstances) plan, requirements to the future result of psychological development".

The researchers fairly criticize the theory of J. Piaget about psychological development of child, in particular about its independence on learning. In fact the psychological development of child is realized through interrelations of personality and society, in the process for acquisition of human experience by it, fixed in different forms. National psychologists state J. Piaget in his concept did not pay attention to the fact that the simplest subjective action occurs under

conditions of communication of child with adult, who is the example for it.

A child is in the environment, which teaches it with the things, with which it constantly contacts. In this connection there appear the new requirements for task in cognitive activity and new ways for their solution about which a child learns from adults and coevals. All this occurs in the process of learning.

The methodological basis in research of problems in psychical development (its drivers, sources and laws) for national scientists is the theory of reflection, and, in particular, the study about human activity, about its relation with development of human consciousness.

The selection of system, in which the psychical development is considered, has the top-priority meaning for receipt of objective data about its drivers and mechanisms. In the history of psychology there are many examples, when the psychic of human as a complex mechanism was divided into simpler components. The qualities, ways for establishment and their modifications we studied and described; the received data were summed up, and thus the necessary knowledge about psychics was obtained.

Such approach was historically stipulated by accelerated development and successes of classical mechanics and physics. The methods of cognition, being developed, enabled answering some unsolved questions.

The principle of mechanism until a certain moment (reduction of the complex to the simple, the whole to the part, system to its elements, the whole qualitative variety of motion in the nature, society to mechanical motion) was also considered to be the most rational way for scientific cognition of psychical reality.

However, the concrete scientific facts testified to the fact that in study of complex phenomena in psychics the mechanistic approach to their development is ineffective as it does not allow disclosing the essence of psychical phenomena, explaining the factors of their development and improvement. All this requires the new approach to their study. This approach, for the first time developed and applied by C. Marx and F. Engels (although now they are not popular

philosophers), to explanation of public processes, despite difficulties, became the main one in the science about psychical life of human.

Later he received the name “principle of systemacity” and enabled clearing up the main laws for origin and development of psychics as the coherent, complex whole.

The psychics of human in all its forms are a dynamic system. The complex interactions, which lead to formation of new elements, subsystems, types of interaction and interrelations, also take place between its subsystems and elements (formations that are considered further indivisible).

In dynamic system its subsystems undergo to quantitative and qualitative changes. Some of them disappear, others appear and are developed. In this connection it is necessary to know not only the initial elements and components of dynamic system (subsystem) but the types of transformations that occur in it. At system analysis of psychical phenomena it is necessary to determine at the first stage what psychical phenomenon is taken as the integrity. The latter one shall compulsorily be limited and defined.

The processes of development, inherent to integral formations, i.e. those ones that have their own internal prerequisites for change and development, appear due to interaction of components in system.

Besides, the important moment in development is the necessity in mediation of drivers by information that is contained in effective components of system, upon which the arranged, directed character of change depends. If we consider an individual human as the integral system, being as if independent on objective world, then obviously it will not have such information. The latter appears when a human is in the system of society and receives it in the process of appropriation (acquisition).

The objective world with its all inherent contradictions is reflected by our consciousness. The contradictions of the world become the internal contradiction of human.

The development of human psychics in phylogenesis is defined by the main contradiction that appears between the world and personality. “... People found themselves before contradiction; on the

one hand, they have the task comprehensively to learn the system of the world in its total relation, on the other hand – they – both through their own nature and through nature of the world system, – will never be able completely to perform this task. But such contradiction is not only in the nature of both factors: of world and of human, it is the main driver for the whole intellectual progress and is solved from day to day and continuously is in endless progressive development of humankind...” [252].

The works of national psychologists made some attempts to clear up the factors for psychical development of human in ontogenesis that are based on acknowledgement of unity in this process of the natural and the social.

Thus, G.S. Kostiuk assumes that an individual is a part of biological system, which defines its physical development, and at the same time – the social one that stipulates its establishment as personality. The personality in relation to society is the “subsystem” but at the same time it is the complex system itself, the integral system of systems, internally connected between themselves, being hierarchical.

The drivers for mental development of child (as well as the source for its self-motion) are the internal contradictions that appear in its life, activity, interrelations with environment, contradictions between new needs, aspirations of child and level in development of its capabilities, between requirements, set to it, and degree in mastery of necessary skills and abilities, between new tasks and habits, being formed earlier, ways of thinking and behavior, between growing internal capabilities of child that are ahead of its life style and objective position in family and collective.

There are other derivative contradictions. They are stipulated by attitude of child to environment, success and failures, imbalance in interaction between individual and society. However, the external contradictions that sometimes acquire the conflict character (for example, between a child and adults, etc.) do not become a driver for development on their own.

Only interiorizing, these contradictions stipulate the appearance of opposite tendencies for development at individual itself that enter

the field between themselves, they become the source for its activity, directed to solution of internal contradictions through formation of new ways for behavior. The contradictions are solved using activity and lead to formation of properties and qualities of personality. The determinant for internal contradictions is the processes of learning and education. They assist to appearance and successful overcoming with such contradictions in life of growing personality.

The main thing in understanding the psychological development of human is the question about its laws. The laws reflect the “internal logics in ontogenetic establishment of personality as a conscious social being, its orientation, capacities and other properties”. G.S. Kostiuk understands the “internal logics” is the internal necessary motion of personality, being formed, from the lowest to the highest levels of its ontogenetic development.

In this rising motion “external reasons always act through internal conditions”, in it there is the irreversible succession in main stages in history of mental development of child that is realized in the process of its learning and education. It is shown in qualitatively different levels in structural and functional relation and in forms of mental (visually acting, verbal imaginative, concrete and abstract conceptual) and practical activity.

It is clear that the learning cannot change this succession of stages in development of intellect as its most complex structures cannot genetically forego the simplest structures, however “it can and shall assist to acceleration of transition to higher structures, their full value formation”.

Thus, taking into consideration the specific laws for mental development is reduced to regard of succession in stages of intellect development. As such laws, due to theory by G.S. Kostiuk, – are the succession in changes of abovementioned changes, then he unites the concept of self-development with succession in changes. “The establishment of personality is the stipulated process, which is self-developing at the same time. It is its internally necessary motion from the lowest to the highest levels...” “Internal conditions”, through which the external reasons are always overcome, are found in succession of changes in stages of intellect development that occur

in the process for established interaction of those external conditions.

In opinion of G.S. Kostiuk, it is possible practically to manage the psychical development of child only taking into consideration its laws and forming “the internal conditions for mental development” in the process of learning. The power of learning, as G.S. Kostiuk mentions, is not that it may disregard the laws for development or change them but that it can purposefully manage the process of development, being based on the knowledge of laws.

What are “internal conditions” that shall be formed in the process of learning? They mean individual peculiarities for the higher nervous activity, its internal laws, described through physiological researches, needs and mindsets of human, feelings and abilities, system of skills, habits and knowledge, in which the individual experience of human, experience of the whole mankind is reflected.

G.S. Kostiuk agrees with conclusions by S.L. Rubinstein about the fact that “internal conditions”, forming under influence of external ones, however, is not their direct mechanical projection. Forming and changing in the process of development, they themselves stipulate the specific circle of influences, to which this phenomenon may be subject.

What are the internal laws for psychical development stipulated by? In the concept of development, described by us, we acknowledged the conformity between concrete age and individual peculiarities and a certain stage in human development. Each period is the section of life journey for growing individual and at the same time it's a certain degree of its development as personality with its inherent and relatively stable qualitative peculiarities.

Age peculiarities (and capabilities) are defined not only by previous learning but by the level in maturation of working capacity of the nervous system, which is defined by genotype in successive establishment of organism systems. The learning assists to maturation of the nervous system. These internal processes are also linked with relations of child with environment, its education.

However they are deprived of relative independence, which should be minded at consideration of those questions. Thus, “the

highest border” of age capabilities is defined by genotypic side of maturation as the influence of learning on development is mediated by age and individual peculiarities of children.

The theoretical approach by G.S. Kostyuk to problem of learning and development enabled him coming to the following practical conclusion: the management for process of development is more complex task than the management for process of knowledge acquisition; these processes are interrelated. Setting the new goals to pupils, increasing the requirements to them and helping to perform them, learning and education directs the activity of pupils and thus manages their development.

The concept of the psychical (and, in particular, mental) development of personality by L.S. Vygotsky, which found its continuation in works by his followers – O.M. Leontyev, D.B. Elkonin, V.V. Davydov, P.Ya. Galperin et al – grounded the historical principle for understanding psychical processes, being important for psychology. The cultural forms of behavior appear and are formed in the course of historical development of human (and, accordingly, in ontogenetic development of each individual human).

The original form for adaptation to nature (according to L.S. Vygotsky) that substantially differs a human from animals and is the basis for its whole life cannot but cause to principally other, unlike, otherwise organized system of behavior. He considers that it is the development of higher psychical functions that is one of the most important aspects herein.

In opinion of L.S. Vygotsky, all cultural is social. Higher psychical functions that appear in the process of cultural development are based on the mechanism, which, according to the words by L.S. Vygotsky, is “the copy of the social”. Any function in cultural development firstly acts as an interpsychological category and later becomes intrapsychological one.

The psychological nature of human, as L.S. Vygotsky told, is the totality of public relations, which are transferred inside and became the functions of personality and forms of its structure. All internal in the highest psychical functions was external sometime. The society (according to L.S. Vygotsky) is the determinant for psychical

development. The stimulating force that actuates the ripening mechanism and pushes it to further development is not inside but outside of a teenager.

Within this context the tasks, set to a child by social environment, are linked with its growing into cultural, professional, public life of adults and is in fact the essential functional moment. And it once more point to mutual conditionality, organic relation and internal unity of moments for content and form in development of personality.

In opinion of L.S. Vygotsky, the historical development is not limited only by a change of the content with which it deals; here there are changes in ways of thinking, structure and functions of psychical processes. The logics of theoretical approach to development of human psychics allows stating that genetic psychological laws are not absolute they are always socially stipulated and have their specificity. The cultural historical concept for development of the highest psychical functions anticipated the concept of subjective activity as its initial point. The activity and consciousness were mutually transitional concepts, united into integral system between themselves.

O.M. Leontyev in his researches came to the conclusion that the genetically initial and main form for human activity is the external, sensitive-practical activity.

In opinion of O.M. Leontyev, the practical activity is included into subject of study of psychology but only with the special content, which is represented in the form of sensation, perception, thinking, i.e. in the form of internal psychical processes and states of subject. However this statement is to a certain degree narrow; it is abstracted from the important fact that activity is included into process of psychical reflection itself, its content, its generation.

In this connection, as E.G. Yudin mentions [Yudin, 1978], the concept of subjective activity helped to clear up the origin and development of psychics: these two processes are the result from development of subjective activity. In pedagogical practice it means that the most efficient way for formation of the highest psychical functions is the development and use of corresponding forms for subjective activity and not just acquisition of knowledge, on which the

whole system of education is in fact built until present times. And one of the reasons for defects in the work of school is namely the inability consistently to implement the principle of activity in learning.

Such approach to subjective activity helped to define the real source for human abilities, which are the product of social historical development. According to theory of O.M. Leontyev, the general form for psychical development of child is the acquisition of socially produced abilities that is actively carried out by subject through its certain activity, thanks to which the recreation of historically formed abilities in psychical properties of individual takes place.

O.M. Leontyev and V.V. Davydov pay attention to the fact that a child in the process of appropriation of general human activity shall perform the activity, being not identical but similar to it. Thus, one of the main tasks for psychological research, in opinion of V.V. Davydov, is to disclose the structure of general human activity and to define how to make the adequate activity of children themselves.

The provisions about appropriation of socially produced abilities as a general form of psychical development in theoretical plan require the establishment of correlations between learning and development.

“There is, perhaps, no famous theoretician of didactics or child psychologist, – says D.B. Elkonin, – who did not try to answer the question, in which correlation these two processes are.

This question is complicated by the fact that the categories of learning and development are different. The efficiency of learning is as a rule measured by quantity and quality of knowledge, acquires in the process of learning, and the efficiency of development is defined by level of pupils’ capabilities, i.e. how much the main forms of psychical activity are developed at pupils that allow quickly, deeply and correctly orienting in the phenomena of surrounding reality” [Elkonin, 1989].

V.V. Davydov [Davydov, 1996] specifies that learning and education acts as a general and necessary form for psychical development of children – namely the form for organization of this process but not the independent process that takes place along with development.

The development of capabilities and acquisition of knowledge, abilities and skills are the processes that are not identical due to their nature. Mental capabilities are shown in acquisition and application of different knowledge. Yu.O. Samarin mentions that the capability is expressed in ability of human to apply most efficiently some or other action. However not each ability may be called capability but only such one that is included into comparatively new solution of question, i.e. creative ability, where action occurs as a result from searches and establishment of analogies (sometimes rather remote one) with the actions, being performed earlier, with their elements, which are combined by a new way.

The significant moment in research of problem on development is the issue about special and general capabilities; their formation has the concrete basis. It is known that special capabilities to realization of different kinds of activity are produced at people as a result from historical development (in particular, in relation to social division of work). Their realization depends on social conditions, position of personality in society, state of productive forces, accumulation of life experience, etc. Special capabilities are defined by objective requirements, which a certain sphere of production, culture and arts sets to a human.

In addition to special working experiences in concrete sphere of activity, a human achieves a certain level of general development, acquires the life experience. Here we speak about general capabilities.

Between general and special capabilities there are complex relations. Special capabilities are genetically and structurally linked with general ones; the latter ones are shown and developed in special capabilities.

“Special capabilities, – writes B.G. Ananyev, – is the product from development of special kinds of activity and have the special meaning in general development of human that influences on formation of potential qualities for personality. The product from general development is the talent, which S.L. Rubinstein justifiably calls “general capability”. Thus, there is more fundamental problem on correlation of general and special development behind the

question about correlation of talent and special capabilities” {Ananyev, 1968a}.

At his time B.G. Ananyev blamed M.S. Leytes in reduction of problem on development of pupils to study of special capabilities, when the event of general talent was in fact ignored. “M.S. Leytes, – told B.G. Ananyev, – wrongfully specializes the process of learning and mental activity of pupils, considering that each of academic subjects at school (Physics, History, Mathematics, etc.) along with general capabilities requires the following qualities as “qualities of intellect and qualities of memory” that find their personal application in a wide circle of activity) of some special capabilities.

M.S. Leytes in this provision obviously confuses the concept of special capabilities to certain kinds of work with specialization of general process of learning” [Ananyev, 1968a]. This question, in our opinion, is disputable as in school practice we have many cases, when a pupil, for example, obtains good results in language, literature, physics and at the same time gets behind in mathematics. Thus, the capabilities to mathematics are not developed at him.

B.M. Teplov considers that more general capabilities are indissolubly linked with special ones. The research, held by him, found out that special capabilities are not something isolated; they significantly depend on peculiarities of intellect and other characteristics of personality.

From here arises the necessity in separation of general and special moments in capabilities. S.L. Rubinstein, B.G. Ananyev, Yu.A. Samarin, S.M. Leytes and some other authors did not disclose qualitative sides of capabilities but only tried to reduce the general capabilities to capabilities of mental activity, which were added with emotional volitional qualities of personality and properties of the nervous system.

Such position had its own objective reasons. The traditional pedagogical psychology, although officially declared but in fact failed to take into consideration the general tendencies of psychical development. The reason for this should be sought in crudity of theories of activity as special form for recreation of individual capabilities.

Only some psychical processes (chiefly thinking), their peculiarities and tendencies of development were mainly researched. Hereby it was considered that historical development of human psychics is namely in reconstruction of separate processes – perception, memory, thinking and language, as well as in change of their role. The concrete psychological researches did not pay attention to the internal relation of psychical processes. But the latter ones are not the independent lines of development, although they may be selected. The development of memory is a certain succession in changes, however its necessity is determined not by internal factors but by the fact that it depends on the place, which memory occupies in activity of human at a certain stage of development.

The psychological study of consciousness in fact went mainly along the line of study of thinking. Thus, speaking about consciousness, we meant the thinking itself, a circle of notions, concepts... However, the psychical development of consciousness is not reduced only to development of thinking. The consciousness has its own psychological characteristics. In order to find it, it is necessary to study the dependence of human consciousness on the way of its life, on its “being”.

Its own special type of the main activity corresponds to each period of childhood. The character and level of formation for types of activity, directed to recreation of socially produced capabilities that consequently change each other, define the content and peculiarities for such capabilities. The latter ones should be understood as psychological mechanisms for realization of some or other productive activity.

The leading activity is the activity, which development stipulates the main changes in psychical processes, psychological peculiarities for personality of child at a certain stage of its development.

The main psychological new formations (capabilities) of child depend on the character of leading activity during this age period; the new kinds of activity appear and differentiate in its form, separate psychical processes appear, are formed and reconstructed.

The issues about drivers for psychical development of child in theory of activity are linked with its place in the system of social

relations. However this place does not define the development and only characterizes already existing, achieved level. The development of child is directly defined by its external and internal activity, which depends on available living conditions. The role of external living conditions for a child and inclinations, which it has, can be explained only due to such approach.

“One can state, writes D.B. Elkonin, – that any notion about drivers for psychical development shall first of all be checked on “test stone” of periodization” [Elkonin, 1989]. Speaking about theoretical and practical meaning of hypothesis about periodicity in processes of psychical development and construction of scheme for periodization on its basis, D.B. Elkonin mentions that it enables: firstly, explaining the gap that exists in child psychology between development of motivational and intellectual cognitive sides of personality, showing their discordant unity; secondly, considering the process of psychical development not as a linear one but such one that runs along rising spiral; thirdly, opening the way to study relations that exist between separate age periods. And at last, fourthly, this hypothesis is directed to such division of psychical development that corresponds to its internal laws.

The need in study of mechanisms for connection of learning and mental development arises from the principle of activity (in relation to age and pedagogical psychology). Such mechanism is the learning activity of pupils as the laws of its development express the laws for development of psychics.

The learning activity is the directed activity; the pupils in the process of its formation acquire the generalized ways of actions and scientific concepts. It is not identical to “tuition” and “learning”. The latter ones characterize the processes for acquisition of certain knowledge and abilities in various kinds of activity. The direct product from this activity is first of all the development of pupil. In opinion of D.B. Elkonin, the product from learning activity is the changes, from which a pupil suffered in the process of its fulfillment.

As any concrete kind of activity, the learning activity has the stages of origin, formation and disintegration. It performs its leading role in psychical development of child in junior school age. The

recreation of human capabilities in properties of individual that formed historically occurs in the process of such activity.

These notions about learning activity substantially change the view on means, using which the acquisition of knowledge and mental development of child takes place. “It is not so difficult to understand, – writes famous philosopher E.V. Ilyenkov, – that the acquisition of material, anticipated by programs, does not automatically coincide with bringing up the capability “independently to think”. However to understand the difference between this and that one means only to make the first step in right direction.

The second, more important and difficult step is to overcome with that difference, i.e. not to consider “the acquisition of knowledge” and “bringing up of intellect” as two different tasks. “Different” means that each of them can and shall be solved separately, independently on each other, and, accordingly, by “different” means and methods. The whole problem is to build the process for acquisition of knowledge so that at the same time it was the process for bringing up of intellect, capability to think” [Ilyenkov, 1991a].

Thus, the study of questions about relation of learning and development anticipates first of all the disclosure of essence for general human activity, imbedded into subjects of culture, its transformation into academic discipline. From what has been said it becomes clear that the learning activity is socially standardized and is carried out in the process of communication. The task for formation of learning activity anticipates the establishment of its motivational basis and acquisition of operating structure. The structure of learning activity, as soon as it develops, is transformed into the form of subjective activity of child, i.e. the appropriate attitude to people and surrounding reality is formed at pupil.

The main structural components in learning activity are the needs, motives, learning tasks, actions and operations but the specific need and motive is the theoretical attitude to reality.

Its essence means the pupil’s assessment of subject using socially produced criteria, namely: through correlation of functions, inherent to a certain subject and ways for their realization.

It is clear that such attitude principally differs from the vital, daily, which is characterized by utility and practicality. The scientific criteria for assessment of subjects, distinguished in the process of learning, are the general laws in a certain sphere of knowledge and become its main units.

The scientific provisions for concept of learning activity are most completely developed for primary school. The researches by V.V. Davydov, V.V. Repkin, A.K. Markova and others showed that the theoretical attitude to reality starts forming already in pupils of junior school age. It is the main psychical new formation, on which the formation of concrete actions, capabilities and motives depends, and thus, acts as the general mechanism for production of other concrete ways for realization of any productive activity.

The most important structural component in learning activity is the learning task, “which main difference from other tasks is that its purpose and result are directed to change the acting subject itself but not to change disciplines, with which a subject acts. Pupils in the process of solution of learning tasks discover and acquire the most general ways for solution of classes of tasks in a certain subjective sphere. The specific peculiarity for learning task is that it acts as a means for learning activity.

The components of learning activity are the learning actions (being adequate to meaningful characteristics of subject) and their corresponding operations. The operations anticipate the establishment of the following changes:

- transformation of situation for definition of general attitude to the system, being considered;
- modeling the defined attitude in graphic and symbolic form;
- transformation of model of attitude for study of its properties in “pure” form;
- derivation and construction of series for separate concrete practical tasks, which are solved by general way;
- control for performance of previous actions;
- assessment for acquisition of general way as a result from solution of this task.

The learning activity of pupils is formed in joint work with teacher, who gradually passes the fulfillment of its separate components to pupils.

The laboratory of educational psychology at G.S. Kostiuk Institute of psychology in APS of Ukraine performed the complex research on problem of learning and development of pupils at general education schools. Its employees researched the psychological peculiarities for formation of learning activity of pupils and its separate new formations (theoretical consciousness, reflection). We thought that the process for formation of learning activity is the original way to manage learning and development of pupils that enables tracking the genesis and dynamics for establishment of psychical new formations as concentrated indices for mental development of pupil.

The research anticipated the following main directions:

1. Designing the learning content pursuant to psychological laws for formation of learning activity.

The structure and procedural essence of learning activity, considered by us, give grounds, immediately after V.V. Davydov, to formulate some logical psychological conclusion, which can be used at definition of content for academic subjects.

The basis for concrete content (native language, natural science, botany, and chemistry), concrete methods and techniques of learning was the principle for convergence from the abstract to the concrete. It anticipated that the acquisition of knowledge, which have the abstract general character, forego the acquaintance of pupils with more partial and concrete knowledge.

The original acquisition of scientific laws became the initial material to derive concrete ways of activity. The knowledge, which constitutes a concrete academic subject, is mastered by pupils in the process for analysis of conditions for their origin that generates the need of pupils in this knowledge.

The pupils in the process for concrete practical transforming activity shall acquire the abilities to detect the genetic, initial, significant, general relation that defines the content and structure of this knowledge in the learning material. The pupils reproduce the

genetic initial relation through special subjective, symbolic or graphical models.

Pupils shall be able to carry out the mental transitions from the general to the partial and vice versa.

They shall be able to pass from fulfillment of actions in the internal (mental) plan to their fulfillment in the external plan and vice versa.

The level of scientific quality in academic (mathematical, natural and linguistic) knowledge, which pupils had to master, although being higher than the one that was included into effective program, however turned out to be feasible for them. It gives grounds to state that age intellectual capabilities of children in acquisition of knowledge in separate subjects are significantly higher than it was considered in traditional learning but they have their own specificity. The result from experiment was also the successful formation of positive attitude to learning and work at pupils. Its source was the objective necessity in analysis and assessment of those public relations, in the process of which a concrete kind of learning and working activity is realized.

2. Formation of action for control and self-control at pupils as one of components in learning activity.

The research of content, functions and peculiarities for formation of control actions in the structure for solution of learning tasks showed that:

- a) the content of control-evaluating learning actions is defined by the character of material, being checked;
- b) the control-evaluating actions at different stages in process for solution of tasks have the prognostic and retrospective functions, they define the uniform structure for control actions, which may be applied to all cases in fulfillment of the task;
- c) the formation of control-evaluating actions in the process for solution of tasks anticipates a certain level of generation of specific subjective actions for change in features for objects of the task at pupils;

d) the readiness and ability to perform the control are stipulated by orientation of pupil to general way for solution of tasks: the more oriented a pupil to a way for solution is, the larger the need to perform the control – both retrospective and prognostic – is.

3. The search for ways of efficient acquisition of learning tasks by pupils. The subject of research, held with pupils in 3-4 classes, was the learning actions, which assisted to formation of ways for “disclosure” and acquisition of words. The process for acquisition of new words takes place:

a) through setting special linguistic tasks, directed to establish the direct and indirect connections of words;

b) through correlation of grammatical form of words and corresponding concepts in the process for formation of differentiated ways for acquisition of words from different lexical groups. Pupils showed the internal properties for concrete subjects and phenomena of surrounding reality, distinguished the significant features. As a result from abstraction and generalization of features they understood the meaning of those words that define certain subjects.

The research showed that the necessary condition to acquisition of new words by pupils is the formation of special ways for solution of linguistic tasks at them.

Thus, a word in learning activity was an object of lexical grammatical analysis, was studied in unity of its form and content.

4. The research of communicative activity in the system “teacher – pupil”.

The communicative activity in the system “teacher – pupil” is of a certain interest as the content of communication may at the same time be the content of learning and learning activity of pupils due to the form is a specially organized communication.

The research showed that the communicative activity of teacher shall correspond to a great number of communicative criteria, the main one of which is the unity of subject’s content in logically defined succession and purposes of concrete communicative actions. The research helped to define that the role of logical aspect in linguistic

component for communicative activity of teacher is increased at child with age.

If the communicative actions of teacher in junior classes are directed to continuous psychological influence on pupils, then the communicative ability in senior classes consists first of all of provision with logics of teaching the learning material. Besides, the significant moment is to follow to the proper style of interaction with pupils.

5. Determination of optimal variants for joint learning activity of pupils.

The performed research enables stating that the successfulness in joint learning activity to a significant extent depends on taking into consideration the peculiarities for attitude in system “pupil – teacher”.

In the process of experiment it was found out that the joint learning activity was mostly efficient in the groups, which were characterized by:

- a) homogeneity in sociometric status of members in groups and available close interrelations between them;
- b) comparatively similar level of successfulness with absence of “mutual non-acceptance” in this group.

Manning the academic groups pursuant to defined criteria in system “pupil – pupil” has the great possibilities for successful construction of learning process in unity of its developing and educative functions.

The basis of abovementioned directions for research of this problem was the uniform methodological approach – genetic modeling method that allows reproducing the psychical processes and stages of their origin under special conditions. It was practically realized in the form of designing the learning content and was built on its basis of learning.

The application of genetic modeling method in the form of experimental learning allows to a certain extent realizing the concept of mental development by L.S. Vygotsky.

Theory of learning activity by V.V. Davydov

This theory discloses the interrelations between the psychical development of child, its education and learning. The general grounds for its elaboration are:

- firstly, the social pedagogical aspect, related to growing requirements to the level of general cultural and vocational training of a modern human,
- secondly, the scientific theoretical aspect that studies the internal dependence of ontogenetic development of psychics and personalities of human, defined system of its creation: learning and education.

The essence of abovementioned problem – “the interrelation of learning and education” – consists in study of meaning for general educational systems in development of child psychics and namely – in detection of internal sources and laws for this process.

The pedagogy in this field sets the didactic tasks to improve the content and methods for academic educational work with children. Psychology is the issue of psychodiagnostics, Vygotsky, rejecting the approach by foreign psychologists to this problem, characterized it as “... the aspiration in the analysis of child mental development thoroughly to divide the one that comes from development and the one that comes from learning, to take the results from both these processes in pure and isolated form” [Vygotsky, 1983a, p. 251-252].

Vygotsky, mentioning that such learning follows the development, “tails along it”, suggested the idea for concrete historical interpretation of social origin of generic capabilities, social nature of different forms for activity in appropriation of social experience.

The psychological theory about interrelation of learning and development, developed by L.S. Vygotsky, S.L. Rubinstein, O.M. Leontyev, P.Ya. Galperin, D.B. Elkonin, A.V. Zaporozhets, suggest the provision about special stage in “recreating activity” that arises and is formed at child in the process of its development, pursuant to which it catches or recreates the general capabilities of human race.

The education and learning acts here as general and necessary form for psychical development of children. The psychical development of child finds its expression both as a result from changes inside recreating activity, its forms and as a part of capabilities, acquired in different kinds of activity.

Hereby in order to study the internal relation of education and learning with psychical development, as Vygotsky emphasized, it is necessary to have the research methods, directed to formation of integral kinds of activity at children and their corresponding capabilities but not the effects for acquisition of certain concepts in the process of learning by child and effects of psychical development.

Among other genetically successive forms for recreating activity we will consider the learning activity that allows a child recreating the capability to theoretical orientation in reality.

It should be noted that the developmental role for system of learning and education is that the modern society shall form a new circle of capabilities at children, i.e. to organize functioning of new forms for recreating activity.

“Pedagogy, – wrote Vygotsky, – shall orient not to the past but to tomorrow of child development” [Vygotsky, 1981a, p. 47].

The problems for interrelation of learning and mental development at human at present time have acquired not only the theoretical but practical meaning that defines the real level of school education.

The efforts by scientists-psychologists are directed:

Firstly, to deepened solution of issue about ways for acquisition of knowledge that lead to qualitative changes in child thinking,

Secondly, to study those forms of mental activity at pupil that provide with penetration into essence of acquired knowledge.

While solving these issues, the psychologists relied on the provision about dialectical way of human cognition, ideas of dialectical logics about the method for convergence from the abstract to the concrete as a way to teach scientific knowledge.

The development of tasks, methods and determination of results from academic work is hereby based on notion about special kind of child activity as a way for acquisition. There arise the tasks to study

the qualitative forms for this activity, its levels and used operations that correspond to different depth for penetration of child into content of knowledge.

The modern researches in abovementioned directions are based on the results, received by different directions of soviet psychological school. V.V. Davydov, P.Ya. Galperin, S.L. Rubinstein and their colleagues researched the relation of large-scale analysis with solution of learning tasks. The imaginary transition from separate peculiarities to logical dependences, made in the process of analysis through transformation of this situation using the defined mental actions, has not only the special meaning for formation of intellectual capabilities at children but for general psychical development, and, in the whole, mental and esthetical education.

The essential moment in mental education is the formation of capabilities for imaginary experiment, to interiorized transformation of subjective content of actions. The full value analysis of learning process is possible only on the basis of adequate provisions in general psychological theory of activity.

The works of those scientists, being based on integral pragmatic interpretation of psychics, consciousness, personality, formulated the provision both for learning at the level of integral personality but not its certain functions and the requirements to motivational sphere of personality that provides with acquisition of personalistic content during acquisition of knowledge and abilities. The real unity of education and learning constitutes the acquisition of personalistic content.

The prejudice of human consciousness, personalistic content of the manifestation for public relations, realized as a subjective form, is carried out by subject only in activity. The transformation of activity, coordination of its different forms and kinds that occur inside the public relation creates personality.

Hereby, the practical activity as the transformation of reality recreates those relations that are reflected in the public form in forms of human theoretical thinking. Subjective practical activity directs the development of thinking and is the basis for scientific approach to cognitive processes.

The pragmatic interpretation of psychics also allows successfully studying the age laws for origin and formation of those types of activity, inside which the development of consciousness and personality occurs.

The concept “learning activity” as a specific form for recreating activity acts as the object of our study. This concept significantly deepened understanding the process of acquisition. It was introduced pursuant to pragmatic interpretation of concepts for consciousness and personality. The scientific study of problem for developmental learning is directly linked with setting a question about concrete historical approach to assessment of character for primary learning.

It should be mentioned that the social functions of traditional school defined its empirical utilitarian character that emphasizes the improvement of visual imaginary thinking. It generates the situation, at which the traditional primary learning does not provide with significant mental development. The latter is mentioned, for example, by B.G. Ananyev, L.V. Zankov et al. [Ananyev, 1968a, Zankov, 1982].

Pursuant to these researches, V.V. Davydov and his colleagues put forward the task for significant change in content and methods of primary learning, namely determinative influence of learning activity of junior pupils on their psychical development.

Scientists think that without psychological foundation, based on ability to study well it is impossible to provide with efficient acquisition of basics for modern science and culture by children. This concept was founded on necessity to form the theoretical knowledge at pupils but not the empirical consciousness, which peculiarity was the separation of general content in different spheres of spiritual production by human. “... Application of adequate ways for construction of scientific concepts, artistic images, moral values and legal norms” [Davydov, 1996, p. 145].

It is clear that such forms for theoretical activity are realized through defined capabilities. It is the capability for construction of different ideal formations by human that embed some or other kinds of activity. These kinds of activity represent a set and their specificity

is that the introduction of pupil into them is possible only using the special learning activity, in which the acquisition of those capabilities takes place.

According to researches by psychologists from V.V. Davydov's school, the main among abovementioned capabilities are:

- a) clarification of general conditions for origin of ideal formation;
- b) tracing the conformity of its actions to conditions (reflection);
- c) performance of actions in internal plan ("in intellect").

Thus, it is possible to introduce pupils into the main forms of scientific theoretical consciousness or thinking only through formed learning activity.

The experimental formation of such integral system of learning was launched by D.B. Elkonin at the beginning of the 60-ies in XX century and is continued until now. D.B. Elkonin showed that the formation of theoretical thinking, mastery of qualitatively new methods for orientation in the world by pupils, formation of capabilities, development of personality occurs only inside full value academic activity. Only through it a subject is oriented to the change and transformation of itself that constitutes the originality of necessary motivational basis for real learning.

These researches answered many important questions about formation of ways for theoretical analysis, questions about reflection, forms of actions, and, on the other hand, set new questions for further research of ways for optimization of academic educational process.

Besides, there arose new questions to methodological apparatus, namely – to forming experiment as a method for active "recreation" of peculiarities for learning activity.

The works, made under supervision of V.V. Davydov, showed that any other system of primary learning, remaining at the level of formation of empirical consciousness, although has a certain developing effect, does not provide with mastery of capabilities, inherent to theoretical consciousness.

The point is that many school tasks that correspond to scientific criteria for cultural level of society require the theoretical approach and analysis for their solution. This, in its turn, assumes the special organization of learning activity and the issue about conscious learning – corresponding methodological provision.

The works by psychologists from V.V. Davydov's school established that the real realization of learning assumes, on the one part, the fulfillment of corresponding actions by children, i.e. transformation of learning material, and on the other part, – transformation of mastered material into direct purpose of those actions. The qualitative learning is hereby achieved by a certain organization for statement and solution of special learning tasks by children.

The disclosure of tasks, structure and ways to use the learning methods of pedagogical science is possible only on the strong basis of psychological research for problem of learning, its methods.

As an object of research, the forming experiment acts as the means for fundamental and applied researches of learning activity in the uniform psychological pedagogical experiment. As a method of scientific cognition, it can be used within different theoretical approaches in composition of curricula, construction of academic subject.

The specificity in use of forming experiment within the concept of learning activity is that the learning material, acquired by pupil, experimentally recreates the conditions for formation of scientific theoretical thinking due to principle of meaningful generalization and organization of learning activity – through “convergence from the abstract to the concrete” (V.V. Davydov).

Hereby there appears the requirement, according to which the psychological didactic research is based on the fact that formation of learning activity shall be directed to overcome with description of process for acquisition of knowledge, abilities and skills by pupils and encouragement for formation of capabilities and acquisition of concepts. Forming experiment is directed to experimental reproduction of conditions for realization of theoretically

distinguished laws for establishment of capabilities and properties of personality in learning activity.

The own psychological part of this study on the basis of forming experiment is the detection and deep study of internal mechanisms for regulation of this activity itself, mechanisms of process for acquisition of knowledge.

The experience in performance of Davydov's forming experiment about experimental design of school programs in V.V. Davydov's school found some requirements to its organization. Let's mention some their moments.

It is necessary to distinguish the indices for formed phenomenon that acts as an object of psychological study and factors that made the influence on establishment of this phenomenon or new formation. Both the first ones (dependent variables) and the second ones (independent variables), according to research hypothesis and tasks, may be changed, transformed, added that influences both on strategy of forming experiment in the whole and on certain moments in its performance – production of hypotheses, analysis of data, characteristics for phenomenon under research.

Only having performed the definition and interpretation of essence for categories and concepts, choice of theory and laws, i.e. initial provisions of researcher, as well as, strictly speaking, a subject of research, new sides of the problem under research – i.e. all that defines the set purpose and suggested hypothesis – a psychologist-experimentalist may proceed to direct performance of forming experiment, during which the planned change in phenomenon under research is carried out.

Making the current quantitative and qualitative analysis of received results, a researcher specifies the hypothesis, or suggests an additional one, specifies and corrects the plan of research, introducing the additional stages, new methodologies for their performance.

The final analysis of results from research, if they are correspond to initial hypothesis, as well as find the adequate explanation within accepted theory, allows introducing specifications and adds the general theory.

Let's return to some aspects of forming experiment, considering the components of learning activity as its variables (independent and dependent). In the first case, i.e. at consideration of separate components in learning activity as dependent variables, the analysis for current situation in the course of learning covers the establishment of components in its structure, its kinds, purposes and levels.

Hereby there may arise the tasks for detailed study of any component in learning activity. They may be: acceptance of learning task by pupils and its independent statement, formation of initial actions for analysis, comparison, change, and modeling.

A researcher may also set a task to study the generalization of those actions at certain manifestations in subjects of considered class. Besides, the peculiarities for formation of pupil's evaluating activity, abilities to transform and to improve the special activity of learning are subject to analysis. A researcher in the course of stage-by-stage formation of actions receives the adequate information about progress in formation of learning activity.

However, based on principles of developing learning, an experimentalist shall record not only separate components of learning activity but the dynamics in their transformation and changes. The special attention is paid to controlled study of joint learning activity.

These changes may relate to research purpose, replacement of object of research, change of central hypothesis at theoretical stage and construction of forming experiment. Dependent variables may be the parts of integral psychical phenomena – such as, theoretical thinking, motivation in learning activity. Accordingly, it may be received only both through the change in learning activity and modified factors in curriculum.

Theory of developing and educative learning

The tasks for further improvement of learning and education require developing the theoretical issues about complex approach to research of problem on unity of learning and education, which is

based on theoretical concept “learning that educates and develops”, introduced into psychological science as a result from long theoretical experimental researches. The content of this concept disproves the theory of some researchers, which state that learning and education are different, independent on each other processes.

The practice shows that only their unity and mutual penetration are the psychological basis for overall development of personality. What concrete arsenal of scientific means does the modern developmental and pedagogical psychology have for solution of task in such statement?

As V.V. Davydov rightly mentions, there are extremely many descriptive works on issues of psychology of personality but the problem is, on the one hand, to study and to check the psychological conditions and mechanism for purposeful formation of certain qualities at children, and on the other hand – ability to manage the complex approach in education of personality.

The complexity of this program is that a complex approach to education requires the interrelations and mutual transitions of various forms and kinds of activity of child. “Our psychology, – emphasized V.V. Davydov, – possesses the learning techniques for separate kinds of activity but feels the difficulties in tracing their internal interrelations when elements of one activity become the components of the other activity (for example, when a playing motive is transformed into cognitive one, a learning action is transformed into working one)” [Davydov, 1996].

This means the attempt psychologically to ground the objective necessity in transfer of accent from developing to educative possibilities for learning activity. The development of this problem was launched in works by L.S. Vygotsky, G.S. Kostyuk, and later – O.M. Leontyev and his school.

Understanding the psychological development of subject requires a certain understanding its activity.

It is known that the concept “activity”, being historically formed in psychology, acts mainly as the characteristics for activity of an individual subject and the process of activity itself – as an attribute of individual human.

However, I.V. Yurkevich in his works considered a human activity wider, as such one that generates a human and defines all its socially important changes. The concrete psychological interpretation of such understanding of activity was suggested by O.M. Leontyev in definition of personality “as internal moment of activity”.

The concept about appropriation of formed capabilities by individual and ways of behavior as the basis of psychological development for many researchers in the field of developmental and pedagogical psychology is not the initial category. Thus, the division of pedagogical process into two main parts – learning and education – takes place, i.e. the disconnected ones are the main characteristics of activity: moral and intellect, will and mind, motivation, feeling and theoretical cognition.

The problem on unity of development and education in learning acts as the correlation of meaning (form for generalized and reflected objective human experience, ideal spiritual form for social human practice) and personalistic sense (attitude of subject to reflected thing). Let’s consider how they appear in the process of human activity.

As it is known, the activity is regulated by psychical reflection that is generated in the process of activity itself. Two systems of relations may be distinguished in the complex process of transition from activity to consciousness, orienting to its motivational and operating technical aspects. The first one is the social subjective conditions, relation of different activities, in which their objective meaning for run of these activities is disclosed. The content of meaning may be fixed in concepts, knowledge, generalized images, actions, subjective and social norms, values, etc. The meaning, which carrier is language, is one of the main “units” of consciousness.

The second “unit” is the personalistic sense.

It is disclosed at study of the second system of relations – attitude of subject to subjective social conditions of activity. The passion of human consciousness is born namely in this system of relations.

While researching the motivational aspect of activity, the reality is disclosed in such system of relations, which show not only the

objective meaning of this knowledge but its vital meaning for human itself. Thus, the formation of personality consciousness anticipates the education of motives as only they define the attitude of subject to surrounding environment, which in this case serves as a purpose of its action.

Speaking about unity in formation of moral and intellect, it is necessary to have the notion about their sources, about determinants of human behavior. First of all it is necessary to take into consideration that the ethical sphere is the important aspect for activity, which an individual shall acquire. As a special phenomenon of human culture, it performs certain functions in life of society and is designed to solve objective tasks. Such peculiarities for ethical sphere set concrete requirements to psychological formation which underlie the behavior of people and act as an original individual mechanism for its functioning.

The determinants for moral behavior (moral) of human are formed in the process of direct communication between people thanks to unity, collision and mutual entwinement of actions and wishes, which reflect the material technical and cultural technical conditions for being of society.

At the same time it is possible to distinguish the factors of behavior, which form the second level of determination and regulate (control, arrange) the actions of abovementioned reasons, restrict or cease antisocial tendencies, which arise as a result from natural “disaster, formed by spontaneous action of factors at the first level”. In this connection there appears the original contradiction between the ones that we conditionally call individual aspirations of people (first level), and possible negative consequences from realization of a certain part of these aspirations for other people and society in the whole.

Such contradiction finds a concrete manifestation in situations, where the commitment of action for satisfaction of narrow individual interest leads to clash of interests from wide layers of society, when a human can make the choice between its interests and the interests of those ones, who surround it.

Such freedom of choice, i.e. practical possibility to commit any of actions that contradict each other, is the significant peculiarity for

this situation and one of reasons that actions of people under these conditions require the special regulation on the part of society.

The regulation is divided into normative, institutional, for example, law (legal rules) and non-institutional, which main form is the moral. Each form of regulation is directed to different manifestations of this contradiction. The moral as a social phenomenon appears during the period for entry of human into system of social relation. The moral is not needed beyond society.

The moral notions and values are formed in social collective activity, and thus, the orientation of moral at each of its participants depends on organization of joint activity, due to which the socially significant moral qualities are formed at its participants and the contradictions of the individual and the social are removed.

We will consider the main functions of learning activity, its educational possibilities in terms of abovementioned positions. Learning activity provides with acquisition of human culture by individual. The latter one acts as the condition for existence of society.

Human culture is the system of activities, accumulated by mankind, which are passed from generation to generation. It consists of four elements: scientific, artistic, moral and legal. Their acquisition enables fulfillment of all social functions by individual.

In order to master these elements of culture, to form the moral and legal consciousness, using the learning activity, a child is included into social relations, collective activity as the moral values, rules of behavior are namely in its basis.

Here it is important to take into consideration the fact that the origin of actions is the historically direct consequence from transition of human to the life in society, appearance of social relations at it in the process of work. The insufficient educative effect of modern learning is stipulated, in particular, by defects in theoretical notions about learning activity. Mostly often it is considered as intellectual cognitive activity. Hence it follows that its purpose is to provide pupils with scientific knowledge and skills, necessary for life.

The learning activity is artificially separated from the system of other kinds of child activity and its pedagogical management is

limited by its progress. The real relations of learning activity with other activities are also not taken into consideration. In this connection the academic learning possibilities for learning activity itself are reduced. Thus, it is necessary to take into consideration that the learning activity of child is the period of its integral and plethoric life during school years and the interrelation of all components in this life is the regularity for human development, which serves as a psychological basis for unity and indissolubility of its learning and psychical development.

Namely the acquisition of scientific, artistic and other experience in the process of academic activity is of full value when learning is interlaced with game in childhood, later passes into work, into fulfillment of tasks, set by society.

Being formed historically, human activity is in the state of constant motion, development, in the process of which different kinds and forms of activity appear. On the basis of one activity there appears another activity (in the process for development of play activity, for example, the learning activity, etc. is formed).

The realization of educative measures requires taking into consideration the peculiarities and character for different kinds of activity, which are formed. The psychological laws are mutually subordinated and the change in human activities in the process of development should be considered as the basis for successful solution of tasks for formation of personality. "Only with such approach that arises from analysis of content in developing activity of child itself, – mentions O.M. Leontyev, – it is possible to understand the leading role of education, which influences namely on activity of child, on its attitude to reality, and thus, defines its psychics" [Leontyev, 1984].

Such approach requires studying the structure and construction of activity, mechanisms for transformation of external activity into internal one. Its structural components, in our opinion, constitute the qualities of personality. Being in the system of various activities, children enter into interrelations with adults. Depending on kind of activity, in the process of which the possessions of human experience takes place, different psychological new formations, qualities of

personality are established, which at the same time constitute its structural components.

The activity of modern child is multidisciplinary and multiple-aspect. Its life in society is characterized not only by a certain composition of various activities and available leading activity, which performs the main role in intellectual and moral development of personality. Hence it follows that the development of psychics depends not only on activity in general but on leading activity in particular.

Thus, “the leading activity in its psychological meaning is such activity, which development stipulates the most important changes in psychical processes and psychological peculiarities for personality of child at this stage”. Its leading meaning is that it maximally assists to development not only of intellectual sphere, psychical processes, properties and states but to formation of full value personality.

The leading activity is the prerequisite, basis for origin and differentiation of new kinds of activity, its role in psychical development of child is not only in improvement of certain function but in change of interfunctional connections and relations that define the development of each psychical function.

Pursuant to study of laws for change in leading types of activity and transformation of certain structural components from one activity into another activity, national psychologists established the periodization of psychical development, which enables constructing the integral system of learning and education of children. Duly organized learning activity acts as the main condition for purposeful formation of personality. It concerns first of all the formation of theoretical thinking, abilities to learn, to possess capabilities, reasonably to operate theoretical knowledge. The proper organization of learning activity helps to form the arbitrariness of psychical processes at junior pupils, reflection of own ways for actions and behavior.

We think that it is necessary to mention the learning activity in organizational meaningful aspect as a personal deployed form for communication in the system “pupil – teacher”. Such organization enables purposefully influencing on personality of child in the whole,

on formation first of all of its needs and system of motives. At such consideration of learning activity we can speak about its real educative effect.

The organization of learning process beyond deployed form of communication cannot serve as the condition for formation of pupil personality.

So, to form the personality means to carry out the managements for hierarchic system of child activities in its each age period.

The serious educative shortcoming in modern learning process, in our opinion, is that the knowledge, acquired by pupil, is mainly included into the system of actions, hereby, the purposes of certain actions are strictly formed, set in the form of tasks with different type: physical, mathematical, i.e. those ones that are performed by him/her. The mastered knowledge (which a child lacks) acquires the educative meaning only in connection with fulfillment of different kinds of activity. And they enter its life as an organic part but not as an external condition only due to abovementioned terms.

Thus, it is necessary to introduce pupils into the system of social relations in interaction with their learning. The attention of teacher shall be directed to search for those kinds of academic work, which form socially necessary features for personality of pupils.

The learning and acquired knowledge educate children. But so that the knowledge would educate, mentions O.M. Leontyev, it is necessary to form the attitude to them. Here is the essence of conscious learning. The important meaning in acquisition of academic subjects is that which place in the life of pupil is occupied by the cognized.

The personality, which is “a subject of social relations, anticipates the joint cooperative activity. It is possible to form the personalistic sense, attitude of subject to subject of actions, motive of activity namely in it. Thus, it is necessary to model, to establish the social relations, into which pupils shall be included, in learning process.

The exchange of activities between pupils and teacher, pupil and other pupils, between pupils and society is carried out in relations. “The clarification for specificity in exchange of activities in the

process of learning, – mentions V.V. Repkin, – is the necessary prerequisite for solution of problem (formation of academic activity). The exchange of activities in deployed form is possible only at acquisition of theoretical concepts.

As empirically generalized ways of actions are oriented to qualities of available action; they beyond this situation are deprived of any content and cannot be represented” [252].

The activity of the one, who studies, in this case means the demonstration of some operations that provide with receipt of partial result and the activity of pupils is reduced to observation and copying of demonstrated operations.

At exchange of empirical generalized ways for actions the association of activities for the one, who teaches, and the one, who learns, rather takes place than their cooperation as the actions of individual acquire the new sense – firstly objective and then subjective only on the terms of cooperated activity.

What are the possible real forms for formation of social relations in learning process? They are various learning practical situations, which shall model, reproduce any moment in future kinds of activity. Thus, in order to orient pupils to activity of communication at lessons of Ukrainian language, they are provided with practical task: to write letters to different people (officer, a concrete person, a friend) with description of a certain subject matter, with statement of some event or attempt to persuade someone, to disprove his/her opinion.

In order to orient to working activity, one can suggest pupils to perform some work together but it is desired that they allocate the duties between themselves on their own. While preparing for a day of self-education it is necessary to give test tasks – to compose a summary, essay, etc. The orientation of pupils to future kinds of activity anticipates that socially important activity that starts immediately after lessons. It includes the work as a collective and socially useful activity of pupils themselves, self-education as independent acquisition of knowledge beyond the school, communication as interaction of pupils with adults and coevals to receive the data about surrounding reality, ways for its transformation. We should train pupils in school namely to such joint activity.

What main personalistic qualities does the learning activity form? Such qualities first of all include:

1. Upbringing social maturity, need to serve to society. It is possible if a pupil is able to imagine, into which sphere of activity he/she will be included according to the knowledge, acquired at lessons. This motivates the learning and forms the social maturity of pupil. This quality appears in learning practical situations, which model the productive activity.

2. Mutual responsibility and personal responsibility for the work entrusted to the comrades, society. These qualities are important for participation in labor joint activity of pupils.

3. Readiness to mutual aid and mutual supportiveness.

4. Ability impartially to occupy the position of any participant in activity. Thus, at mutual control – it is the ability firstly to be in the role of teacher, then to occupy the position of pupil in order to check, whether the latter one assessed its own work. This ability is also the basis for assessment of its activity in any situation.

Different regroupings, which are very widely used in present practice, assist to formation of new qualities for personality. Their essence is that a teacher delegates some its functions – at organization for acquisition of new knowledge and at assessment of work – to pupils themselves. A pupil by turns is in the position of the one, who assesses, or in the position of the one, who is assessed.

The acquisition of certain rules for behavior that act as one of components in the structure of human moral also occurs in learning activity. Performing these rules, a pupil shows its attitude to work of class collective. And the performance of rules in this case is the form for collective individual behavior of an individual pupil due to its direction and content.

Thus, at acquisition of rules for behavior at school it is this moment that shall step forward. Making subordinate to rules requires a pupil to have the ability to regulate his/her behavior and forms higher forms of free management by it.

It is the most important educative function for learning at school. Thus, the educational tasks of learning may be performed well, if its educative functions are realized at high level.

Theory of gradual formation of mental actions by P.Ya. Galperin

Forming experiment in psychology received the independent life as a research method thanks to efforts by L.S. Vygotsky and group of his pupils.

Let's fix on description of the main facts and scientific psychological events, under which influence the main directions in educational psychology that rely on forming experiment as the main research method were formed.

In the first turn, let's consider the theory of gradual formation of mental actions that is linked with the name of P.Ya. Galperin [Galperin, 1976, 1966] and his followers. Since the middle of the 50-ies in XX century the forming experiment was used in works by O.V. Zaporozhets, N.S. Pantyna, Z.O. Reshetova and P.Ya. Galperin. The main merit in development of further theory of forming experiment itself belongs P.Ya. Galperin.

P.Ya. Galperin in one of his works, written together with N.F. Talyzina, defines the essence of his approach, according to which "... we consider that mental actions are the psychical reflections of the higher mental actions. This provision has the direct practical meaning: it requires that the formation of new mental action would start from its external, physical form.

If its objects and tools for direct action are unavailable in original, the formation of new mental action shall start from its materialized form, i.e. from action, which relies on the material image of significant properties and relations of those means and objects" [Galperin, Talyzina, 1957].

However, the idea about interiorization does not arise from the theory of gradual formation of mental actions. This idea is rather the derivative methodological provision in the theory that wished the adequate research method. Forming experiment in this theory becomes such research method that mostly expresses the central idea of theory.

But being taken apart, even in combination with a concrete method of its realization, the idea about interiorization could not constitute the content of theory itself yet. For this, it is necessary to

put forward the hypothesis that explains the essence of interiorization process, disclosing it in the main chains.

The hypothesis, formulated by P.Ya. Galperin, was that the formation of oriented basis for action has the great, not to say, the determinative meaning at the very initial stage for formation of mental actions.

Indeed, P.Ya. Galperin was not alone in the 50-ies in understanding the meaning for oriented basis of action. Approximately at the same time some researches by O.V. Zaporozhets and his colleagues showed the significant meaning of orientation for formation of motor skills [Leontyev, 1984, p. 363].

At the same time P.Ya. Galperin found out different types of oriented basis for action. Researching the formation of abilities and skills, he and N.S. Pantyna, established that different variants for orientation of testees in the new tasks are grouped around three main types: the first of them is characterized by spontaneity in orientation, the second one – by available conscious orientation, limited by certain tasks, the third one – by conscious orientation, free from this limitation.

Hereby it was established that the definite process for formation of action and definite qualities of its product corresponds to each type of orientation according to Talyzina. Thus, due to some indices (speed for acquisition of knowledge, width of transferal, resistance to the change of conditions), the second type of orientation significantly exceeds the first one, and the third one exceeds the second one much more.

It is characteristic that P.Ya. Galperin understood the oriented basis of action not just as the previous notion about task, “compulsory notion about system of those features for new material. applying which it is possible correctly to perform the mentioned action” [Galperin, 1976, p. 60]. The concept for oriented basis of action by subject allowed realizing the fact that if the psychological content of mental action can be studied without reference to the psychological, the irreversible thing cannot be made: the psychological content of action cannot be studied without reference to non-psychological one.

It means that at formation of actions in mental plan it is necessary precisely to know the objective conditions for this process and objective requirements to its product. In other words, as P.Ya. Galperin mentions, “the possibility to track its formation as a completely objective process is opened thanks to subjective content of mental action. At the same time the psychological processes, which are included into this action and serve their fulfillment are opened to the same objective research”. [Galperin, 1976, p. 60].

Thus, the theory of gradual formation of mental actions is aimed to objective study of processes for origin of psychical phenomena.

Already in 1957 P.Ya. Galperin mentioned that “the main thing is that formation of mental action allows us tracing how on its basis the psychical phenomena appear...” [Galperin, 1957, p. 60].

The development of this theory led to separation of method for forming experiment as its central core. At the same time the application of this method caused to statement of such task as study of origin for the psychical. At initial stages of development of P.Ya. Galperin’s theory the method for forming experiment failed to receive the independent meaning as the disclosure of structure and description of stages in formation of a certain mental action were in the center of this theory, i.e. forming experiment was used not only as a proper research method but only as the condition that allowed studying the establishment of mental action.

Thus, the initial stages in development of this theory were linked mainly with three main directions of researches: definition of types of orientations, study of main characteristics for mental action, research on stages of interiorization. These three directions continued being developed during the next decade.

It should also be mentioned that the researches, held within the theory by P.Ya. Galperin, gradually passed from study of issues about formation of some or other certain mental actions and concepts (for example, abilities and skills of written language, simplest materialistic concepts, etc.) to study of problems for origin of general forms for psychical reflection [Zaporozhets, 1986].

The extension in range of such researches wished the development of some methodological issues. In the first turn –

realization of specificity for method, used in this theory, as well as analysis of consequences that arise from it both for psychological research and pedagogical practice.

In 1963 P.Ya. Galperin, O.V. Zaporozhets and D.B. Elkonin [Galperin, Zaporozhets, Elkonin, 1963] tried not only to make certain conclusion from theory of gradual formation of mental actions for pedagogical practice but to implement the psychological achievements, related to development of method for forming experiment, into pedagogical practice. Generalizing the results from developments, psychologists shared the new possibilities that were discovered in connection not only with conclusive part of research itself but its method, with pedagogues.

For the first time we mentioned the special importance of method for establishment of psychical formations not only for research tasks that appeared in practice of learning.

Thus, they pointed that “modern methods for primary learning ... are insufficiently efficient, lead to a large dispersion due to successfulness ... significant pedagogical faulty workmanship (different forms for poor progress and even elimination from school). The principal advantage of these methods is that they in fact reduce the pedagogical influence to verbal description and visual demonstration of samples... while the progress in acquisition of those samples and those actions itself remains non-regulated” [Galperin, Zaporozhets, Elkonin, 1963, p. 61].

And further “The gradual formation of mental actions that causes to their transformation from external, material ones into internal, ideal ones constitutes the main content for process of acquisition and the defined organization of external subjective activity of pupil that provides with such transformation is the main principle for rational management of learning process” [Galperin, Zaporozhets, Elkonin, 1963, p. 62].

Thus, in opinion of abovementioned authors, the organization and gradual formation of mental actions creates the nuclei of process for acquisition of new knowledge, abilities and skills by pupils.

So, in the middle of the 60-ies in XX century the psychologists came to the border that related to notions about forming experiment

not as about condition for psychological research but about significant means that allows studying the process for acquisition (appropriation) of some or other psychical formation by individual itself.

In 1966 P.Ya. Galperin, having considered the originality of method for forming experiment, unlike stating one, put forward the requirement for construction of psychical functions with preset properties [Galperin, 1966]. There are grounds to think that the researches, which are held using designing and modeling, firstly, the content of necessary psychical formations, secondly, main characteristics and forms, start more clearly defining in the field of educational psychology namely since this period. This line in development of forming experiment was headed by V.V. Davydov [Davydov, 1996].

P.Ya. Galperin thought that the study of already formed psychical processes and actions at human cannot find their real psychological mechanism as their structure has already been deployed, and, as much as to say, “frozen”.

It meant that it is necessary to pass from statement and external peculiarities for those processes and actions to study of their formation.

The idea about study of formation, as it is known, belonged to L.S. Vygotsky, who wrote: “To explain any thing means to clear up its real origin, its causal dynamic relation and attitude to other processes that define its development... For this we shall transform the automatic form for reaction into living process in the experiment, again to return a thing into motion, from which is appeared” [Vygotsky, 1982, p. 188].

It infringes the issue about dependence of research method on kinds of psychical formations, which are necessary to study, i.e. the issues about varieties of forming experiment itself. P.Ya. Galperin, answering the set question, defines the ways for development of cognitive function for forming experiment, distinguishing but not separating it from constructive one.

As it was mentioned above, in the 60-ies the need in methodological apprehension for relation of theory and method,

being adequate to it, put the representatives from theory of gradual formation of mental actions to necessity in deployed self-determination. P.Ya. Galperin in 1966 for the first time in explicit form suggests the system of coordinates for his theory. He writes: “We are obliged to L.S. Vygotsky that the concept of interiorization was introduced into practice of Soviet psychology...” [Galperin, 1966, p. 25].

Further P.Ya. Galperin marks off understanding of interiorization in J. Piaget and L.S. Vygotsky. Addressing to ideas of L.S. Vygotsky and pointing to their significance, P.Ya. Galperin mentions that experimental researches at L.S. Vygotsky were performed genetically and (although in implicit form) contained three fundamental ideas:

- a) the real structure of psychological functions is disclosed only in genesis; when they are finally formed, this structure “goes inside” and “is covered” by “external”, absolutely other kind, nature and form;
- b) psychological processes have not only “external” but “hidden” behind it, “essence” that is given not from the remotest times but is formed in the process for establishment of those processes;
- c) this “essence” is not reduced to physiological processes, on the one hand, and logical schemes of things, on the other hand, is the inherent organization of interiorized oriented activity – organization that continues functioning after it quits the stage, being opened to self-observation” [Galperin, 1966, p. 29].

P.Ya. Galperin formulates the main purpose of forming experiment as such method that in fact renewed the genetic research for functional formation of mental actions and concepts. The new line of genetic research was first of all in the new method.

Hereby L.S. Vygotsky mentioned that the real genetic analysis of process will be its “systematic reproduction that is learnt by experiment” [Galperin, 1966, p. 26]. And he continues: “Only functional genetic research discloses their (actions and feelings – S.M.) real relations – and shows the essence in psychological

phenomena that was so long denied by the whole idealistic philosophy and psychology” [Galperin, 1976, p. 30]. P.Ya. Galperin a bit later wrote”: “The problem of method is the first problem in study of psychical development... Our method is more known as the method for gradual formation of mental actions” [Galperin, 1976, p. 15].

The theory of gradual formation of mental actions is in many respects linked with ideas of algorithmization, operational decomposition and successive fulfillment of actions that within the context of ideas about programmed learning means the achievement of probability for right answer, close to one.

It is anticipated, in other words, that the gradual formation of mental actions may provide with correct learning. It is clear that such assumption requires special cautions and to a certain extent restricts the sphere for applicability of theory. In fact, it is possible to solve without mistakes, and, accordingly, to teach to solve only those tasks, for which there are algorithms.

There, where the solution assumes the oriented seeking activity (trials and search) the possibility not to find the answer is not excluded, i.e. it is impossible to solve a task or to find a wrong solution.

The choice for the optimal one is not reduced to construction of a certain algorithm as such tasks can in general be not formalized at solution according to logical operations.

But hereby there arise the psychological question – only definite capabilities, intellectual abilities, necessary for solution of those tasks can be formed in learning, hereby quite by another way than the theory of gradual formation of mental actions requires it, i.e. to teach with general ways for actions namely of non-algorithmic type that create the psychological prerequisites for successful search for solution under preset conditions.

And here the first place is occupied by forming experiment and its tasks that are changed depending on the level of cognition, while the requirements to gradual formation are found to be of another kind. It is not surprising that P.Ya. Galperin and his followers paid the main attention to some one type of tasks, as a rule, from the field of

mathematics and language, or from those disciplines, where there are precisely defined concepts (history, architecture, etc.).

It is here where some restriction of the theory itself lies that provides with learning only of one type of tasks and processes (in this case – algorithmic one) and cannot pretend for universality. Speaking in general, this conclusion arises already from the concept of algorithm itself, its properties of definiteness and determination: algorithm in the whole and the actions, stipulated by it at each step, shall be set definitely and give the same results.

It is obvious that even fixation of conditions and proof for “identity” in level of formation of actions as a result from algorithmic process is found to be a complex tasks. The introduction of new mathematical concept for “fuzzy sets” and “fuzzy functions” for algorithms in principle defused this problem. It assumed that “approach” of mathematical apparatus to real processes, related to human activity and generalization, in particular, the possibility to work with linguistic variables, assessed by people in a different way.

However at modern understanding the properties for definiteness of algorithm, according to which the result from its fulfillment due to some, fixed parameters in advance, will be made with admissible precision.

The principle of algorithmization may practically be realized only at formation of some separately considered actions but not any, and moreover – deployed activity [Elkonin, 1986].

Let's mention that the theory of gradual formation of mental actions (at least, in the 60-ies) did not pretend to formation of system of actions, it meant separately considered actions and concrete types of tasks. It is necessary separately to emphasize the importance of oriented basis. As it was mentioned above, the most important provision in theory by P.Ya. Galperin is that in the process of learning it is necessary to distinguish the oriented basis, i.e. features, to which a human shall orient during solution of the task. Such way of learning in its time was suggested to make the general basis for theory of programmed learning.

The necessary features in oriented basis cannot be distinguished as it is the task for search but the field of search is not defined. It

appears if the task is algorithmized, it is not heuristic. There are tasks that principally resist to algorithmization.

Hence the conclusion follows that the theory of gradual formation of mental actions is one of certain applications in general systematic approach to processes for management of activity by complex systems, to which a human belongs. This theory on management of learning process deals with the tasks of one type, which are determined and are subject to algorithmization and allow with its content providing with complete oriented basis of actions, guaranteeing the correct solution. Thus, the results, received using the theory by P.Ya. Galperin, reflect the influence of interpretation and cybernetics on different spheres of human activity.

Let's consider the possibilities that were formed in the theory of gradual formation in relation forming experiment. Forming experiment in theory by P.Ya. Galperin, in our opinion, was that here the research on establishment of psychical phenomena (for the first time after attempts, started by Vygotsky in the 30-ies) became the initial point for deployment of psychological research itself.

Within this theory the forming experiment received the initial authorities, with which it was granted already by L.S. Vygotsky. The forming experiment was gradually transformed from condition of organization of research, directed to cognition of essence of psychical phenomena, into the most important way for reproduction and designing the psychical reality itself.

As P.Ya. Galperin mentioned, "the objective study of psychical activity remains episodic and cannot start the systematic one until we find the ways for objective researches of ideal actions. This way is opened by hypothesis, according to which the ideal actions do not differ from material ones due to content and originate from them" [Galperin, 1976, p. 154].

The experiment in theory of gradual formation was established as a method for objective genetic study of psychical formations that allow disclosing the internal dynamics of development, formation of new psychical qualities and properties of subject. This moment of objectivation in theory by P.Ya. Galperin was added and remained the important provision that at the same time the method of forming

experiment, as it was mentioned before, led to constructive method but not only to exclusively research position. Hereby, the content that could be formed was known and set in advance.

The characteristics for forming experiment and its development within the theory of gradual formation of mental actions would be incomplete if we forget about one more function of forming experiment, which it acquired within this theory. This means its diagnostic function. This function for forming experiment is based, on the one part, on the fact that “oriented activity as any other one, has typologically stipulated peculiarities... and formation and dynamics of orientation under subjective conditions are mediated by type of the nervous system” [Galperin, 1976, p. 11].

Thus, according to theory by P.Ya. Galperin, using forming experiment it is possible to define the possibilities for subject of activity itself. The separation of this function for forming experiment sets a great number of new problems in diagnostics (for example, the problem on such strategy for formation of cognitive activity that at the same time allows avoiding the learning effect).

Thus, the method of forming experiment in psychology arose firstly in the form of one from concrete methodologies for formation of concepts (Vygotsky performed the development of forming experiment in this form). However, Vygotsky was not limited only by methodology for formation of concepts. He developed the methodological basics for principle of genetic research on psychical formations and hereby defined the requirements to forming experiment.

Further, the psychologists, among them P.Ya. Galperin, tried to ground this method using the whole arsenal of psychological conceptual and research means, pushing off from idea of interiorization, subjective mediation of activity and algorithmization. P.Ya. Galperin separated the oriented stage as the main chain. Having formulated the provision that the character for acquisition of learning content depends on the type of orientation, he started using the forming experiment as a research function.

The realization of the fact that the most important thing in this theory is the main method for its deployment – method of forming

experiment – took place with development of researches within the theory of gradual formation of mental actions. P.Ya. Galperin started identifying this method with the theory of gradual formation. But the method itself hereby received further development – along with research function it acquired the constructive, modeling and diagnostic functions, which at this time are the most significant and the most perspective ones.

***Theory of management of knowledge acquisition process
by N.F. Talyzina***

The logical completion of this theory was the work by N.F. Talyzina “Management of knowledge acquisition process” [Talyzina, 1975], in which the relation of theory with ideas and principles for cybernetics is expressed in explicit form.

In fact, the theory suggests using so-called cyclic management due to principle of “white drawer” in relation to learning and education; hereby the realization of such management is possible only on the terms for fulfillment of defined system of requirements, offered by cybernetics. This fixation of purpose for management, initial state of managed process, program of influences on process, receipt of information due to some system of parameters about state of this process and production of regulating influences pursuant to processing of information, received by feedback channel (and development of two kinds of managing programs) of learning – main and regulating influences [Talyzina, 1975].

We can tell that the theory by N.F. Talyzina returned to initial point of its origin – to cybernetic sources. And thus the peculiarities, being inherent to cybernetic interpretation of concept for “management” may be applied to processes of formation and for present state of this theory. So, the evolution of forming experiment was going in the direction from auxiliary function to research function and then to constructive function, which is closely connected with modeling (or projecting) function.

The works by Talyzina state that it is necessary to model the anticipated structure, and then to form actions with such structure

and to check the functioning of formed action in order to study the psychological processes pursuant to analysis of conditions and tasks for these processes.

Such interpretation of forming experiment, although reflecting its research functions, however introduces the new aspect into study of actions unlike their empirical research as the oriented model, being imagined, is not derived from direct experience and is modeled in theoretical plan. In this case the model may be considered as the hypothesis about possible structure of those actions that were spontaneously formed at human. Thanks to the model it becomes possible to study spontaneously formed actions as this model contains them implicitly.

The essence of forming experiment is, thus, contained in provision with the choice of adequate activity of object for acquisition (concept, ways of actions), if, of course, the formation of psychological new formation is the open book for researcher.

Hereby, the forming experiment performs a) research, b) constructive, c) modeling functions or in the complex or depending on tasks and conditions for concrete research.

While analyzing the problem there appears the question to study how psychologically adequately the constructed learning influences on manifestation of possibilities for subject of learning itself. Talyzina mentions: "The theory of learning that realizes the personalistic approach to process of learning by P.Ya. Galperin, allows forming the modeled kinds of activity with the planned qualities in advance. This approach significantly changes the possibilities for learning and hereby allows coming to other indices of individual development.

The personalistic approach to human capabilities, to human intellect requires the meaningful disclosure of new formation that transfer a human from one stage of mental development to another one, instructions of qualitative originality for cognitive activity at each of those stages. It means that at this approach the diagnostics assumes the availability of meaningful models for those kinds of activity, which are subject to research" [Talyzina, 1981, p. 286].

Cybernetic theory of learning

We mean first of all the origin of new science – cybernetics at that time. Cybernetics as a science about management of technical, biological and social systems appeared at the end of the 40-ies – at the beginning of the 50-ies. In its initial point of development it, as other scientific directions (physiology, physics, etc.) declared about its universal meaning and pretensions for monopolization of means, methods and tasks for scientific cognition that relate or may be described using the concept “management”.

The following opinion gained a foothold: cybernetics is not a “usual” separate science, cybernetics – a scientific phenomenon that unites some spheres of knowledge into scientific system due to defined general properties for objects of their study. It researches the general reasons for motion of functional, mainly self-managed systems that exist in biological, social and practical spheres of reality. Hereby, despite differences of cybernetic systems due to the level of organization and development, their functioning takes place according to general laws, which are studied by cybernetics.

All this could not but caused, on the one hand, to non-critical attitude to cybernetics, being inspired by success of this science, on the other hand – by original protective reaction, which essence was formulated by the following way: a human is so complex systematic creation that application of cybernetic methods of research to it, inevitably leads to simplification, induration, eliminates the lines of analysis, being significant for cognition of human activity.

In fact, cybernetics first of all gave rise to new directions in researches of natural mathematical cycle of sciences, stipulated the development of theory of algorithms, theory of information, theory of nuclei, etc.

The universality in ideas of cybernetics generated – at least at the beginning – many attempts for their non-critical transfer to other fields of scientific knowledge. The reduction of cybernetic ideas into sphere of pedagogical psychology that found its expression in the consideration of learning process in terms of general theory of management was significant in this relation.

Let's mention that the reduction of cybernetic ideas and methods was also shown, for example, in the theory of optimization of learning, developed by Yu.K. Babansky. He used the mathematical concept "optimization" that assumes the most efficient (optimal) functioning (in this case – learning process – S.M.) in terms of set criteria [Babansky, 1977].

According to such approach the object of management is the psychical activity of pupil, the purpose of management is to change the state of managed object, to bring it to the planned one in advance, i.e. to introduce some changes into psychical activity of pupils – to enrich it with the new notions, concepts, different operations, actions, etc.

In order to achieve this purpose it is necessary to provide with receipt of information about real progress of process, i.e. feedback with object of management, as well as to perform regulating influences on its basis that correct the process and bring it into conformity with the planned program for management (learning).

All those tasks, as N.F. Talyzina rightly mentioned in one of the first generalized works on problems of programmed learning, arise from general theory of management and appear at programming any process [Talyzina, 1973]. And without their solution it is impossible to compose the efficient program for management. And the latter one, in its turn, shall be built taking into consideration the specific peculiarities for programmed process, in this case – process of learning.

And thus the theoretical notions about learning acquire the significant, determinative meaning. As it is known, the development of theory of gradual formation of mental actions was held taking into consideration the methodological restriction in most theories of learning, used in the middle of XX century – associanists', behaviorists' gestalts' one, etc.

First of all – to counterbalance behaviorism as theoretical basis for variants of programmed learning, very widely spread in 50-60-ies of XX century (linked, in the first turn, with the names of B. Skinner and N. Krauder) that in the flush of their popularity pretended to the role of panacea from all problems in learning. It was anticipated (and

numerous experimental researches confirmed it) that the most efficient management for formation of set forms for psychological activity is possible only on the basis of theory of gradual formation of mental actions (in comparison with other theories of learning).

As it concerned the characteristics for the way of formation, they were based on the principles of programmed learning, which were linked with:

- firstly, selection of information, definition for system of knowledge and abilities, being subject to acquisition, and system of tasks, necessary for acquisition of this knowledge and abilities with intended qualities;
- secondly, with necessary discreteness in supply of learning information, and, thus, its special division into portions.

And, at last, thirdly, it is necessary to define the system of signals, using which the information will be delivered. In other words, it is necessary to code information taking into consideration the peculiarities for receiving channel, by which the latter shall be delivered. Hereby, such adequate channel in management of learning process is the activity of pupil.

MODERN STAGE OF GENETIC RESEARCHES IN PSYCHOLOGY

Learning activity – prerequisite for quasi-discoveries

The attempt for analysis of modern state in national genetic psychology is linked with significant difficulties that have general and completely logical explanation: they appear because this sphere of psychological science is in the process of rapid establishment, which is accompanied by ambiguous phenomena. A very serious task is to define the subject of research, which is complicated by the fact that most other sections of psychology are inclined to the problems of development and formation.

The subject is thus “washed off” that once more testifies to the long crisis in scientific psychology. If to try in the analysis “to catch” everything that is known about development in modern psychology (and, at last, it would be fair) – we would have to write a large book, although it could not help in this situation to differentiate this subject from other sections of psychology. Thus, it is very difficult to distinguish the field of analysis “due to subject”.

Moreover, it is not necessary to do it in terms of scientific ethics. So, if we aim the analytical research to the problem on development of psychics, then we are just obliged to use the results from a great number of works that are not included into that scientific school, in which achievements we are interested.

It is impossible to pretend that as if there are no other directions, which also relate to development, or to mention them only in negative aspect, as it is unfortunately the case in some theoretical analytical works on genetic psychology.

So, having acknowledged that psychical development is studied very widely, let's mention that we are interested in those researches, which were made within theoretical notions in cultural historical model by L.S. Vygotsky using experimental genetic method (if the research is experimental).

This unity (theoretical notion – method) is very essential not only in terms of general methodological point of view but because, in our opinion, it is namely its strict learning that allowed the scientific direction not only surviving but developing into independent and very interesting sphere of psychology (hereinafter in the text we will use the expression “genetic psychology” exclusively for designation of this direction in psychology).

Overcoming with incentive-reactive scheme in experimental research, study of psychical development as “a process” but not as “a thing”, replacement of subdivision of the psychical into “elements” for more meaningful analysis, and, at last, definition of essence for human development, entry to sad two-factor paradigm due to its backwardness – it is the main purpose for those ones, who conducted pioneer research in national genetic psychology. The realization of abovementioned purpose led to deployment of the whole scientific direction, which for 70 years principally changed the system of notions about development of psychics – practically new science has been created.

Dismal grimace of social conditions “provided” with closedness of this science for international scientific community, and not only international ... (at least, modern western psychology, with all its positives, continues fighting in the nets of two-factor scheme for explanation of treatment and development, artificially finding “something third”). It is compulsorily necessary to open national genetic psychology to the scientific world, having realized the real meaning of its achievements, without neurotic shyness.

Famous historian of science in the USA Loren R. Graham wrote, analyzing the development of Soviet psychology: “I would like to warn historians of science against mistakes in assessments, related to the tendency to look at events that occurred in the Soviet Union, as at something that has no meaning for history of development of thought in the whole” [Graham, 1991].

It is not sufficient to analyze concrete researches in order to understand and to assess the scientific results, received by genetic psychology.

The initial theoretical and research position, ways for receipt and interpretation of experimental results are the things that have top-priority and principal meaning in order to understand the essence of this direction.

Firstly we will try to formulate our vision of this real phenomenon in scientific thought. Here we will analyze the main directions that were formed in genetic psychology. Then we will briefly fix upon some problems and perspectives in experimental genetic study of development of psychics.

Of course, it is necessary to start from L.S. Vygotsky, from his understanding of necessity in refusal from existing way of scientific psychological analysis and statement that “it is not the experimental but genetic psychology that leads us to the new understanding of analysis” [Vygotsky, 1982, p. 95]. And further Vygotsky explains which analysis, in his opinion, will be adequate to psychical development as a subject of research. This, he writes, “is the analysis of a process but not of a thing, the analysis that discloses the real causal dynamic connection and relations, and does not divide the external features for the process, so, the explanatory genetic analysis but not the descriptive one that returns to initial point restores all processes of development of any form that in this kind is the psychological petrification” [Vygotsky, 1982, p. 100]. And a bit further there is the exact formula” “Most difficulties of genetic analysis are to penetrate into how the real natural process of development occurs using experimentally caused and artificially organized processes of treatment” [Vygotsky, 1982, p. 129].

The abovementioned citations are necessary as they contain the sources for genetic psychology and to do without them would mean to interpret Vygotsky that is in general very difficult, as he is very precise in scientific definitions while expressing his opinion. It is important as the research position of scientist is important for us.

What was inconvenient for Vygotsky in existing way of psychological analysis? He found the facts for creation and application of symbols (signification) in human behavior that resulted in principal reconstruction of behavior: a human itself managed its psychical life.

The scientist understood the real meaning of these facts (phenomena of mediation) but the existing methodological apparatus of psychology did not allow explaining them (let's remind that there was talk of the process for choice in indefinite situation, mediated memorizing and "bringing up" operation of calculation).

These higher psychical functions in the life of adult (or a child that achieved the level of mediation in its age) are in fact obvious but it is impossible to explain them using any finesse of traditional methods. They really create the impression of petrifications for these methods (i.e. such ones that are as firm as stone and do not allow a researcher to come "inside them"). And meantime they are principally important because only they transform the natural psychics into cultural one. So, we need the adequate analysis.

Here, in our opinion, is the most important turning point. And it happens so not even because a principally new method of research was established but because the fundamental and unique tradition of scientific research for psychology until now was laid here. Vygotsky, having noticed and distinguished really key facts, found the bravery to treat them as the facts of life and did not start interpreting and creating his theory but made significantly correct step as a scientist.

He started creating the method in order the facts of life would be filled with theoretical content, would be confirmed, disproved or specified and only then would be laid as the basis for theoretical construction. This position became the ideology of pupils and followers of Vygotsky, and, finally, the whole national genetic psychology. It determined the success of the latter.

What shall be the adequate method of research? In principle, the problem of method is one of the central problems in genetic psychology and hereby such one that is actively and meaningfully being developed. One can tell about separate direction of genetic psychology [Maksymenko, 1981, 2000], which object is the experimental genetic method. Here we will settle only schematically as certain directions of genetic psychology were mainly formed pursuant to modifications of research method.

Vygotsky thinks that it is necessary artificially to cause and to create the genetic process of psychical development in order to overcome with petrification of mature psychical structures. This is the definition for experimental genetic method of research. But what and how is it necessary to cause?

Let's again return to the facts. They, as the whole ontogenesis of personality, show that the higher processes are developed in the direction of possession of psychics by human using artificial (social due to nature) means, i.e. indirectly. The same facts testify that later, in mature state, these structures become very compact (folded) and are not "caught" in usual research procedure, although they are very obvious, even banal. In fact, the real ontogenesis sets here the scheme for method (Vygotsky told about it for many times).

This scheme is concretized in the first variants into instrumental method (research of mediated memorizing by O.M. Leontyev) and method of double stimulation (formation of artificial concepts by L.S. Sakharov). In both cases a child has two stimuli – stimulus-object (something should be done with it) and stimulus-means, from which a child creates a means for management of its activity. Such means may be a symbol or a tool, meaning of word (concept). Vygotsky thought that there may be other means, which are from set – external ones – passed by child to internal plan, and, finally, are the "units" of consciousness.

The ways for this transition (appropriation): acquisition, invention, inheritance are planned. The principally important nuance is that the means are not given but set, i.e. a child itself shall make (create) something (finally, it may be anything) by the means. Here,

Firstly, the real ("natural") genesis is taken into consideration (the characteristic expression by Vygotsky on occasion of how a Moor "wrote" the whole message using hacks on the tree: "How many thoughts were used for this!")'

Secondly, the genetic heterogeneity of psychical development is emphasized (it is convincingly concretized in modern researches by P. Tulviste about heterogeneity of thinking [Tulviste, 1977]);

Thirdly, the determinative meaning for activity of subject itself is accentuated, hereby, the activity is clearly creative due to nature (it establishes the means).

Hence, such purely psychological thing as feelings “clears up”, and the process for creation of means and the means itself and its “displacement” inside is experienced. F.T. Mykhaylov exactly tells in this relation: “Any subjective feelings of human are the feelings – processing of external subject into “its-living”, into the sphere of its life” [Mykhaylov, 1990].

In the whole, already at initial stages of application, the experimental genetic method brilliantly confirms its research possibilities. He is equally and highly efficient in research of genesis of all higher cognitive processes, and, besides, very flexible and multi functional (the latter one, by the way, is already seen from names.

Vygotsky himself used very many terms: in addition to classical – “experimental genetic”, “genetic modeling”, “causal genetic”, “synthetic genetic” and even “conditional genetic” (it is doubtful that Vygotsky here uses the synonyms – he rather underlines the nuances but this problem should specially be studied).

Along with strictly diagnostic qualities the fact that this method is also forming and modeling starts increasingly being realized and accented. There appears the perspective (that takes your breath away) for purposeful formation of human psychics. Perhaps, it partially caught Vygotsky himself. In any case, the sixth chapter “Thinking and language”, devoted to research of development of scientific concepts in childhood, contains some passion on this occasion; and due to content it is in many aspects not limited by study of this process and presents the perspective program for development of special measures for formation of scientific concepts.

Strictly speaking, it historically so happened: this chapter became the basis for this sphere of genetic psychology that we now call “Theory of developing learning”. Here the problem on correlation of learning and development is actualized and solved by Vygotsky in the brilliant classical style using the new concept “area of the nearest development”. He clearly sees the perspective for management of psychical development and it catches him (as it shall catch any psychologist). It is necessary to take into consideration the time of actions – they would like so much to remake a human!

And still Vygotsky have enough courage to be very careful and cautious. Thus, learning as management of process for acquisition of cultural historical experience by child in the form of ways of activity is the determinative one in development. It is its form, it may “tail along” development, may forego or “keep pace” with it but it is not the same.

They are two different processes. They are correlated (“learning and development correlate as the area of the nearest development and actual area”) but however they are different things. All this is clearly formulated in the following phrase: a step in learning may mean hundred steps in development or vice versa (!).

The same refrain is in the problem on correlation of vital and scientific concepts, relative and absolute successfulness, and normative academic disciplines. These problems have been waiting for their solution until now. The problem on individual variants for development is in the same context. The discussion of abovementioned problems by Vygotsky is the warning against very daring modeling (designing) of psychical processes.

By the way, G.S. Kostiuk was the nearest one to Vygotsky in the terms of manifestation of special caution in issue about management of development. We think that the common point of view that these two scientists followed to different opinions on this problem is absolutely ungrounded. On the contrary, their opinions on the problem of learning and development are not just close but practically identical. (We will not stop here on detailed analysis but we will mention at least one thing: only Vygotsky and Kostiuk have a very clear and important thought that the development of cognitive sphere, no matter how active modeling it would be, it is not the whole development yet.)

In the whole, researches, made by Vygotsky and his pupils, allowed determining the important mechanisms for process of psychical development. Besides, they opened the directions for further search. Strictly speaking, these directions are found to be included into experimental genetic method itself. The first and the main line in development of genetic psychology became the

possibility for construction of the higher psychical processes at child with the indices, set in advance.

Here the works by P.Ya. Galperin about formation of oriented basis for action, ideal action (way of action) and its transformation into internal component of consciousness (interiorization of action) were initial ones. This line was quite logically “included” into learning and transformed into the most powerful part of genetic psychology (theory of developing learning). Further we will return to the analysis of this direction and now we will fix only upon its scientific essence.

If we assume from the primary scheme (instrumental method), there is the mystery how a subject transforms “another” object into the means. It is natural that it causes to a certain activity. For it this is the whole tangle of problems: it is necessary to “retain” the task, to identify the object that mostly “suits” to be a means for its fulfillment in the environment, to make the system of actions for transformation, to return to the task and to fulfill it. The process is not finished at this but one can already see the scheme, researched by P.Ya.Galperin with his colleagues and pupils.

The most impressive results were received from special learning of blind, deaf and mute children (I.A. Sokolyansky, O.I. Mescheryakov). In this case the nature provided the genetic psychology, if we could say so, with the ideal conditions for experiment, and the possibilities for method were brilliantly confirmed. However, the approach by Galperin-Davydov (including the theory of developing learning) itself does not and cannot solve all problems on study of genesis of psychics. It shows only one aspect – functional (due to apt expression by L.F. Obukhova), i.e. such one that discloses and realizes the possibilities for directed formation of psychical structures.

There is one more, strictly speaking, genetic problem, related to age development as such one that occurs beyond and regardless of experimental learning. The issue, whether the process of development can be as much formed as studied using experimental genetic method, gave rise to the second line of researches, linked with the names of O.V. Zaporozhets, O.M. Leontyev and G.S. Kostyuk (by the way, it was the first one chronologically). There is one more

line of genetic psychology – the least developed but, perhaps, the most interesting one.

This is the problem for formation of personality. It is obvious, logical and fair to think that it was launched by researches of L.I. Bozhovych.

One more, already hardly marked line of researches is linked with application of provisions and schemes of genetic psychology in psychotherapy and rehabilitation work (post-traumatism). We shall pay attention to the fact the theoretical (even philosophical methodological) searches are now intensively run in modern genetic psychology. They are very original, in particular in modern Ukrainian psychology, and we will return to these, really most important questions at the end of section.

Modern science receives the main massif of experimental data about psychical development of personality thanks to researches, held within pedagogical science. It relates, as it was already mentioned, to powerful development of theory of learning activity (D.B. Elkonin, V.V. Davydov, S.D. Maksymenko, A.K. Markova, V.V. Repkin, et al.). The generalized work by V.V. Davydov [Davydov, 1996], as well as in our book [Maksymenko, 2000], tracks in details the evolution of experimental genetic method from methodology of gradual formation of mental actions (P.Ya.Galperin) to forming educational experiment.

We can here restrict only with underlying the essential things for our analysis:

Firstly, the abovementioned evolution “transferred” the research from laboratory to natural experiment (and this is principally important as here the development is specifically brought together, the one, being modeled, and the “natural”);

Secondly, it is necessary once more maximally to settle with the term “forming”, as until now some works of adherents and opponents of direction reflect its primitive wrong understanding: as if we transform a child into passive, objective being (ancient “tabula rasa”) and literally “form” its structures with our influences.

In fact, everything is quite on the contrary. The activity of child itself is formed always using the special psychological pedagogical

technique in any experimental genetic research, if it is made exactly in the terms of theoretical methodological one.

But it is not just activity but such one that allows him/her mastering the learning material through ways of actions with objects of acquisition, transforming them into means of development of own psychical structures (self-development). in general and in the whole we speak here about formation of learning activity.

Finally, thirdly: the researches, made within the framework of theory of learning activity, are very important for pedagogy – both practical and theoretical. It is an independent and very interesting aspect in modern development of pedagogical psychology that exceeds the limits of this book.

The main, essential idea of forming experiment in the theory of developing learning was that the acquisition of theoretical concept by child as a way to solve learning tasks means its (concept's) transformation into the means (stimulus-means, by L.S. Vygotsky) of management by its cognitive sphere. This means first of all the spontaneity and mediation of cognitive processes, realized and reflected self-development of mental actions, and, as a result, – scientific theoretical attitude to reality.

It was hypothetically anticipated that as forming experiment has vivid constructive modeling nature, change of conditions and content of its performance, it will allow directionally forming other, including personalistic, psychical structures of child. A great number of researches, made during realization of this idea, allowed receiving many most interesting results, which are impossible to generalize now – as they are so multidimensional and numerous.

We will try to analyze only some modern researches in order to describe two important questions: whether the forming educational experiment in fact allows disclosing and studying the process of development that is hidden from observer under usual conditions. And, secondly, whether this experiment in fact allows influencing on development, designing it? It means that we are interested whether the abovementioned experiment is the variety of experimental genetic method?

Let's return to the facts. Our colleague L.I. Arshavina studied the peculiarities for development of analytical components for thinking at junior pupils [Arshavina, 1983]. The diagnostic research shows the preference of empirical or theoretical components in analysis in different modifications at various children. It allows establishing these components (composite structural, functional and genetic). However, the question how the analysis is developed, on what this development depends, remains open and is not studied within traditional experimental methodology.

This methodology enabled understanding the only thing that is the correlation between the type of analysis and the type of generalization, which is formed in learning: mainly formal analysis is formed at empirical type of generalization, at theoretical one – accordingly – theoretical. It allowed assuming the available dependence between generalization and analysis.

At the same time it was anticipated that the use of forming experiment will allow studying the process for analytical components of thinking itself. L.I. Arshavina performed the series of forming educational experiments with the group of junior pupils, devoted to formation of theoretical type of generalization at them. They really allowed disclosing the process for development of analysis.

It was found out that the key factor for development is the separation of genetic relations, which characterize the principle for construction of objects. The acquisition of these relations in the process for theoretical generalization leads to origin of theoretical forms for analysis. However, the process for development is not finished at this. The research convincingly shows that the ways for theoretical analysis are developed into techniques of independent mental activity, i.e. provide with further development of thinking process. It is the main line for development of analytical components in thinking.

It is expected that further pupils, thanks to the new psychological structure (independent techniques of mental activity), “will be able to overcome with generalizations that are empirically “introduced”. Thus, this research in fact studied the process for development of analytical components in thinking.

Author shows that, strictly speaking, the theoretical analysis is formed only at those children, who mastered its all three components (structural, functional and genetic); the prerequisites for rapid formation of this kind of analysis are formed at other children (“area of the nearest development”).

The research by L.I. Arshavina positively answers our second question – it was obviously developing. Let’s mention that this research caused to interest and had the continuation in the work by other authors [Nezhnov, Medvedev, 1988] that modeled the development of meaningful analysis not on learning material but through construction of “ideal subjective action that allows reconstructing the researched subjective system by thought, as well as ideal subject as the nearest prerequisite for realization of action itself” [Nezhnov, Medvedev, 1988, p. 18].

Hereby, as the authors mentioned, the ideal actions serves as the own law for changes of object and the ideal object – as the “mechanism” (symbolic tool) for fixation and realization of action itself. The abovementioned idealizations in totality fix the “cellule” of researched subjective system, modeling the general principle for its establishment.

The interest to study on development of thinking using forming experiment remains very high. Researchers received very important results. It is necessary to mention the works by Ya.O.Ponomaryov, who studied the influence of experimental learning on formation of internal plan for actions at junior pupils, O.S. Zak, who analyzed the peculiarities for development of theoretical thinking at junior pupils, and many others.

Let’s briefly stop on the analysis of some works in this field, made by our colleagues. Already in 1982 the research, devoted to study on development of creative musical thinking at junior pupils, was held [Vasylykevych, 1982]. In the analytical declaratory part of this work we tried to move away from traditionally multidimensional explanation of creative thinking (which, unfortunately, is still used until now) and to apply the analysis “due to units”. It was anticipated that such “unit” shall determine the development of creative musical thinking.

It was necessary to find it. Besides, of course, we had the task to disclose and to study the process of development itself.

Forming experiment allowed determining that motion in development of musical thinking at children from reproductive until creative level is in fact determined not by a range of musical psychological components (hearing, sense of rhythm, etc.) but by the use of absolutely special structure by a subject as a means, which we then called musical experience.

This “unit” is internally structured pursuant to initial general contradiction (perception of music – musical self-expression).

The experimental learning of music, built due to the type of meaningful generalization, was aimed to master the musical experience as a theoretical concept, i.e. a way for solution of systems of learning tasks. The way for development of musical thinking at children, the appearance of elements for creativity in it became obvious as a result from such learning.

Moreover, it was also cleared up that the formed structure then continues being developed, defining the attitude of children to music. This research, in our opinion, was to a certain extent unique, mainly due to its results.

We mean that it was found the interesting phenomenon for integration of vital knowledge at child and ways for its communication into uniform psychological structure (musical experience) and its use of this structure as a means. Unfortunately, it was not continued and has been waiting for its researches, being very perspective. (It is a great pity that this first most interesting result is not mentioned in monograph by O.M.Laktionov (1988)).

The peculiarities for development of thinking at pupils of average school age were studied in connection with formation of techniques for linguistic activity at them [Tokarevo, 1997]. The educational experiment in this research was built in the form of original spiral, at each coil of which pupils mastered the definite operations from subjective sense bearing and logical organization of verbal statement, as well as the arsenal of techniques for their use.

The characteristic feature for this system of learning tasks is the realization of principle for unity of subjective content in thinking

verbal activity and operational technical procedures that was expressed in realization of linguistic structures as a composite integral verbal statement.

The special attention in this monograph is also paid to the objective content of learning that a pupil in this experiment transformed into a means for development of own thinking.

Such means here was the author's verbal statement (thereby, among others, the provision by M.M. Bakhtin about addressness and its meaning in establishment and perception of text). The use of this means allows pupils processing and building the sense bearing structures of text that, in their turn, testifies to development of analytical synthetic components in thinking.

We cannot here in details analyze other researchers, in which forming experiment served as the modification for experimental genetic method in the sphere of learning and formation of structures for thinking and cognitive processes. It is absolutely obvious that we receive the positive answers for questions, set at the beginning, i.e. the method does not only diagnose the development but causes to it.

It seems to us that it is possible and necessary to mention here one peculiarity that, due to our data, is inherent namely to researches by Ukrainian psychologists.

The task in described cycle of works was to receive the scientific facts, which would confirm or disprove the initial idea by Vygotsky that a means can be not only a tool or symbol (it is studied by Vygotsky himself) but very many other things ("anything", if to cite the classic more precisely). Firstly, our researches once more confirmed experimentally that such means can be the meaning (scientific concept).

By the way, Russian authors in traditional researches limited by this, passing to solution of other problems. Later it was found out that a means may be "musical experience", "verbal statement" and many other factors. They all are the means for development of different sides in higher psychical structures. Interiorizing, they stipulate, first of all, different connection of other psychical functions that are included into this "cluster"; secondly, define the genetic

heterogeneity of higher forms for psychics and, thirdly, create their own tissue of consciousness.

We think that our direction of researches is cardinal because it experimentally opens the specificity for construction of human consciousness and fills the concept of interfunctional systems, which was the last “favorite” subject of study For Vygotsky, with concrete scientific content.

The possibility really to understand the structure of consciousness, relying on data of science but not on own logical schemes, is opened. The research on mechanisms for goal-setting in learning activity is demonstrative in this sense [Shvalb, 1997, 1983].

Having theoretically proved that “a unit” of goal-setting is not the relation “purpose-result” but relation “purpose-means”, author showed that the main form for goal-setting in learning activity is the perception of learning task by pupil, i.e. transformation of this task into learning exercise by pupil that “is in fact the objective rethinking of learning task, i.e. it is the subjective purpose of action” [Shvalb, 1997, p. 66].

The learning task reflects the personalistic content of learning exercise and learning in the whole, thus, it is strictly connected with sense-forming motive of learning activity. The diagnostic research of goal-setting allows detecting three levels of its development in junior pupils. The use of forming experiment opens the process for development of this psychological phenomenon and allows establishing that the means for construction of learning purpose are determinative in this development.

In case of traditional learning such means are not clear notions about product of activity and the ways for its fulfillment as if “fall out” from actual consciousness of subject and is not directionally formed.

The experimental learning, held due to the type of formation of learning activity, is directed to appropriate namely the ways for construction of subject under study. In this case these ways serve as the means for construction of purpose. Thus, the meaningful determinants for goal-setting are established – “psychical formations (concepts, notions, and images) that function in activity in the role of the means for definition of purpose, and valuable motivational

components that are expressed in the interests of personality” [Elkonin, 1974, p. 25].

What occurs further?

Goal-setting is the process, being appropriated using the special means, – became “a unit” of consciousness and is transformed into the means not only of ordered and purposeful treatment but serves to development of higher levels of consciousness.

Yu.M. Shvalb makes the conclusion that goal-setting is the component of consciousness but not of activity and provides with realization of its attitudes to the world by personality. Thus, the author comes to a very interesting concept of goal-setting consciousness.

It was found out that the level in fixation of results in productive actions that stand, perhaps, higher than the level of productive goal-setting, i.e. “intentional processes appear a bit later than capabilities of children to separate and to form their own results” [Lysiuk, 2000, p. 66]. Pursuant to received results the author assumes that the capability to form productive purposes consists of minimum two mutually dependent processes: process for establishment of capability to form and to separate the productive results and process for transformation of productive results into purpose at children. We see that “a unit” of analysis in this work pursuant to analysis for empirical data is the relation “result-purpose-result”.

It seems very interesting to continue further search in order, at least, to clear up: this relation is the key one for pre-school age, and then the relation “means-value-purpose-means” “is included” in the role of key one, whether there are other, much more complex psychological grounds for development of goal-setting? Or is the correlation of purpose and result not only genetically primary but has the general character in development of goal-setting?

Another line in modern genetic psychology is represented by researches, in which the attention is paid to the process for formation of learning activity at pupils. Here experimental genetic method is represented (and is used) in the form of natural forming experiment. If we use the term by L.F. Obukhov “functional genetic research” it should be mentioned that the functional part is realized in this

direction. It is also essential that the developing effect in these researches acquires the mass character because it concerns at once a significant contingent of pupils.

Certain research tasks for this group of works were defined already by founders of theory of developing learning (D.B. Elkonin, V.V. Davydov, S.D. Maksymenko, V.V. Repkin) and remained, strictly speaking, without changes. It is:

Firstly, logical psychological analysis of different school academic subjects,

Secondly, organization of children learning due to experimental methodologies,

Thirdly, formation of psychological components for learning activity of children.

It is important that each concrete research in this line contains the solution of tasks from all three groups, although, of course, one prevails depending on purpose of the work. Let's mention that these researches are well-known, rather fundamentally generalized and thus, we will here touch only some perspective, in our opinion, problems and results.

Logical psychological analysis of academic subject is the procedure, which is very necessary in developing learning. Already L.S. Vygotsky by research way established that "scientific concept is developed", later the way of this development in consciousness: from the general to the concrete was studied (E.V. Ilyenkov).

The activity itself is hereby a quasi-discovery. In general, the learning material shall be the dynamic model for theoretical generalization.

The first researches were held on the material of Russian language and Mathematics in primary school. They were very successful and perspective, having confirmed, in the whole, the developing effect of this approach (L.I. Aydarova, A.K. Markova, P.S. Zhedek, V.V. Repkin, et al.). In fact, different opinions of scientists appeared already here.

Thus, if logical psychological analysis of Russian language in works by V.V. Repkin and P.S. Zhedek was held in terms that the essential task for its acquisition was the formation of theoretical

linguistic concepts in learning cognitive activity, then L.I. Aydarova assumed that genetically initial learning linguistic activity shall be formed in this age (junior pupils).

Hence her approach to analysis is, strictly speaking, communicative and she considers “notification” as a general way of speech. Further the point of view by V.V. Reprin was mainly developed (effective curricula, textbooks and study guides were created namely pursuant to those notions).

However, the problem is not already solved. The abovementioned positions shall be researched and synthesized by some way because the principles of experimental genetic research require it. It means first of all the requirement of Vygotsky that the method shall not only be formed but shall allow studying the development itself and here one cannot but takes into consideration the importance and generality of communicative activity in linguistic development of child.

On the other hand, the psychological collision, related to genetic heterogeneity, is disclosed: simultaneous representation of “vital” layer in psychics (unconsciously acquired and used in communication by native language) and layer of “theoretical – theoretical – scientific theoretical” (acquisition of generalized linguistic concepts). This coexistence worried very much already Vygotsky (correlation of scientific and vital concepts), however, now we are still far away from solution of issues on heterogeneity in this meaning; in other words, we cannot answer, which activity – learning cognitive or learning linguistic – will mostly optimize the general process for linguistic development of child.

In the whole, we shall mention that logical psychological analysis and construction of other academic subjects (in addition to language and mathematics in junior classes) were and are carried out in the theory of developing learning much less intensively that may be justified only partly. The cardinal psychological question “What is developed?” remains still without answer in the theory of developing learning, and, moreover, it shall be added with other cardinal question: “What could be developed?”

If we think that the acquisition of one-two subjects due to developing methodology will provide with overall development, then we easily return to the theory of formal discipline “in terms of influence of the whole on everything in learning’ [Davydov, 1996, p. 232]. However, the fact for influence of experimental learning in one-two subjects on overall development in theory of learning activity has not been proved. V.V. Davydov in his time expressed the meaningful idea about different sides of developing consciousness (scientific theoretical, artistic, moral) that are quite different, and, thus, they shall be developed in different modifications of learning activity, and using different academic subjects.

We think that this side of problem on development is very important, thus, we support the intensity of corresponding scientific researches. During recent year the work on construction of such academic subjects as natural science, botany, chemistry, physics, history, music was held. As it is seen, the researches cover not only very different academic subjects but go beyond junior school age that is very essential in itself because the learning activity in teenager’s age stops being leading, the social situation of development is changed, thus the experimental check of developing effect in forming experiment is necessary.

Let’s emphasize once more: our interest to empirical research of different academic disciplines means that, besides, other, methodological instructions – conclusions and generalization shall arise from scientific facts. In other words, we think that the conclusions about possibility for construction of all academic subjects due to logics “general – concrete” and receipt of developing effect from their acquisition will be reliable if we receive these results but not transfer them in the process of own analysis, relying on “development” of one subject.

The results from performed researches and those ones, which are held now, not only confirm the initial theoretical prerequisites, they allow establishing specific peculiarities for development of children. The work by M.D. Boyprav, which studied the psychological conditions for formation of scientific concepts at junior pupils while studying botany, is demonstrative in this content [Boyprav, 1982].

Logical psychological analysis of academic subject, held by author, allowed establishing the initial genetic relation in the course of botany as a sphere of scientific biological knowledge.

It is the relation “function – structure”. The structure of academic course as a deployment of this correlation and development of scientific concepts was built up. The way for acquisition (transformation of concept into means), suggested by author, is interesting. The educational experiments played its role.

Experimental genetic research allowed studying the development in independence at pupils, having defined four qualitatively original levels in it. Besides it was found out that the declared waiting of author about influence of independence on efficiency in formation of concepts shall significantly be added as the reverse process was detected: independence was formed in educational experiment and theoretical concept served as the means for this formation.

On the other hand, it was determined that independence was used as a means for further acquisition of concepts.

In the whole the research “comes to” the structure of consciousness in a bit other plan than the works on goal-setting but more precise because here we can exactly define the structure and functions of interfunctional system, which appeared, having hereby avoided excessive hypothetical character. This work, thanks to its complexity, touches very important aspect in development of personalistic structures using learning activity in great number of interesting researches on personality in genetic psychology, on which analysis we will fix below.

The third from abovementioned tasks (study on construction of learning activity and psychological peculiarities for its formation) is considered in numerous theoretical and experimental researches, made within the theory of developing learning. The theoretical works by D.B. Elkonin, V.V. Davydov, A.K. Markova, which underlie the theory of learning activity, are well known.

Fundamental works by V.V. Repkin allowed clearing up the construction of learning activity, peculiarities for learning tasks, their classification and development in learning activity of pupils.

Another line here is the research of separate structural elements in learning activity and peculiarities for their formation. Thus, our colleagues study the peculiarities for development of goal-setting in learning activity (abovementioned research), formation of self-control at junior teenagers [Glazyrina, 1985], formation of separate learning actions and their system, peculiarities for assessment and self-assessment in learning activity, etc. The cycle of researches, devoted to study of motives for learning activity, will be considered at analysis on development of personality in genetic psychology.

One more line of researches concerns the problem on acceptance of learning tasks. We think that it is one of the most interesting and perspective directions in modern researches of learning activity. The fact for acceptance of learning exercise alone means the principal change in psychics of pupil, and, in the whole, pupil alone as a subject of learning activity. It is a key moment that is realized by psychologists and requires very large attention.

The process for acceptance of learning exercise is in fact studied very widely in terms of theoretical and experimental but, unfortunately, not genetic psychology.

The phenomena of pre-definition and post-definition were discovered by experimental way (G.O. Ball, V.T. Dorokhina, Yu.I. Mashbits, et al.), and these are principal discoveries that however have the empirical character. A great number of works established the factors, which influence on the process for acceptance of tasks, however, they, although being very important, cannot explain the essence of this key phenomenon.

In these researches the acceptance itself is taken out of the brackets. The attempts for theoretical explanation for this phenomenon in its “binding” with learning task are very fruitful, and especially it should be mentioned about significant step by G.O. Ball, who introduced the concept “internal learning task” and at its development he most closely came to understanding the essence of process for acceptance of learning task.

Why do we think that this phenomenon is the key one and its study is so important?

In our opinion, it is in fact a meaningful “unit” of process for development in learning activity. Hereby it is not usual relation of two opposite phenomena in their unity. It is a complex “unit”, in which such different structures as the level of actual development and “area of the nearest development”, motives, interests (both learning and extra-curricular processes), level in acquisition of ways for actions and many other things “gathered” in it.

All this gathered and implemented in simultaneous act that we call “acceptance of learning task”. And this is the personalistic act itself because the emotional sphere and individually typological peculiarities also have their representation in it.

We think that it is necessary to deploy the researches, directed to detect the psychological essences of this phenomenon. Let us state the assumption that acceptance of learning task is the “ideal object” in genetic psychology and shall be studied in classical variant of experimental genetic method. And here, in our opinion, there is the possibility to unite its functional and genetic components.

The simultaneous process for acceptance shall be deployed and exteriorized under special experimental conditions, and at the same time it shall be formed (once more we refer to classical experiments by O.V. Zaporozhets and then O.N. Leontyev, G.S. Kostiuk, S.D. Smirnov, et al.).

Having sketchily implemented the depicted scheme, we can study the genesis for acceptance of learning task and it means to study and to understand it alone.

Directions in study of mechanisms for personality development

A separate large question in modern genetic psychology is the question, whether experimental genetic method in modification of learning forming experiment allows clearing up something new about laws and mechanisms for development of pupil personality. It is impossible to answer it in such formulation due to maximum polysemy of term “personality”. However, we may set the question otherwise: can we theoretically settle this concept thanks to research

of psychical reality, being such one that develops, and, thus, substance, being complicated.

It seems to us that such formulation of question is more correct and constructive. Modern researches, which somehow or other study the development of personality in learning activity, may be united into three main directions that are differ by initial methodological position.

Personality as an internal moment of activity

The traditional paradigm for modern psychology is realized in this direction: there is some concept of personality (in this case it is the concept for theory of activity, where “personality is an internal moment of activity” (O.M. Leontyev)) and in so-called “narrow” sense it is some unity of three elements – motivational needed sphere, system of social roles and self-consciousness, further it is considered that it is correct (i.e. reflects the essence of psychical phenomenon), and, thus, the question about study of psychological nature in personality is removed.

Genetic psychologists, at their choice, research the development of one from elements of personality in learning activity (motives, interactions, self-consciousness), and hereby it is considered that the development of personality is studied.

From methodological point of view there is a very interesting mixture – real experimental genetic research is held in exclusive formal, empirical scheme with substitution of concepts, with restructurization of essence and phenomena. In fact, it is the research of separate sides of general psychical development that usually has the relation to personality but in fact not more than many other aspects of psychology.

At the same time, in terms of scientific facts, many interesting and productive researches were held in this direction. The cognitive motives and their development in learning activity of pupils are very fruitfully studied. The researches by A.K. Dusavytsky and his colleagues [Dusavytsky, 1996] simultaneously studied the development of cognitive interests of class collective and learning

activity itself as a constituent system. It was found out that the principal changes in motivational component of personality take place in junior school age.

We observe the intensive reconstruction of pupils' motives, which is based on development of cognitive interests (we mean the situation of experimental learning). Until the end of this period these interests acquire the generalized character and stability and "are found in relation to different learning material, encouraging a child to independent search for sources of their satisfaction" [Dusavytskyy, 1996, p. 6].

We have the materials, received from researches by our colleague, that allow significantly enlarging this statement. It was cleared up that this generality generates some attitude not only to all academic subjects but is transformed into general position of personality. It relates not only to the type of learning but to experience of successfulness in junior school age.

The analyzed work showed that the experience for successfulness of learning in this age is in fact the key one; it defines the "motion" and social status not only in learning but other spheres of life.

The genetic approach of author allowed establishing that the individual style of learning activity at senior pupils, their learning and vital interests, and choice of profession is mainly stipulated by content of experience for successfulness of learning already in primary school, and its specific "deployment" during the whole school age [Maksymenko, 2000]. In this work we realized our developed concept for personalistic mediation of learning activity, about which we will tell in details below.

In another work under our supervision they studied the psychological peculiarities for dynamics of cognitive interests at pupils [Papucha, 1998]. It determined that the central chain in development of interests is the acquisition of special system of learning tasks by pupils, which solution provides, however, not with extension of available cognitive experience at subject but with establishment of conditions that generate the initiative in independent search for new information at it.

Returning to researches by A.K. Dusavytsky, let's mention about their absolute argumentation and complex character. They studied not only the cognitive interests but the development of joint collective activity, as well as the knowledge itself. The data, received by author, allowed coming to conclusion that namely junior school age is mostly favorable for change in egocentric position in relation to environment for objective position, i.e. cognitive and moral. "But it appears, – writes author, – only on terms of substantial change in content and methods of learning" [Dusavytsky, 1996, p. 6].

This last thought seems a bit tendentious, adopted by passion in theory of developing learning. (But in fact the change in this position occurs in any case but not only in the terms of experimental learning. On the other hand, here we do not see the answer for the main question of genetic psychology: how does the development occur under natural, i.e. not experimental conditions as it really occurs!).

Resuming a brief description of the first direction, let's mention once more that very interesting results from joint learning activity of senior pre-school children and junior pupils as a means for development of psychics are received within its limits (S.A. Amonashvili, V.S. Mukhina, V.K. Kotyrlo, V.V. Fliakiv, et al.), and about development of self-consciousness in learning activity (mainly, works by M.T. Drygus and her colleagues).

These works collected the important scientific empirical material that requires the special work for generalization, and, undoubtedly, is a part for real scientific grounds for psychological theory of development of child personality.

Personality – human that has the creative potential

This direction consists in attempt to construct the theory of child personality, being developed, pursuant to generalization of mass of data, received at realization of experimental learning. Such very interesting and meaningful attempt was made by V.V. Davydov [Davydov, 1992, 1996]. As a result from analysis of large experimental material he came to conclusion that "personality is a human that has the creative potential" [Davydov, 1996, p. 23]. In

other words, the real ground for personality is the capability of creativity. These researches very fundamentally analyze this capability with involvement of philosophical methodological provisions (E.V. Ilyenkov, F.T. Mykhaylov).

On the other hand, V.V. Davydov reflexively describes the way of his theoretical generalization, which basis was the results from works mainly by Ya.A. Poluyanov, G.N. Kudina and Z.N. Novlyanska, which studied the process for development of junior pupils and teenagers during acquisition of subject in esthetical cycle due to experimental methodologies (accordingly, fine arts and literature).

The following works were made within the same limits on material of music (I.A. Vakhnyanska, N.V. Papucha). The results from researches by O.M. Diachenko, held with pre-school children, were important for considerations of V.V. Davydov. They, in particular, determined that imagination (process, which V.V. Davydov rightly considered to be the key one in creativity) has two components: “generation of general idea about solution of task and composition of plan for realization of this idea” [Davydov, 1996, p. 27]. The progress in considerations of author of theory shows, however, that he in its construction covers not only these data but practically everything that was received by it in experimental learning, until the time of its establishment that is natural.

Moreover, it is possible to find so-called classical sources for this theory: we have already reminded that L.S. Vygotsky told about three ways for establishment of psychological means – appropriation, inheritance and creation. And here it is built due to scheme for work of imagination: when the whole is caught earlier than parts, “is caught correctly” and then turns back.

The fact that imagination does not belong to the lower functions, and, thus, is the “pure” derivative of human vital activity adds significance to the theory by V.V. Davydov (genetic researches by L.S. Vygotsky, D.B. Elkonin, O.M. Leontyev convincingly showed that imagination appears as a result from appropriation of game. By the way, many western researchers (E. Erickson et al.) will come to the conclusion that imagination is the game, “transferred into human mind”).

V.V. Davydov, to my high regret, did not manage to develop his theory and to add the integral and complete form to it. However, it seems to be very perspective and already now has one useful application: in many aspects thanks to it, the researches of developing learning started gradually expanding to pre-school age, on which V.V. Davydov insisted in his last large work [Davydov, 1996].

It should be mentioned about significant effectiveness of these works (we have already stopped on research of goal-setting at pre-school children, we can also mention about interesting direction that is developed in our collective, in particular, works, which were made by pupils of V.K. Kotyrlo). We are especially interested within this plan in modification of experimental genetic method at work with pre-school children and those results that thanks to this may be received.

In this context the last research by S.G. Jacobson and M.M. Safonova [Jacobson, Safonova, 1999] is very attractive, in which the analysis on formation of mechanisms for arbitrary attention at pre-school children was produced. The form for development of arbitrariness is forming classes that unite playing and, strictly speaking, educational moments.

The received results allowed making the interesting (unexpected and symptomatic, in our opinion) conclusion that calls in question “the general character for provision, spread in national psychology, that any arbitrary action is mediated” [Jacobson, Safonova, 1999, p. 9].

Authors think that arbitrariness of attention in the age of 3.5-4.5 years is carried out not at the expense of use of additional means but as a result of inclusion of new components into activity and its transformation. It is imagined that here the unity of arbitrariness and mediation is not disproved but we speak here about internal mediation. And it is already in 4 years!

Really unexpected results will be received if to be based on traditional interpretation of interiorization. But the point is that “traditionally” in this case means, unfortunately, simplified and just incorrect. In fact, neither L.S. Vygotsky, no later P.Ya. Galperin considered that interiorization is the process of development. “Cultural forms for behavior have natural roots in natural forms, they

are tied with them by thousands of threads, they appear on the basis of the latter ones but not otherwise”, – this opinion by Vygotsky is not cited for some reason or other by any modern “theoreticians” that “straightened” him, then his pupils, making it only in order to show their significance on contradiction [Vygotsky, 1983].

But the closest pupil of Vygotsky, O.M. Leontyev, was not also so superficial, as some theoreticians try to present, for some reason or other started treating S.L. Rubinstein with favor (by the way, he wrote that “it is impossible to avoid internal reasons and vulgar materialists, Marxists do not deal with inward world of human). O.M. Leontyev in his direct polemics with S.L. Rubinstein expressed the opinion: “It is not the external that acts through the internal but the internal acts through the external and hereby changes itself”.

This opinion is much more idealistic (if we speak in terms “materialism – idealism”), it assumes namely the primordial availability of the internal psychical. It is difficult to understand how the ones, who considered themselves to be theoreticians and historians of Ukrainian psychology, cannot see this now.

We would like to underline that we do not want to have oppositions in general, moreover, such masters as Leontyev and Rubinstein, we think that the latter one is really the classic of national psychology and the largest specialist namely in the questions on inward world of personality.

Our brief publicistic digression is caused by indignation on occasion of how clumsily and non-professionally sometimes some people try to make the name in psychology, on its own “cutting” it into parts and transforming the received pieces as they like (then the science of psychology may seriously be called a subject, and why not, indeed: the science studies, it means that it is active, so it is a subject (!) – it is good that not personality). However, let’s return to our analysis.

Process of personality establishment

The third direction in study of personality development in learning activity is the concept of personalistic mediation for this

activity. The theory of personality is not established in this direction, we assume from classical provision by L.S. Vygotsky that “personality becomes for itself as that thing that it is in itself, through the things it presents for others. It is the process of personality establishment” [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 144].

The results from numerous researches (only a small their part was analyzed here) convincingly tell that the development of child in learning activity is a two-sided process. Thus, the ways for solution of learning tasks are appropriated as the means, and hereby, are undoubtedly developed. But at least two facts are quite obvious:

Firstly, they, having become the structural part of consciousness, influence on further learning of child,

Secondly, we deal with that fact that a child is always capable to appropriate the means.

All depends only on how to help it in this.

We underline – always: there is no such moment, such point in ontogenesis, when a healthy child could not make it (of course, it is necessary to take into consideration the developmental peculiarities). So, it always has some set of other means (area of actual development). Strictly speaking, two-sided character of development is that not learning activity develops something at child but a child on its own develops itself using learning activity. This is self-development.

Having already schematically constructed this concept (which, we emphasize once more, appeared as a result from generalization of empirical facts), we made some researches, related to regard of individual peculiarities at pupils in learning.

Traditional “hopelessness” of this problem in pedagogical practice relates to unlimited amount of individual peculiarities, and, as a result, to indetermination of set task. Based on the concept, analyzed here, we assumed that the point is that the problem was set principally incorrect.

We speak about not about “passive” position (how to take into consideration?), but about active (how to develop?) and not about “stupid” infinity of properties and peculiarities and about individuality as unique integrity. Strictly speaking, the problem was formulated by

the following way: conditions for development of individuality in learning activity.

The scheme for traditional forming experiment was a bit changes taking into consideration the individual motion of pupils (in particular, we tried practically realizing the idea about relative and absolute successfulness).

Without resorting to details, let's mention that it became possible to direct the development of individuality, not making (in the plan of pedagogical technology) any special innovations, i.e. no individual work (alone) in traditional meaning of the word was required. The experiments in this direction have only been started but they promise to be very perspective.

Let's mention that these researches originally and newly continue the line, started by work of D.B. Elkonin, who studied the developmental and individual peculiarities for junior teenagers [Elkonin, 1974]. Namely here for the first time it was told about insufficiency of classical form for forming experiment to study development, as there is no place in it for "individual variants of development" (by the way, V.V. Davydov (1996) considered it as one of obviously weak places in theory of developing learning).

D.B. Elkonin mentioned then that "the comparison of individual variants for development shows that it is hardly possible to apply the provisions about average statistical norm, which is derived as a result from use of statistical methods for processing of material, to researches on processes of development, and, in particular, formation of personality [Elkonin, 1974, p. 264]. And here it is told that understanding individual peculiarities only as qualities of personality is incomplete.

Thus, our approach does not contradict to theory of learning activity, and, vice versa, is the attempt to overcome those restrictions that were anticipated already at the beginning of researches.

Making a brief summary for modern state of researches within the theory of developing learning, let's mention only two essential moments.

First – general, and it relates to the state of theory, which we can describe as necessity in scientific methodological reflection. The

application of forming experiment allowed being convinced that, really, experimental genetic method allows forming virtually any psychical structure at subject of learning activity. But it led not to solution of questions “what is developed?” and to its original exacerbation: can one tell that the one, being formed, is the one, being developed? (Let’s remind that it is a fundamental question, set already by Vygotskyy). The theory of developing learning does not give the answer to this question yet.

But we hope that there is the way to receive the answer: “One of the most important basics at transfer of experimental scheme into reality is the data, received not by experimental way” [Vygotskyy, 1983, p. 130]. It means that it is necessary to think about further modification of experimental genetic method. The problem is in fact exists, especially if to take into consideration that educational forming experiment due to its specificity, massiveness and inclusivity is not just a method of research.

Namely due to learning character it creates as though the “third” reality, providing not just “growing” of child into culture but quite special growing into quite specially executed cultural environment.

It is not clear not only how it correlates with “natural” learning and education. The problem has the moral side, especially if to take into consideration that individuality, in general, is not perceived (although at the level of communication with teacher) and the correlation “available level of development – area of the nearest development” at each child in forming experiments is ignored.

The second moment more concerns the pedagogical aspect. The role of teacher as the whole pedagogical activity in the system of developing learning is absolute unique and quite unusual for traditional pedagogy.

V.V. Davydov in his time paid the special attention to this. However, practically there are no researches to elaborate this theory (Moscow, Kharkiv schools) for the whole years of its existence that would be devoted to analysis of problem in pedagogical activity. Only some works by S.A. Amonashvili may be considered such ones, where the issue on activity of teacher in the system of developing learning is developed.

Our colleagues held few researches in this direction (O.F. Bondarenko, A.P. Konyaeva et al.), the interesting results that concern the formation of perception of pupils in interpersonal interactions, use of teacher's language as a means for organization of learning activity at pupils were received and, of course, this direction is only "started". In this connection we would like to pay attention to the work by American author J. Verch, who showed that "reciprocal learning" is used as a model for pedagogical communication, i.e. such activity of teacher, where a teacher sets the means to pupils by his statement.

The results, which are described here and in many other researches, allow telling about completion of definite stage in study of psychical development at child within the modern genetic psychology. The general summary of this stage is that indisputable data, which describe the main mechanism for psychical development, were received in numerous and various researches, i.e. it (development) is always mediated by cultural context.

The object, which is the product of human activity, is the "coded" and folded imprint of psychics not just of human but literally of the whole society.

A child in specific form of own activity "decodes", "unfolds" and appropriates this subjected psychics (desobjectivation), hereby forming its own one. The most adequate form of activity hereby is the learning activity. We managed to show that these objects of appropriation are not limited exclusively by scientific concepts, on the contrary, their circle is very large and each of them in its own way is included into process of development, defining its diversity and uniqueness.

Their further "destiny" may be considered to be established: being appropriated as the means for solution of learning tasks, they create the structures in the consciousness that constitute, forming "around themselves" the one, which is called interfunctional psychological systems, by a certain way influencing on further behavior of subject.

So, the phenomenon of personalistic mediation for learning activity and phenomenon of "double mediation" for psychical

development appear: now it and cultural context (external) and personalistic (internal) is mediated.

The following step, directed to deeper understanding the process of development, shall be related with displacement of accent of researches from mediation process to the phenomenon of mediation. The theory by Vygotsky understands the latter as the act for formation and use of means for transformation of its psychological possibilities by subject (or psychological possibilities by other human).

It is the psychological nature of this act that remains absolutely unknown, and, so, the content of psychical development remains undisclosed, in any case, within the context of use of concepts “natural” and “higher psychical functions”. Let’s underline once more: the latter remark concerns namely the phenomenon of mediation but not the process of mediation because we exactly know about the latter that it stipulates higher psychical functions. Moreover, we can surely tell about unsatisfactory remark by A.V. Brushlinsky (he does not agree that natural functions, being also not mediated by culture, just “suspend” in the air because no one ever objected against this: of course, they are mediated but not only at human).

The natural psychics of animal (at least, domestic ones) is mediated very much by cultural context and it is known by anyone, who ever had a cat at home. Animals do not just create the means.

In order to ground the importance of study on psychological content of mediation as “a unit” of psychical development, we will briefly fix upon what reality this concept describes. First of all, the attention is paid to the fact that it is the act itself (action but not reaction).

Mediation is the own specific activity of subject, and it in this capacity contains practically the whole psychic sphere of human (do you remember, what amount of thoughts shall be at Caffre in order to write down the message using notches? Let’s add not only thoughts but the volume of memory, degree of imagination, feelings and wishes – as all this was imbedded in creation of means).

So, mediation may be presented as the act of embodiment of its inward world into reality. Hereby the means may be created not obligatorily on the basis of material cultural object. It can be conditioned (term by Vygotsky), i.e., strictly speaking, intellectual, imaginative or symbolic. The inward world of personality is used in this case but the action is obligatorily present here. The psychology of this activity and its relation with development of consciousness, its heterogeneity is very interesting and mysterious and requires the special research.

It means, for example, the following consideration: any object may become a means but a means of what?

The first experimental researches allow suggesting the hypothesis that forms and content of this activity at human are the adequate sides of developing consciousness (theoretical, esthetical, ethical activity). The extension of researches in this direction is justified as it will allow finding the answers for functional questions in psychology of development, related to multidimensionality, heterogeneity and polymodality (amodality?) of developing consciousness at human. Hereby it is essential that the act of mediation is directed not to external object but always to itself and thus, it is the act of self-development.

Next important moment is the impossibility to research mediation (and, so, the development in general!) in logics of causality. This act may take place or not because mediation is self-causative. It is possible or not to assist to its appearance or to prevent but we cannot guaranty whether it will take place or not.

The indirect confirmation for this though is our observations, according to which it is impossible to establish the genetic lower border for appearance of mediation: a child is found to “be always ready” for it. The favorable or unfavorable factors are developmental, individual peculiarities, “area of the nearest development” and the degree of assistance by adult (it is especially visible in the work with blind, deaf and mute children).

The individual variants for development, individual peculiarities for key experiences and other most important indices, which are not

already studied in genetic researches, shall be considered within this plane of scientific analysis.

Please note that the mediation is the act for establishment of the means. Hence there appears the necessity in study of personality creativity. In this connection there is a tangle of problems on study of creativity: it is possible to create a means only possessing the corresponding intellectual activity, high level in development of imagination. But what's to be done if a child, in fact, in any moment of ontogenesis is ready for this. In these terms the study of mediation may interpret the problem of creativity quite by another way.

The assumption that the product of creativity is that means using which a human transforms its psychics, building the one that is called the higher psychical functions, enables coming to the problem of creativity quite from another side. All elements of creative process in this formulation as if find their place, starting from internal initial creative activity and finishing with purely individual nature of this phenomenon (creativity as embodiment of individuality).

Of course, until now – it is only the statement of problem, scheme for development of future experimental researches that however is not a scholastic fiction.

Let's remind of classical model for instrumental method: we set a task (stimulus) to a child and give the third element of scheme ("stimulus-means) to it. The question is, why a child "accepts" it. But in fact it does not realize the situation, based on the fact that it is necessary to apply this element because it has the problem with memorizing in order to overcome with them (and to make a task). A child experiences the tense desire to commit and act and at the same time to limit the situation for its commitment. It is active and accepts the stimulus-means only because it on its own seeks for it and is ready to use it.

We see that the situation is not limited by cognitive processes and, strictly speaking, by the fact for fulfillment of task. It in fact is integral and personalistic, moreover – creative. So, there are two things that should compulsorily be taken into consideration: already in this elementary psychological situation we found the capability at child to go beyond (but otherwise how we can understand that it is

necessary to apply this means), capability to “catch” the whole (all set situation), earlier separate parts and this is the essential creative capability.

We would like to repeat that it is still our assumption: in order to receive the answers for questions, being arisen, it is necessary scientifically to study them. For example, if the establishment of means is the creative act, and goal-setting is one of its forms, is it really limited only by acceptance of task due to its psychological nature? (Already now it is seen that these things are principally different).

So, we think that namely the research on act of mediation (establishment of means) is the most perspective in modern genetic psychology. However, this process is very intimate, and, in the whole, is still not simple for experimental learning. We have already reminded here about its incompatibility with logics of causality but there is one more peculiarity that transforms the research into serious problem.

Mediation due to its nature is rather the simultaneous process, i.e. it is referred to such ones, which M.K. Mamardashvili called: “Processes, in which a human cannot in principle catch the point, where something appears. It always deals with the one, already appeared... And every time, as soon as we fixed some process for establishment of consciousness, it is already not the one that we fixed” [Mamardashvili, 1990, p. 75-76]. Due to this reason the act of mediation was less lucky with experimental study – this problem (speaking precisely, its separate indirect aspects) was studied only partly in researches by Georgian psychologists. However, we wish to be in the space of genetic psychology, and thus we shall approach to mediation as the process of development.

But it means that it is necessary not to reconstruct but to model that changes the situation principally, although leaves it to be very far from completion. Our data allow telling about modeling. Let’s remind that we received the results that disclose the process for motion of appropriated means in psychics – it is transformed into key unit of new interfunctional system of consciousness, interacts with other similar systems, forming the quality of personality and

structures further behavior and activity of human already in this form by determinative way.

This is self-motion and self-development and again it is a surprising fact when consciousness is self-developed.

We can state that this mechanism was discovered thanks to received results from experiments and this is “natural” mechanism (within the context that it is unchangeable under any conditions).

But if it is so, then namely genetically-modeling method will be the most adequate one to our further tasks and at the same time to those “natural processes” that interest us from all varieties of experimental genetic methods, suggested by Vygotsky (when the development already goes as self-modeling, it is clear, due to definition, what form shall suit us).

However, the concrete task for research is quite new and very uneasy: it is necessary to model the intimate, multilayer and multifactor process, in which some object (it may be any object) is somehow transformed into the means (psychological content of this concept is also far away from clearness) for transformation and development of any psychical structures at subject. The solution of this complex and maximally indefinite task assumes the entry beyond pedagogical psychology.

It seems reasonable to perform researches with adults, in which the act of mediation has the mature and complete form. Further we shall go downward (“down”), i.e. from mature to less mature forms in order to understand something in this complex phenomenon (within this context it is useful to remind of Engel’s’ thought that the key to anatomy of monkey is in anatomy of human but not vice versa).

Further it is important to seek for such peculiarities of social life at human that could be used as experimental models. In particular, we mean that:

1. Numerous social facts, as well as special researches show that people may apply their inward experience as the means for transformation of own psychical processes. It is well seen in experiments on identification of different things in complex situations, in tests on recognition and recollection, as well as in many vital facts, when a subject actualizes and retains the memory, using

it as the means for management of own behavior and state in solution of vitally important problems. "Reverse" phenomena are in the same plane, when a human uses, for example, images or imaginations, emotional states for management of memorizing processes.

2. The original and very interesting model, in our opinion, is the cases of psychological problems that are experienced by patients of practical psychologists, in particular, psychotraumata and post-traumatic stress conditions. The research, made by our colleague [Papucha, 1999], shows that the psychological content of post-traumatic conditions is namely the original destruction of mediation process.

This work applied the specific modification of experimentally-genetic method, namely, the study of affected processes of development as a result from psychotrauma in the process of psychological rehabilitation. The work was held with young people (early youth) that transferred the manifestation of exogenous psychotic state.

It was found out that in cases of preservation of cognitive and emotional sphere, as well as higher levels of motivation, the problems of patients are defined by destruction of mediation. The attempts to renew this act using correction work led to serious improvements even in cases, when the manifestation in fact determined the start of pathological process. It seems that the detected phenomenon has more general nature and is the psychological reason for the large class of psychical deviations. On the other hand, this phenomenon is in fact the experimental model for the research, being planned here.

3. The phenomena, being well-known in social and ethnic psychology, acquisition of norms for communication and presentation of inward world of personality, phenomena of self-presentation, self-regulation, etc. may be used for solution of tasks, set by us. The mediation of such phenomena and objects of culture as myths, works of art, folklore and similar things are of special interest in this plan.

We assume that there are other vital situations, which may be considered as experimental models for our research.

Besides, of course, the special experimental conditions that disclose and expand the process for establishment of means by subject will be created. It seems that the planned research will allow receiving the results that describe the process for development of psychical components in human consciousness by a new way.

FROM FEELING OF SUFFERINGS TO SCIENTIFIC CONCEPT “NEED”

Ontogenesis of personality

Genetic psychology is grounded on those logical methodological principles according to which, as it has already been mentioned for some times, the real cognition and understanding the object of research is possible only on the terms of tracing the appearance and establishment of the whole object. So, from genetic point of view, in order to understand what personality is, it is necessary to explain and to show (recreate in models) the process of its establishment, to define, how and as a result from effect of which laws and mechanisms the personality as integrity appears and is developed.

This way for search, finally, leads to possibility to answer the question “What is developed?”, “What is the object of development?”

At first sight, more than sufficient attention is paid in psychology to research of problem of personality development [Antsyferova, 1981, Bozhovych, 1968, Vygotsky, 1983, Dusavytsky, 1996, Kostiuk, 1989]. However, it is true only at the first sight... The thorough analysis on a great mass of literature testifies that the task for study of personality development in absolute majority of cases is concretized and realized as a study on development of separate psychological phenomena or their group (reductionism).

The purpose in understanding the psychological essence of personality through comprehension of ways and mechanisms for its establishment is not even in general set. One from consequences of this situation is rather clear and surprisingly easy logical dilution of theory of personality development into so-called “biologizing” and “sociological”.

Just the first group of theories is built on generalization of empirical facts about establishment of separate psychological phenomena, on which (as if) biological (hereditary) factors influence more, and the second group studies the psychological phenomena that are developed more under influence of social surrounding.

Of course, these theories fix the real state of affairs: so, personality, in fact, ripens as a biological being, and, on the other hand, it is formed as a social being. Ripening and forming is the components for process of personality development but they are not this development and do not “provide” it even at putting together (the latter is rather a problematic moment, and since that time, as O.V. Zaporozhets mentioned, that the interrelations of ripening and forming are not researched in psychology, nothing has changed). We can now mention that the psychology has no theory for development of integral personality through one essential moment: “the third component” of development, namely self-development, is lost.

In his time G.S. Kostiuk mentioned that the insufficiency of existing opposite approaches to real understanding of personality development shall be overcome by “scientific understanding the process for establishment of human personality as “self-motion” that is defined by unity of its external and internal conditions” [Kostiuk, 1989, p. 130]. During 30 years in succession the same thought is expressed by V.I. Slobodchykov and Ye.I. Isayev: “We shall speak about development not only due to essence of nature (ripening), not only due to essence of socium (forming) and first of all due to essence of human – about self-development: as a fundamental capability of human to become and to be a real subject of its own life” [Slobodchykov, Isayev, 1998, p. 13].

So, nothing positive in this direction of personality psychology has occurred during these years... Genetically-modeling method, as it was shown, includes the principle of self-development, so, our further analysis will be made namely within the limits of this method.

It seems to us that there is the sense to put the fundamental question, which was not put by G.S. Kostiuk or V.I. Slobodchykov (as in general by other researchers): this is the question about sources, drivers for self-development of integral personality. Here again the genetic logics work: statement for availability of phenomenon (self-development), its description does not mean its real understanding when we do not decide, how, thanks to which sources this phenomenon appears and is developed.

On the other hand, the attention to phenomenon of self-development is not surprising – so, it is the essential, key functions of personality.

We can tell by the following way: personality exists as the integral structure that provides with realization of function for self-development, self-motion. So, how does this function appear? The overall fundamental analysis of human existence, as well as numerous theoretical notions about it allows us defining in this aspect: the source for self-development (and, thus, the personality in the whole) is the need as energetically-informative essential quality that provides with expansion of life in onto- and phylogenesis. The need acts as the uniform initial intentional force, which activity “launches” the complex system “personality” and provides with its development as self-development. It, this force, is the unique carrier for dynamics of life, in particular, life of human.

The need generates not only the existence, and not just the ontogenesis; namely the need stipulates the unique phenomenon of life and its development: the evolution of life is found to be directed, and it is directed to constant complication and progress. Thus, the need defines the availability of determinant in biological evolution: the development is found to be determined but not available level of morphological, anatomical construction or functioning, it is determined by the future – this is the motion to complication.

This phenomenon in modern science received the name “orthogenesis”. The need in its understanding is the source for existence and development of any living being but not only human. However, it seems to us that the need due to its own nature is dynamic and open for self-changes. Thus, it is capable to be modified within the systems, where it acts, and this modification generates the new, more complex functions, and, accordingly, structures, designed to realize them.

Self-change and capability to evolve means that the need of plant, animal and the need of human is the only energetically-informative carries due to deep nature but these changes, which it received, being within a separate chain of life (for example, vegetative), lead to the fact that their further action, its further overall

existence requires and with necessity generates more complex systems, which realize it.

We quite with good reason touch and underline here the globality in nature of the need. But it allows understanding the indissoluble unity of the whole living that exists on the Earth. On the other hand, such understanding assists to solution of theoretical logical problem in definition of real place for this phenomenon in some known intentions of living being, and, undoubtedly, human.

The closeness of the need to Freud's libido becomes salient most easily and quickly, and, thus, there appears the desire to identify these intentions. But this closeness is imaginary and does not absolutely correspond to reality. If we speak about Freud, libido at him means only the sexual drive "in primary medical sense". Libido here is in fact the force, which manifestation provides with the effect of instinct for continuation of genus and through it – expansion of life.

So, libido due to Freud is the energy creation of exclusively narrow-sexual orientation, and, on the other hand, at the same time it is found in instinctive, i.e. simplified, conceptualized, biologically programmed behavior [Feud, 1998, p. 35]. Such understanding is in fact very far away from our imagination about the need, although it should be mentioned the following: due to the sense of the word itself, due to its etymology, libido, in the whole, is completely adequate to our understanding the need, being although not identical.

The reduction of term most probably did not satisfy the author himself, who in his late works was more and more inclined to overall meaning of this phenomenon, finally deciding to introduce the new (for himself, of course) term "Eros" that means the fundamental vital force, and most probably, even – "space source for existence". However, the thorough analysis of works from this period testifies that Z. Freud, working really with this concept, still remains within purely sexual instinctive ones.

The designation for paradigmatic provision by Freud about opposition of the social to libidinous energetics at exclusively conflict background for development of structure and dynamics of personality is important for us.

C.G. Jung developed the concept libido most meaningfully and interestingly, bringing it to real philosophical world-outlook sounding.

Mentioning that “the concept of libido receives the same meaning in the sphere of biology in functional relation, which the concept of energy has in physics” {Jung, 1944, p. 117}, Jung develops the concept of libido to designation of overall psychical energy, vital force that is inherent to all organic world. Further Jung offers his own “genetic theory of libido” and builds up it to philosophical level [Jung, 1996]. He thinks that libido provides with adaptation of organism to surrounding environment, appearing here as “over-sexual” branch of primordial single stream. “This consideration leads us to the concept of libido, which in its extension goes further the limits of natural scientific formulation to philosophical world outlook, to concept of will in general” [Jung, 2003, p. 116].

Jung pays attention that the concept of libido in his interpretation stands near such imaginations as Eros by Plato, world soul as the energy of intellect by Plotin, will by Schopenhauer, etc. Jung especially emphasizes the capability of libido to be divided that is the prerequisite for any development and creativity: “world soul” is “infinity of the whole life” and thus exclusively – energy, it is the organism of ideas, which acquire the efficiency and actuality in it” [Jung, 1996, p. 116].

It is mentioned that “the will of libido” in most various application and formation is imbedded in multicolor natural phenomena. The idea of Jung in this general philosophical part is very attractive as it corresponds to actual state of affairs. But only in this abstract image. Further analysis testifies that Jung managed to come to understanding the essence of human psychics “on the top” only in this part, i.e. from the point of view of global natural and cultural phenomena.

When we run up against interpretation of concrete mechanisms for action generally-global libido, Jung, unnoticeably for him, explains them in traditional psychoanalytical (Freud) logics – “from below”. He quite fairly, although, let’s mention in the brackets, and not discovering any especially new, thinks that the appearance of human

psychics, consciousness relates to specific reduplication of natural world, thanks to capability of human to create symbols. The “new” here was anticipated in discovery of mechanism: symbol for Jung appears as a result from effect of general energy of libido.

But, unfortunately, the new was only anticipated: C. Jung explains this mechanism, being based already not on the libido, which nature he described philosophically but exclusively from Freud’s libido: unrealized sexual instinct “is branched out” and is embedded into specific motion, subject or image that symbolize ... sexual act.

And further Jung, using his really phenomenal erudition, tries to prove that the production of fire, painting, written language, speech, and ... all other purely human is the symbols, created thanks to “deviation” of libido but – exclusively as sexual instinct.

So, Freud remains unconquerable. When Jung transfers his logics into the sphere of ontogenesis, he turns out to be nearer to Freud. By the way, we could here imagine with curiosity, what is the problem of Jung-researcher? Paradoxically: he much earlier than Freud started developing the idea of libido as the general (and only narrow-sexual) carrier of life, including rational life. He exceeded Freud in philosophical methodological plan but having returned with this own (really interesting, deep and perspective) position to psychological limits – he had “to move’ to Freud’s notions...

It seems that it is the problem not only of scientist but the personalistic position, speaking precisely, – interpersonal: it is terrible to make a step, which leaves the master-founder behind... This situation, among others, is confirmed by the fact that Jung does not introduce the new term: as that phenomenon, which he postulated, described philosophically and proved, is quite unlike libido by Freud, which already at that time was so much united with the name of author that the personal position by Jung turned out to be not advantageous from the beginning: he wanted to enlarge the sphere of favorite concept by founder of psychoanalysis and it appeared that he discovered another phenomenon, being more interesting and deeper.

Here was the double negative effect: on the one hand, we are sure that readers were not much caught by the content of Jung's theorizations, having met with term libido, and on the other hand – Freud obligatorily felt this advance by Jung, and, perhaps, it would be better for their relations if the latter one was not afraid of introducing a new concept. But Jung in his position turned out to be successive – he “stuck” Freud's old mechanism to the new phenomenon and then refused to describe, strictly speaking, psychological (not philosophical world-outlook) nature of this phenomenon: so, libido remained just sexual instinct and bright constructions by Jung “suspended” beyond psychology.

And still the theoretical statements by Jung attract us just because we find no analogous concept in history of psychology, which so deeply and skillfully concern the nature of initial driver for ontogenesis of personality. And thus we will try to compare our notions about the need namely with this theory.

The need, undoubtedly, is the flow from energy of life but it is not the sexual instinct. And in general it is not the instinct. The latter in exact understanding is exclusively biologically programmed behavior. Such behavior may be stipulated by the need and this occurs only in the most elementary, separate acts of organismic functioning. As G. Allport fairly mentioned at his time – exclusively instinctive, purely biological behavior is the abnormality, pathological phenomenon. The thesis requires explaining.

Traditionally, the term “biological” is used to describe anatomical or morphological structure of organism and its purely natural functions – motion, nutrition, growth, reproduction, evolution. So, the biological is exclusively the natural, and it is induced by the same “purely” natural demands that provides with existence of organism. It is clear that the initial energy essence of organism in this tradition, which generates concrete demands, has exclusively real nature.

Here arises unsolved problem of the social, which should somehow “be overcome”, “be included” into existing energy system. But we would like to pay attention to the interesting fact: within the living nature of the Earth we do not meet any case when an organism would exist alone, separately, independently on other organisms. The

apprehension of this fact as fundamental one led V.I. Vernadsky and T. de Sharden in their time to creation of theory of biosphere and then noosphere as unique unity of the terrestrial life.

Really, this fact tells about very essential thing: the existence and expansion of life at all its levels is provided not only by infinite energy of reproduction and by the same infinite drive to coexistence. The need is the initial combination of those two forces, which in its unity create the powerful stream of infinite existence.

The roots for the social, undoubtedly, are in the simplest interaction of living beings, which is absolutely necessary attributive fact, being as significant as reproduction.

Thus, the need originally is the combination of two global aspirations – reproduction and interaction (“biological” and “social”). But one is impossible without other, and it is, if you want – the imperative for existence of living.

It appears that an organism needs to fight with environment (at all levels of living) in order to live as it needs to be with the other living and it causes to development of corresponding forms for behavior. Why Freud noticed only the fight, only opposition – we can only guess but namely this brought it to reduction. We may once more address to evolution of life and mention that it is a small and evolutionary unproductive group of organisms (although very numerous), to which another organism is not necessary for reproduction.

The absolute majority may realize this fundamental demand exclusively on the terms of meeting with another one. Thus, the meeting and interaction stands not only “near” reproduction but is transformed into its prerequisite. This is a “cellule” of process when the social (interaction) is transformed (embedded) into biological – a new living being.

Thus, the first attributive meaningful feature for the need is its heterogeneity: the biological and social here originally constitute the discordant but absolutely indissoluble unity. Another important characteristic for the need is linked with its informative aspect. It seems to us that it is the postulation of invariability in nature of initial vital energy substance by scientists is an unpleasant mistake (Freud, Jung, Plotin, Plato, etc.). Jung was right in relation of numerous

branches for initial vital force. Each branch of the need generates a living being as a subject of realization of its essential function.

While a living being lives – there is the branch of the need in it, which is namely the branch, i.e. it remains the component of uniform stream of the need. Numerous vital manifestations and contacts of living being, all its changes are absorbed (assimilated) by the need, remain in it, enrich and diversify this infinite energy flow with the great integrity of new information.

Each meeting of two beings that occurs with the purpose of their own continuation through generation and birth of new being means not only the duplication of energy but the duplication of information, variety of existence.

Namely this is the initial condition for development. Thus, the second attributive property of the need is its capability of development (self-development).

The analysis of phylo- and ontogenesis, as it has already been mentioned, testifies to infinite course of the need, its self-development is not sudden and chaotic. It has the directions. It is directed to constant complication and increase in integrity. This motion under conditions of the Earth is finished by “entry” of the need to position of possibility to realize itself (reflection). But we can speak with responsibility that it is not the real final stage in establishment of the need: just the mankind has appeared at this stage and the need has reflected itself. But the motion is continued... Thus, the third attributive property of the need is that its development is directed and is orthogenesis.

The important attributive property of the need is its capability of generation. This creative quality is shown in everything that is linked with the life, and it is in fact a real miracle (O.F. Losev). But we will fix here on the most essential things. The meeting of two branches of the need, embedded into living beings of different sex, generates the qualitatively new need (informatively and energetically new), which is continued in existence of new living being. This act is a uniform integral subjectification of the need in wild life.

If we speak about human, we meet the “other” reality: human need may create a new human and qualitatively new product

(creativity). We will discuss the peculiarities for this aspect below. However, it should be mentioned that the need in the act of its creation does not play the role of some modified libido (even in animal world), as it is originally the unity of the natural and social.

Next attributive property of the need is that it exists only in the form of embodiment into a living being, generated by it. "Living" does not mean for us such energy-informative biosocial essence as the need is. We can imagine that it is linked with purely physical energetic of the Universe but appears and exists exclusively as embedded into biological being. But here we would rather have the effect, similar to those phenomena of microworld, which discovery led to necessity in establishment of principle of complementation: a living being exists as a structure and the need, embedded into it, at the same time.

On the other hand, we cannot cover the need by another way that the study of living being as its manifestation. So, everything depends on the approach angle of research.

The attributive property of the need should be its affiliated nature. This work showed that the real form for existence of the need is the love. Within the context of analysis of the need, we are inclined to consider the love (according to T. de Sharden) rather widely, assuming that it is the force that is opposed to space entropy and stipulates the motion of all living beings (not only humans) one to another. And namely the result of such motion is the birth.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the important attributive property of the need is the infinity of its existence. The complete (final) stage is the existence of organism, personality as carries and embodiment of the need. But thanks to Meeting and through it, the need continues its existence and is infinite in time. It seems to us that the analysis of this attributive property will allow, among others, discovering the new aspects of meaning for time in the life.

The abovementioned attributive properties of the need define (let in the meantime schematically) its nature. We, in particular, see the principal difference of our understanding in comparison with the point of view by Jung and other scientists. Only now we can make the analysis for ontogenesis of personality, which is the form for existence and discrete manifestation-embodiment of the need.

Within the context of this task we anticipate the special attention of our readers to the term “need”. Traditionally, at least, in national psychology, this concept is used to describe the most primitive, undeveloped, purely natural energy tendencies of organism (and – exclusively organism), realization of which provides with its purely biological adaptive existence.

The attitude to such tendencies in literature is univalent: personalistic existence, – says G.S. Batyshev, – is just to overcome, to cross out, “to remove” initial natural “needs”, which attaché a human to biology, do not allow it to become free [Batyshev, 1969, p. 237]. At what expense had the need, being interpreted in such a way, to be overcome? It is clear that of course at the expense of sociocultural, higher demands.

Where do these demands originate? ...

And the answer to this question is the real “moment of the truth” as at the same time it is the methodological position, which will be realized in further theoretical constructions of authors.

There three variants for answer: personalistic (purely human, sociocultural – terminological details are not important here) demands are such ones that “are put” into human originally and then “are deployed”. We may bravely put a question mark in this response near each word: by whom, where and how are put, what “originally” means, why and using what mechanisms they are deployed?

The second variant for answer – about socialization: the social surrounding forms the cultural demands at human. Here almost everything is not clear for psychology: how exactly, strictly speaking, “from what” are these demands formed? And what does it mean that someone else forms the demand at human? The third variant tries to unite “requirement” (in traditional meaning) with cultural demands: “needs” meet with social surrounding and are transformed into personalistic demands. It is not so important in this sense what exactly happens at this meeting – collision and confrontation, as Freud though, or acquisition and appropriation, as Vygotsky though. The main point is that namely the transformation of “needs” into cultural formation has not been fixed by no one and nowhere.

As it is seen, neither variant for answer can satisfy us as they all anticipate the initial “duality” of human – organism and social being (personality) at the best case coexist in some surprising, obviously imagined space.

Here not only the continuity principle (non-disjunctivity) for existence of the psychical as a process is infringed but something worse happens – the psychical is somehow destroyed, lost between these super phenomena – the biological and social. (And here the real moment of the truth: generally speaking, as a matter of fact, no one digresses from Freud, at whom the psychical is “between” instincts (the biological) and *super ego*). And even O.V. Brushlinsky, who very seriously, competently and soundly defends the principle of non-disjunctivity, is not able to stand it and makes the warning: “Any psychical at its ontogenetic stage (except, the first one) is formed and developed from the psychical.

A little roughening the matter of fact, we can even tell that the psychical at any infant arises only “once” – at the very beginning of ontogenesis, and then it is only formed and developed pursuant to already existing psychical formation” [Brushlinsky, 1981, p. 121] (emphasized by us – S.M.).

Brilliant specialist makes the small, as it seems, remission but this one time is worthy of much: it crosses out the whole concept, being absolutely right and heuristic.

We put a very simple question: can any (in general – ANY) internal intention be considered not psychical, i.e. such one that does not appear as a result from reflection and does not direct further this reflection, such one that does not self-regulate? And here is only one (and at the same time “simple”) answer: of course, no! The simplest, “most biological” intention is the psychical one due to definition; it is the psychics (although, of course, the psychics are not only intention). Thus, the need, even in its traditional meaning, is undoubtedly the psychical formation.

So, there is no “meeting” of purely biological with the social and the psychics are not born, at least “once” – it has already been, it is always and the need is its carrier. Human – a living being and it means that its initial intentional nature cannot significantly differ

from intentional nature of any other living being. It differs principally but not essentially.

Thus, we do not see any necessity to refuse from initial concept. On the contrary, we return to it its real wealth: the need, in general, reflects the radical, well-grounded necessity, and besides it means the obvious dynamics – motion. This is an unsaturated dynamic tendency (in this sense “demand” is much weaker term from the point of view of active dynamics).

On the other hand, we do not imagine any possibility to understand the mechanism for ontogenesis of personality beyond psychodynamic aspect. Yet “to take out of the brackets” the most essential point – motion of system that exists only in self-motion – means to destine itself to complete failure, or, at the best case, to imagine one more static scheme, which will have no relation to the real state of affairs.

We consider the personality, as it has already been mentioned, as a complex open system, being self-developed. The direction for development of personality (phylo- and ontogenesis) does not essentially differ from the general direction of evolution – complication, differentiation, prevalence in development of the internal in comparison with the external, self-regulation, integratedness.

The features for development of personality should be considered, firstly, absence of strict reference to any advanced defined scale, criterion, sample, standard; secondly, succession, i.e. stipulation by previous stages of development; thirdly, integrity, when the system is developed in the whole and it outgoes the development of certain particles, and, fourthly, universality in development of human potencies, which is a self-purpose.

The past (scales, samples, standards) cannot directly and indirectly determine the development of personality, as it is the “lower” in the structure of personality – of the “higher”. And this past, the “lower”, is changed and transformed in the structure of personality, losing the initial directing tendencies. S.L. Rubinstein mentioned: “... with appearance of new levels, the life and all its levels that are lower act in new capacities” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 259].

Thus, the initial tendencies and standards do not in fact disappear but become the others, mediating with the new level of existence and its future existence. Let's consider two determining tendencies in ontogenesis of personality on the part of the "past" – hereditary genetic and purely historical (as history of generation). At the first sight, it seems that the code of inheritance (genotype) most clearly and strictly defines the existence of human as it contains the information about all possible structures and mechanisms.

So, there is the original matrix (completely of material nature), which stipulates the existence of everything that will appear on it (but only on it! And it is the restriction). And again – we have the vulgar and simplified logic of rough division: matrix – material and everything that it generates, – it is its functions, properties, i.e. – not material, ideal (let's remind: psychics – property (function) of the brain, it looks like the odor is a property of acetone).

This logic of which we are literally "sick and tired" does not correspond to reality at all. The genotype of human is found to be not similar with any matrix-cliché. The molecular genetics surely shows that the genotype itself is very flexible and mobile: there are quite reliable data that the number of working genes in adult is increased in comparison with a newborn child by hundred thousands times (300 trillions against 30 thousands).

This growth cannot be explained only by increase in number of cells at adult. The increase is stipulated by principal unlimitedness of human capabilities, and the genotype through feedback with living conditions (social) as if provides with possibility to realize this limitlessness. Although we speak namely about principal but not actual living situation: in fact a human is always limited namely by living conditions.

Another fluctuation – during 12 years of life after birth the volume of human brain is sharply and significantly increased (by 100% at the end of the first year and by 100% more – in teenager's age). And how much (and during the whole life) the surface of cerebral cortex is increased! This increase is in fact structurally infinite. So, a human genotype is principally other (both due to the

structure and functions) in comparison with genotype of other living beings.

How has this otherness appeared?

It appears from mediation: interaction of biological structures with social factors. Our genes are not purely biological formations, they, as integral need, are namely the biosocial unity since the origin already. Just as the biological formation becomes the social one in its manifestation (properties, features, behavior) so as the social formation becomes the biological one that can already be seen in existence of animals, aside from human. As we cannot even consider the genotype to be a purely biological component, we cannot tell that the development of personality is to any extent determined biologically.

The process of stipulation means the other: some biosocial tendencies (genotype, need) meet with the other, same biosocial tendencies (surrounding natural and social world), and, mediating by each other, define the development of this integrity, which is a human personality. The most discordant thing in this sense is the aspect for correlation of dispositions and capabilities. On the contrary, it seems to us that it is the most vivid confirmation for our idea.

When they tell that with all theoretical considerations it is necessary to agree that “a human cannot exceed the bounds of its dispositions”, then they tell as if it is right. But let’s they give the answer for one more, simple question: What is an inclination? Who has seen, observed even one inclination?

They answer similar questions very imprecisely: they tell that inclinations are linked with morphoanatomical structure, they are hereditary, and, thus, – not psychological, and capabilities, on the contrary, are psychological and not hereditary.

But as soon as we know, no one ever has definitely studied any disposition. And it is not surprising: a disposition is not the one that really exists but the one that exists as a term, concept – i.e. – in the head of researcher and nowhere else. Does any reality correspond to this concept? We are sure that there is just no clear, definite, concrete reality (both material and morphoanatomical) in the strict meaning of this word.

The morphological construction of human vocal cords may be called as a disposition of verbal ability but, on the other hand, it may not be called as such one. As verbal ability, in fact, is not the division of sounds: it consists of just other things. To grant sound successions with meaning and sense, to understand this sense, to pass it, “entering” the context of life existence of personality of address – what relation has the morphology of human throat to this? Of course, it has some relation.

But capability is in general the phenomenon, being very far from anatomy and morphology: does a blind, deaf and mute person have the verbal ability, which understands and transmits a thought but does not tell and does not hear? By which disposition is the skin sensitivity of human stipulated to color that was experimentally formed by O.M. Leontyev? Did Ludwig van Beethoven lose his musical capability when he became deaf? We can put many such questions. It is not very difficult to answer them, it is only necessary to digress from scholastic logism and division of everything into elementary parts. Biosocial unity, which is a human organism, does not determine the development of personality, and, on the contrary, is determined by this development – changes, varies, including changing the “social heredity”.

In the same way as the development of personality is not limited by its genotype, it is not limited by history of generation. Children always differ from parents from the point of view of social existence, even if they continue the labor dynasties, they perform the same social role and do not go beyond the social stratification, occupy the same places as their parents and grandfathers in it.

Undoubtedly, the genetic heredity undoubtedly plays the role in continuation of social “affairs” by parents, and here the microsocial surrounding in childhood is important.

But here there is not strict determinism and limits: in any case a human on its own chooses a way of life, follows it, achieving own peaks. There are children, who continue the affairs of parents (although there are not much of them) – are not “put” to this journey and are not a simple mould – copy of parents’ personality. They follow their own way as they have their own motives and values.

Jung described this moment very vividly [Jung, 2003, p. 325]. The development of personality in childhood and especially in juvenile age as a start of motion by life journey is accompanied and directed by archetype (maturity, wisdom, erudition). Jung writes that such archetype for him personally in juvenile age was the image of a wise unknown human, to whom the boy often addressed at difficult moments and always received the answer, attention and advice (of course, the place for such archetype may be occupied by real person – father, grandfather or someone from famous relatives).

But following to archetype (here, as we see, archetype determines and at the same time restricts, “models’ the development) finally lead to a sharp conflict with it. Jung painfully survived this conflict – divergence with the “guide” but a human at a certain limit shall decide on its own.

So, the development of personality is not determined by the past (in any its form) and is not limited by it. At the same time the succession is kept in this process – each new stage is the result and consequence from previous one. The continuity in existence of the psychical in the whole and personality as its human form of existence, in particular, are provided namely by such situation. We are interested in limits of succession in time. The concept of the need allows refusing from discreteness in understanding the existence and development of personality.

Finally, we start understanding the sense of metaphor, according to which the development of personality is the continuation in existence of the biological and the social, and thus – has the historical characteristics. You may interpret our idea that we substitute a metaphor for scientific concept: personality in its establishment continues the history because it is the function of biosocial need, which was dematerialised in it and hereby continued its energy-informative existence.

Thus, personality, purely – does not appear but is born by two personalities, continuing them, and thus all other people.

And namely for this reason it is the carrier of history as general evolution of the Universe. Namely hence – universality and inherent worth: the world reflects itself in personality, in this sense – there is

no more self-sufficient and significant purpose of existence and establishment.

We have already mentioned that the diagnosis of development, at least within the meaning, available at L.S. Vygotsky, is absent in modern psychology. Neither direction in our science can boast that it, although fragmentarily and partly, developed the diagnostic procedures namely for process of development. Even experimentally-genetic method cannot be considered as purely diagnostic one, as it does not solve such problem, set by Vygotsky: is the one, being formed in the process for application of this method, the same one, being formed without its application.

The absence of methodological research procedure forces to tell about reason for it. It seems to us that the main reason is in the fragmentary analysis of personality – partial elements are considered to significant and meaningful, and due to this the subject of research is deformed.

Development of personality – deployment or new growth?

The concepts for development of personality as deployment of certain “structures” or “plans”, which since origin exist in special contracted state at human, have the long history and are urgent in modern philosophy and psychology of personality. One of reasons for their stability is free, and as we would tell, easy transference of laws for development of organism to personality in the whole. Biology cannot release from epigenetic notions about development of living organism, although these notions contradict to the new scientific facts.

The absolute majority understands the process for development of biological being as deployment and realization of genetic program.

After violent literary philosophical psychological discussion in the 70-ies of XX century, being victorious for E.V. Ilyenkov and his colleagues, the literal and direct transferences of notions from biological epigenesis to development of personality became unpopular in national science.

But it should be mentioned that the genesis of separate personalistic structures is often considered namely within this paradigm (the development of capabilities is the direct result from deployment of dispositions, the development of character is the deployment of properties for the nervous system).

Although these theoretical views in most cases are not declared, however, the construction and ways for analysis of experimental researches and applied psychological (corrective) work testify to methodological background of such works. We do not already tell about sphere of practical pedagogy, where the notions about biological programming and fatality not only of capabilities and features of character but value orientations of child are absolute and uniform principles for construction of process of learning and education.

The point is, however, not only in biological program and its deployment. Modern western psychology of personality very widely uses the principle of deployment. Officially only the theory by E. Erickson has the name of epigenetic but, as the analysis testifies, it is not separate. According to Erickson the development of personality has clearly stage character, “these stages are the result from epigenetic deployment of “personality plan”, which is genetically inherited”. The role of social surrounding is to accept inherited stages and to assist to their realization by child. What are those “plans” remains unclear.

The humanistic psychology and phenomenology takes the same position. Thus, L. Hyell and D. Zigler mention: “Rogers postulates the natural development of people to “constructive realization of their inherent inborn possibilities” [Hyell, Zigler, 1999]. A. Maslou speaks about deployment of selfhood and the process of development, in his opinion, is in actualization of this selfhood (self-actualization). It is interesting that the humanistic psychology, which is called “new wave” and which appeared as the opposition to psychoanalytical theories, left the same principle of genesis, which was leading in psychoanalysts. It only changed the programs: if the development in psychoanalysis is interpreted as the deployment of the subconscious

(instincts, drives, and archetypes), the development for humanistic psychology is the deployment of super conscious.

The attractiveness and imaginary clearness in phenomenon of deployment generates, however, many questions and differs much with the real life of personality. The main point is even not that “plans” and “programs” remain as unclear phenomena and such ones that are not in general subject to cognition.

The most important thing is that the determinism is too much strict, which does not correspond to reality at all. The experience testifies that a human itself chooses its way; it suffers from aspirations and finds the ways to achieve the purpose. It is often mistaken and disappointed, changes its life, finds another surrounding, and refuses from habits, etc. All this is not somehow united with programming.

It should be mentioned that no matter complex programs would be, they are still limited. Instead of, the variety of human individualities as variants for development of personality is unlimited. Besides, there are purely scientific facts, which testify that the significant number of separate psychological structures of personality during its development is not deployed, and vice versa – is reduced. Thus, the cognitive sphere of human is specifically reduced with appearance of mediacy: thanks to mediated memorizing, for example, a human may “allow itself” keeping not the huge literal information but its sign in actual experience. The reduction is inherent to all higher psychical functions of personality.

The process of personality development in cultural historical theory by L.S. Vygotsky is understood not as the deployment of something reduced and encoded but as the appearance of principally new psychological qualities – new formations, which occurs in energetic activity and interaction of individual with cultural environment, other people.

The biological (subconscious) plays its role in this process. “The biological relation, – mentions E.V. Ilyenkov, – which is reflected in identity of morphophysiological organization of individuals from species of *Homo sapiens*, constitutes only the prerequisite, only the condition for human, “generic” in human being but not the

“essence”, not the internal condition, not the concrete community, not the community of personality and personalities” [Ilyenkov, 1991a]. The same prerequisite, on the other hand, is the available spiritual cultural environment – carrier and keeper of common human values (super conscious).

The purposeful activity of individual itself, which will lead to appearance of new formation, shall “take place” between those subconscious and super conscious prerequisites so that the development of personality would happen (the life of human would happen).

So, there is not the contradiction even but the opposition: on the one hand, understanding the development of personality as the deployment of internal plan (program), which is at human now in a certain form. On the other hand it is the vision of development as the acquisition of psychical new formations in active distributed activity. These two positions may dialectically be united: the development of personality is the acquisition of psychical new formations by individual in own pragmatic activity. The appearance of those new formations means the deployment, complication of personality in the whole.

The development of personality occurs through appropriation of cultural historical experience from the whole mankind by individual. But the mechanisms for smelting of this experience into experience of individual are not clear. On the other hand, how is the appropriation of experience linked with the internal process of development and with activity of human itself? In other words, the development of personality occurs only in the processes of learning, education and other forms of interaction but it does not occur only in these processes.

This contradiction is purely epistemological and appears through simplified understanding the process of appropriation, its identification with socialization. The latter one is adaptive “external” process for adaptation of human to social conditions of existence. It is the process for origin of the ideal. Meeting with social environment in the process for realization of own activity, a human establishes the special means-signs from these objects (material or ideal) that help

it to realize its activity. These means are transformed into psychological structures of consciousness, developing and changing it.

So, the unity of own essential mechanisms for development with the motion of personality in the society take place. In fact, as L.S. Vygotsky mentioned, the development of personality is not the socialization but, on the contrary, individualization, as the personality is complicated in this process and acquires the uniqueness and individuality. So, the contradiction is overcome in that, as E.V. Ilyenkov writes, “an individual shall “appropriate” not the ready results from development of culture but only the results together with the process that generates them and continues generating, i.e. together with the history, which creates them” [Ilyenkov, 1991a].

There occurs the process, which is called “desobjectivation” when a human in own activity realizes the discovery of common human efforts and mechanisms, which led to appearance of cultural subjects. This is, strictly speaking, quasi-research, quasi-creativity. But this “quasi” is appropriate only in the terms of social value of result. It is a real creativity for personality itself, internally. This thesis is very essential for pedagogical process.

It testifies that the assumption, which prevails in pedagogy and psychology, as if the development of intellect is the consequence from acquisition of ready knowledge, as well as abilities and habits for their use, is principally incorrect. “In this case, – mentions F.T. Mykhaylov, – the development will be minimal and sudden” [Mykhaylov, 1990].

Instead, the real developing activity is that not a ready object of acquisition is put to a human but the special learning situation, in which own task and own creative activity, directed to possess the means and situation in the whole appears at human, is created. L.S. Vygotsky wrote about it: “Only when a personality possesses some or other form for behavior, it raises to higher step” [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 226].

The problem in relationship of development of integral personality and separate psychological structures is important. This is, strictly speaking, the question about correlation of the whole and parts in development. It is theoretically new thanks to dialectic logic,

it is solved rather easily: “The development of each separate function, – mentions Vygotsky, – is the derivative from development of personality in the whole” [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 237]. So, it is clear: the development of personality is determinative and advanced in relation to separate psychical structures and mechanisms.

It is clear that only the research on development of integral personality may explain the peculiarities for development of its parts but not on the contrary. The same concerns the pedagogical management for development of individual: the determinative and prognostic result from study and education may be achieved only through interaction with integral personality but not on the way for influence on separate psychical functions.

This contradiction, however, is rather sharp in the practical psychological and pedagogical sphere.

In fact, if to assume that personality is not inborn but appears, it is necessary to acknowledge the available certain period for development of child, when there is no personality yet. Here the development of each separate process is determinative and the derivative from their development will be integral personality. It is clear that this logic requires original systems of experimental work and pedagogical activity (learning and education).

The development of personality consists in organization and integration of the inward world by human. It is the way to itself, the way of self-cognition and self-realization. As a matter of fact, the psychical development becomes the development of personality only when it starts being the reflection of own experience by human. Since that moment a human itself defines the directions in own development, controls it and is responsible for it. It is what we call self-development in modern psychology.

But at the same time the development of personality cannot be reduced to reflection. In fact, S.L. Rubinstein wrote very deeply about it, the personalistic development is carried out exclusively within the plane of active pragmatic interaction of human with surrounding world.

The solution of this contradiction is in simultaneous “retention” of these two lines of development. A human, who is concentrated on

itself, standing aside the world, is a disharmonious personality and its development is deformed. But a human, who is not able of deep reflection and self-regulation, also is disharmoniously perfunctory, irresponsible and unpromising. But such position stipulates the insufficiency of self-regulation and crisis of responsibility. Finally, the whole personality may be reduced only to external manifestations, being a simple set of social roles-masks.

The continuity in run of personalistic processes means that a personality at each period of its existence should be considered as a result from existence of the past, its present is based on history of development, is the derivative from this history. The experience, which is acquired by personality, making its life journey, is determinative. So, the personality, its real present state and its future may be understood and explained on the basis of history for its development.

This provision is very widely used in separate direction of practical psychology, especially in psychoanalysis. Its absolutization leads to acceptance of thesis that the past of personality determines its life journey (Z. Freud and A. Adler).

However, the life experience and scientific facts testify that the personality, laws for its development and forecasts of the future, in fact, cannot be understood only on the basis of experience and the past alone. In particular, the cognitive psychology proved that reproduction of material from memory takes place only within the context of modern situation and present problems.

Moreover, the material, being reproduced, is not in the pure form as it is memorized. It itself is the other, i.e. such one as a human sees it now. Practicing psychologists and psychiatrists meet with this phenomenon very often when they research the premorbid states: not only a patient but his/her relatives interpret the past from the point of view that a human fell ill.

They as if seek the confirmation for development of disease in it (or, vice versa, interpret it by such way as if no disease could be. This is the case when relatives do not accept the affection of patient). G. Allport, arguing with psychoanalysts, determined the availability of so-called “autonomous complexes” at human. These new formations

of motivational character are formed in human at a certain stage of life and are not linked with the history of development at all. At least functioning of the autonomous complex and its origin is completely defined by modern life of human. The abovementioned and some other contradictions in interpretation of personality development underline the complex and controversial character of this process.

The analysis testifies that the personality is developed in the form of establishment. Namely this concept to most extent reflects the essential peculiarities for this process. The term “establishment” is most often used as the synonym for “development” or “formation”. Meanwhile, we find the detailed elaboration of this concept as such one that reflects the specificity of development not in general but only separate complicated systems, which include the personality, in theoretical research works by O.F. Losev.

According to Losev, the establishment is such form for development, “when new and new qualities, being unclear, appear from simple quantitative maturing, if we understand the previous quantitative maturing only as abstractly quantitative” [Losev, 1991, p. 432]. So, the development in relation to certain structures and systems occurs only in the form for establishment of quantitatively qualitative structures.

Losev defines the establishment as “the uninterrupted process of change when it is impossible to define any point that would infringe the entire continuity of space” [Losev, 1991, p. 250]. Any deviation, even a mental disease of human, should be considered only within the context of integral process for establishment. The human life, writes Losev, “is first of all the establishment... The life establishment cannot be formed only of discrete points. The motion is not the sum of fixed points. As mathematicians tell, this is the continuum”.

Further the philosopher pays attention that “it is necessary firstly to be something in order to be established, and this “something” shall remain unchanged in the process of this change: so, what is changed as there is nothing unchanged?” [Losev, 1991, p. 432]. It is a very important and deep thought, and Losev returned to it for many times, formulating it every time by a different way. Hereby, the concept is developed and deepened. In another work according to

the main rule of dialectics he explains that the establishment may take place only there is the one that is established and that is remained unchanged at all its changes, which actually occur. “As soon as this “one” is infringed and changed in its essence, then we can tell that its establishment was interrupted and the establishment of something else started” [Losev, 1991].

This remark enables to understand and to realize the whole integral continuum of human development by a different way. If we assume that the personality appears, exists and disappears, according to positions by Losev we should acknowledge that we have not the only one but three different processes for development of human. This is the development, which generates the establishment of personality (until its appearance), and the development, which continues this process in quite other forms (after death or complete ruin of personality).

Unfortunately, this thought is not reflected anyhow in psychological researches of personality, even in genetic psychology and in cultural historical theory. It seems to us that it may open the principally new and productive way for researches in the future.

So, Losev sums up, “the personality is first of all some unchanged unity, which as if exists alone beyond any change” [Losev, 1991, p. 73]. However, the real personality is the historical personality.

It is constantly changed and established. Our logic in study of personality is based namely on this approach: it alone, as integrity, is always and is unchanged (as when it is not the case, then it is established), at the same time it is constantly and perpetually changed and developed due to certain lines of development.

We have already told above that each of these lines is a certain line in development of the whole personality. Now it should be added: namely such establishment provides with two significant, and, at the first sight, opposite things – it defines the uniform motion of personality at its preservation as an integral unchanged unity (it is unchanged exclusively in this integrity and unity).

Firstly: we have the establishment of real personality, concrete human. It is linked with its own history and its establishment is the infinite flow.

Secondly: the establishment occurs with the idea of personality, which “remains at its place beyond its history”. The idea of personality is established very slowly, together with establishment of culture (the idea of personality in the antiquity, for example, cardinally differs from idea of personality at our times, so it also passes through establishment but very specific).

Thirdly: Losev states that the personality has something that “in fact manages the whole establishment and not only its ideological conceptualization. This is the prototype, real implementation of idea” [Losev, 1991, p. 112]. The personality in its development is governed by aspiration for this prototype and, in fact, it manages the own establishment.

Thus, O.F. Losev’s understanding of personality establishment is that it is the constant motion of something uniform, integral and unchanged. Hereby, at the same time it is the constant flow and change within individual lines-manifestations. The characteristics of establishment as self-motion and self-development is also essential.

We can here provide only the general characteristics for the main lines of personality development because, as it is easy to notice, they correspond to directions in research of personality. Hereby, we would like to make not analytical review of researches and theoretical constructions but to set forth the conceptual vision for life motion of integral personality due to individual lines of development.

So, what is the development of interrelation of personality with the external world (first line)?

If to answer by one phrase – the development of this sphere means to overcome the strict opposition “subject – object”, or “subject – another subject” and to achieve the state of harmonious unity with the world without loss of subjectness, i.e. without “solubility” in this world. We mean the establishment as the dialectical motion along the spiral and objection of objection (B.M. Kedrov, 1983). The organism of human before appearance of

personality is not in subjective opposition to external world – object as it is an object among other objects, “dissolved” in this world.

The birth of personality means the appearance of subject, i.e. a reflexive, realizing and passionate human. Human, which alone takes decisions, using own motivational experiences, and it itself builds the own behavior. Its motion now becomes the life journey. The subjectness, in addition, anticipates the distance, dissociation from surrounding (from “non Ego”), its transformation into alienated object. The personality in history started by such way, by the same way it starts in each human ontogenetically. Known crisis of three years (crisis “I am myself”) has the abovementioned transformations as its internal essential content.

O.M. Leontyev testifies that firstly the attitude of child to people and things is undifferentiated, i.e. it does not separate some from others. But these attitudes in both cases have vivid objective, detached character. Further these attitudes become different but their objectness is kept. During further ontogenesis the relations with people are partly changed, overcoming with aloofness starts appearing in them, and sometimes “equally human” subject-subject relations may appears with some people.

The objectness with the rest of subject and phenomena is mostly often kept during the whole life. But the real progress in establishment of personality, its entry to the higher spiral turn is linked with possibility to overcome this aloofness and “to let” the world to itself, to enter into relations with it, which M.M. Pryshvin called “family attention”. The fact that personality can do it is known by us from own experience – every one of us, although once a life, felt this relationship and deep penetrability by world.

This experience testifies that such state is really the higher level in existence of human on comparison with alienated objectness.

The fact that some or other attitude of human to the world is defined by its own activity, its actions is principal. The initial moment here shall be the philosophical methodological provision by E.V. Ilyenkov: “Not only thinking cannot exist without materia but materia cannot exist without thinking” [Ilyenkov, 1991, p. 420].

The development in expressiveness of personality as a line of establishment may be imagined by the following way. The expressive activity of human inward world causes to vital motion of personality, in which it encounters with the social reality. The social behavior is built as the acquisition and fulfillment of a great number of social roles. So-called role layer of personality structure is formed. The role behavior, for example, professional, may be rather strong and rigid, suppress the expressiveness. Then the personality involves.

The development is that the expressiveness “passes” through the layer of social roles, and personality, its essence is reflected on behavior and products of activity. If we speak about professional activity, in this case we have the essence of mastery. Master-professional, who does not just correctly perform labor operations: he embodies the personality into them, as well as into the product of work. In general, there is the sense to speak about special human demand on its embodiment in this world.

The establishment of personality in many aspects is defined by development of this demand. Traditionally in philosophy this demand and activity, generated by it, is described by category “objectivation”. Human in its activity continuously as if “dissolves” the cultural and natural things and phenomena, hereby moving them to own personalistic essential forces (desobjectivation). But it embodies these forces into external world. A human objectifies itself as an individually unique social whole. “The result from its objectivation is its creation”.

The creation is something that makes our life and our personality to be eternal (hereby, “creation” should here be understood widely, it is in fact everything that human leaves after itself). “The real being of human ... this is its action, – wrote Hegel, – the individuality is real in the latter... only creation should be considered to be the true reality” [Hegel, 1974, p. 232].

The development in expression-embodiment of personality is the urgent pedagogical problem. As O.S. Arsenyev convincingly showed, the purposes for development of creativity (expression, objectivation) and traditional tasks of learning and education in pedagogical process are antinomic [Arsenyev, 1981].

The pedagogical system as reflection of state system is first of all, aimed to adapt children to available social conditions of life. It occurs through suppression of expressiveness (the layer of social roles suppresses the expressiveness).

Hereby the organic adaptation of child to social reality is achieved but at the same time the creative initiative is locked. The solution of this dilemma, development of creativity in children and adults remains the global problem in modern education.

Now let's consider the line for development of personality integration. The progressive changes in system of human interrelations with external world lead to the situation when the personality is transformed into subject not only of its own behavior but its own inward world, i.e. itself. The transformation of human into a subject of own life and own establishment means a certain duplication of process for development. So, there appears the management and control on the part of individual itself over developing processes and mechanisms.

The self-development is inherent to mature, integrated personality. What is this motion? The important component in line of integration is the extension of realization, i.e. approach to balanced and integral inward world of personality (selfhood or "syntonic Ego" – in terminology by C.G. Jung). Most foreign theoreticians of personality see the essence of integration namely in extension of consciousness.

Another essential component in process of integration is the appearance of feeling for participation and intrinsic motivation. This motivation means that the personality contains the award for performance of certain actions in itself. A human, who acts, receives satisfaction, feeling own competence and self-respect. Hence there arises the feeling for own efficiency and feeling of itself as a source for changes in surrounding world. Such motivation generates the feeling of personalistic participation of human in what it makes, and the external awards become not so important already and as if secondary.

We think that the development of intrinsic motivation and, accordingly, feeling for participation is not only the consequences

from processes of personality integration but the important conditions for development of these processes.

Thus, we can assume that the weakness of integrative processes in school age is caused by orientation of assessment for learning and behavioral actions of pupils almost always to external awards.

The researches testify that external awards block the development of feeling for participation and brake the intrinsic motivation, and the personality remains internally indifferent to its actions and successes. But the delay in abovementioned processes means the delay in integration of personality in general. Moreover, one more essential element in process of unity is not formed in such pedagogical situation.

We mean that the responsibility, in particular, the integral locus of control. Externally oriented, stimulus-reactive pedagogical management for development gradually trains the individual that the external conditions are determinative in life and activity but not the internal aspirations and experiences. Thus, there appears the externality, irresponsibility. It harms much to completion of personality, as the absence of responsibility means that the inward world is not realized and is not formed by human.

Traditionally, the start for ontogenesis of personality is linked with physical birth of human, although in this case, at least, national psychology discussed the thesis: “no one is born as personality – one becomes a personality”, removing the birth of personality much more in time (O.M. Leontyev in general told about “double” birth of personality).

Empirical researches of behavior and peculiarities for development of human embryo allowed making the generalizations at modern stage, according to which there is the sense to tell that “the initial stage in ontogenesis of personality is impregnation|. However, it seems to us that this moment, in fact, cannot be considered the initial as in this case the primary biosocial unity of the need as a factor for preservation of real succession in existence of personality as a representative of species “human” is disclosed.

We consider that the first stage in ontogenesis of personality is the special social situation for interaction of two loving persons from

opposite sex, which is finally directed to creation for own continuation for each of participants – appearance of new human being. These interrelations are absolutely unique and not reproductive in principle. Loving relations are the most vivid and complete manifestation of the need as general unit for existence of human being.

This is unique case for its objectivation that coincides in time at two persons.

All essential features of personality, its life senses and values are mostly frankly, deeply and brilliantly reflected in loving relations; the mobilization and activation of all spheres, including purely organismic, takes place. The optimal conditions for self-manifestation are formed namely here, and at the same time for manifestation of all those depths and layers of human culture, accumulated by generations, which carriers are each from those loving one another beings. Manifestation and embodiment. Here the aspirations and intention is generated, the image for future existence of result is formed, as well as the organic continuation of love – unique establishment (creation), which is the future personality. There are numerous (although only primary) empirical data, received in different spheres, unfortunately, excluding the psychology about greatest meaning for development of future child's peculiarities for relations between its parents, which preceded its impregnation.

We will discuss this question in more details further. The interrelations of two loving persons are the important component for objectivation of the need and, at the same time, the means for its continuation in the new being. On the other hand, the peculiarities for these relations determinatively influence on realization of next stage, – strictly speaking impregnation. They do not only mobilize all forces and truly “open” personalities towards each other and ... towards a new being, their joint creation. In these relations, if we consider purely psychological limits of phenomenon, there appears the special psychical state of people, and it influences on activity of all systems at being, including, biochemistry, physiology of genital system due to mechanisms, inherent to existence of any state in general. The psychical state of future parents determines the next

stage and indirectly defines the important peculiarities for further development of child.

Thus, the first stage of ontogenesis takes place, at the first sight, absolutely without this personality. But in many aspects it is determinative for it. The time is united here: the past, present, future is concentrated in momentarinesses, and the future becomes determinative. The ideal (psychical, social) has much more force in this case, it becomes the social, embodying into material process and arranging, structuring, directing them.

We see that the question is about important mechanism for ontogenesis: the need actualizes the internal (ideal), gives to it the quality of actual real force, which, having united with the similar force of loving being, determinatively changes the material processes. In addition, the factor of information is very essential in this mechanism – the dynamics of the need provides with transmission of historical hereditary information through parents (actualizing in their special state) to the future through a child.

The described mechanism for ontogenesis (“need”, – initial intention ® interrelations in special psychical state, – “social” ® sexual contact, – “biologically” new being – “personality”), as it can be seen, is such one that directly contradict to the mechanism, discovered by Freud, and mechanism of interiorization. Unlike Freud, we think that the real primary is namely the social, contact of two personalities, i.e. – exclusively cultural historical being. As it concerns interiorization, we can note that the primary and initial in birth of personality is just not interiorization but exteriorization (if we use already this terminology), i.e. – manifestation of the inward world (internal conditions – S.L. Rubinstein) and execution of principally new being in this stormy manifestation. It means that personality starts from the love.

The second stage of ontogenesis is, strictly speaking, the impregnation. We already see that it is not exclusively biological, natural process as it is deep-rooted in the previous, social interrelation and through it, – in general in all generations, in history itself. The process of impregnation itself is the interesting model to

understand different levels of interaction. So, strictly speaking, it is the interaction (i.e. – the social) at the level of cells.

Two “units” of life, male and female, interact. Hereby, the process of impregnation – just about the only act of interaction of “pure” units in the nature (although we got accustomed that “unit” is obligatorily something abstract, not existing in reality as a fact). The interaction is caused and directed by the need of each from loving personalities but neither male “unit”, nor female “unit” alone will give the continuation, they shall become the one. (It is important for this formulation that before an ovule and a spermatozoon form a zygote (become the one), two personalities become the one for a certain period, – both physically and psychologically).

The phenomenon of impregnation as interaction should be considered as a social phenomenon as surprising it may sound. It is in its own way complex and conflict: just imagine that only 1 (!) from 300,000 spermatozoons penetrate into ovule.

So, the selection takes places and this is also the aspect of interaction. In this case it is not already essential, which agents influence on interaction, define it. Thus, here these agents are mainly purely chemical. But the interaction does not stop being such because of this. And if we already speak about “levels”, we should not forget that the interaction of adults is also under influence of chemical agents (for example, pheromones) and in general physical ones – as visual and auditory stimuli have, finally, purely physical, wave nature. Thus, two first stages run “under sign” of interaction, directed to birth of creation.

The social aspect of the need vividly prevails (again according to Freud) and the social by no way suppresses, “contracts” the manifestation of the natural. On the contrary, it is only the single possible way, means for this manifestation. It may seem that we started the consideration of ontogenesis long before the personality appears and becomes the fact of existence. But it only seems. Loving relations, generated, including by the wish for its continuation (desire to have a child), cause to appearance of expectations. This is wishes, images, dreams, planning: a future personality is already in them.

Thus, it is absent yet in real, purely material processes that are described here, it is the expectation and potency but it is not less real because of this as surprising it sounds at first sight! The existential psychology very soundly and reasonably proves that the inward world (Eigenwelt) is in no way less real for human than the external, material world that surrounds it (Umwelt). This is its world and it means that it is the most real.

And a child that already exists in the worlds of loving beings is not a phantom and mirage; it is the reality itself for those people: it exists. And it means that the onset in fact is just here and there is no contradiction as, speaking about mature personality, we very clearly and bravely tell that the main thing in its features is not the external appearance but something that is beyond it, i.e. – ideal, psychical.

Why shall not this logic work in this case?

Nevertheless, when loving people think about their future child, they ... feel it, experience, somehow correlate their life with it – future, plan its future, think about name, sex, where it would live, how it would be educated, how their life would be changed, etc. This is the whole world, and the external behavior becomes such one as if it, this child, was already born.

One more essential remark to the first two stages in ontogenesis of personality. Undoubtedly, the chance (acquaintance and contact of two persons, their social peculiarities and identity, – are, so to say, – macrolevel of interaction; conditions for environment inside of mother's organism, hereditary features, genotype in the whole, – microlevel) in these process has a certain meaning but in no case we can tell that the orderliness here is born from the chaos.

In fact, everything is put in order – social historical experience, organismic tendencies and genotypes of parents. That is, orderliness is born from orderliness. It is undoubtedly new but at the same time it is the continuation. So, now modern “order from chaos” does not relate to genesis of human being at all.

The third stage is the process of embryogenesis (prenatal development), which includes two phases – development of embryo and fetus. The significant changes take place at this stage, and it is not in vain at all that it is continued for a quite long time. The need

here for the first time appears in its new, individual form. Its manifestation marks the start for self-development of new separate living being.

The psychology during recent years pays much attention to research on prenatal development of human child (mainly, we mean foreign empirical works). The facts, received in these researches, testify that in the whole the psychical function appear at human already in antenatal life (sensory, emotional, rudiments of behavioral reactions). Within the context of application of genetically-modeling method for analysis, for us it is important to mention the following. The diversity in forms for interaction of human being that is developed significantly increases during this period. The need, as we have already mentioned, enforces the self-development, which is realized, on the one hand, in chronologically weighed and structurally defined succession for foundation and start for development of organs and their systems, which, functioning, generate purely psychical reality. This chronological and spatial orderliness was noticed by biology long ago but its secret remains unguessed.

From where does such clear synchronism appear? We think that the answer should be sought, having united this phenomenon with another, also noticed long ago: due to Haeckel-Muller law embryogenesis is a short repetition of phylogenesis. Again we deal with informative branch of the need, now already as an independent individual force: synchronization is stipulated by historical roots and experience.

In fact, the new form for manifestation of the need leads to differentiation of initial unit of new life (zygote), the process of complex interaction between separate components of structural integrity, being generated and developed, starts.

At the same time this integrity is in complex interaction with mother's organism. And here already all channels of interrelations are engaged – chemical, physical, biological, and psychical. The generation and development turned out to be synchronized in time with interaction with another being – mother. This is the first level, strictly speaking, of social contact, so, “contactee” is a social being, mature personality. Perhaps, qualitatively new level in development

of mammals' class is linked with the fact that a child very early acquires literally organic and completely safe experience of social relations – inside the mother – with her.

Perhaps, it is not realized and not comprehended by fetus but the experience in some forms is undoubtedly acquired, as well as the joint use of necessary substances, neurointeraction and many others remain. Mother, at the same time, acts both as a mediator in the first acts of human interaction that matures in it with external environment. Empirical data tell that a child near the sixth month of prenatal development hears sounds and emotionally reacts to them. And first of all it hears mother's voice and its intonation and loudness turned out to be correlated (biochemical) with psychical state of mother. Thus, the readiness for further interaction appears.

The described stages of ontogenesis are the process for interaction of phylogeny and ontogeny and specific transition of the first into the second one thanks to the need. This is the start of personality (in the form of individual), which mechanisms are linked with functioning of the need as initial force that stipulates joining heredity and interaction. The social is the primary and thus psychics are primary (but the social is always the product from the psychical).

Thus, we cannot tell about origin of personality as about separate act: it has deep roots in phylogeny and heredity, which are passed through loving interaction of parental couple. In addition, the personality "passes" through some specific interactions and metamorphosis during prenatal development. Thus, it "starts" long before physical birth, and therefore already a newborn child obligatorily has a certain history of its existence and development.

And, mainly, this is a human child (personality) originally: the world of culture is the object of its interaction already in prenatal period, and, at the same time, it alone is the object of influence from this world already at the first two stages of ontogenesis. It is, strictly speaking, originated as a creation of human needs, people.

We think that the interesting consequence from this complex way is the development in readiness of child for life in the world, beyond mother's organism. It turns out to be ready for this not only physically but also psychologically. Western psychology during recent

years received many facts that testify this readiness. Let's mention some of them [Craig, 2001].

Newborn children that came into the world only just some minutes ago put out their tongues and open the mouth widely, imitating the motions of mother. The complex mimicry, expression of joy, fear, and surprise is imitated (this, in the meantime, – unconsciously – but exists!). Imitation turns out to be an important inborn quality that assists to establishment of complex bilateral interaction with mother. Infants since birth purposefully concentrate on mimicry of mother, her intonations and motions. Their reaction is adequate originally: gentle and calming actions of mother cause to a smile and pleasant, mild sounds (“mutter”). Impatient tone and threatening mimicry of mother lead to appearance of expression of fear and despair. Immediately after birth a child at once prefers the voice of its mother, defining it due to those peculiarities, which it found out, being still in the mother's womb.

In the whole, the acquaintance with foreign sources testifies to revolutionary improvements in empirical research on psychology of newborn children, and all data testify, strictly speaking, to the only one – not just a living being from mammals' class is physically born – a human, personality is born. It is ready for meeting with the world, and it seems to us that this meeting is desirable.

Within the abovementioned and new empirical data, we skeptically look at tragic-dramatic intonation in description of “birth crisis”.

Mildly speaking, the tragic situation is obviously exaggerated and negatively metaphorized. It is painful for a child to come into the world, and it cries very much at first... But is it so painful? And does it cry, declaring its right for this world and leaving the first imprint of the new Ego by this cry in it? It seems that the technique of experiments (western psychology) will allow very soon answering these questions (for example, the degree of acuity in pain senses or parameters of emotions), and for some reason or other it turns out that we would not find any strong tragic situation – even if alive mother were near!

Maria Montessori called clearly a child, who came into this world as “spiritual embryo”. The first real contact of child with the external

world... “In this case, – mentions Montessori, – we can speak not just about difficult but determinative moment in human fate. Namely during this period the forces, which shall manage large-scale creating activity of human – spiritual embryo, are awakened at child”. [Montessori, 2002, p. 123]. But these forces shall be excited, and in this case we should speak that we – people, who surround a child, excite them.

“Social impregnation, – like this, let something metaphorically but exactly we call this important stage in ontogenesis of personality. So, a child is found to be ready for this stage, in addition, the cognitive sphere so rapidly (explosively) is developed immediately since the start of its life in the world but all this is not the essence. The need generates one more new form for interaction and – surprising form. Although a child becomes an autonomous being, it preserves all forms for interaction that existed before birth. And the physical isolation from mother does not mean the termination of interaction, which used to be – it was left in experience, accepted new forms. But the need enters to the new turn of spiral – the appropriation of the world starts (appropriation as transference into its own).

The new form for interaction is the direct and open relations with other people, first of all parents. It turns out to be determinative. The need starts branching into demands, “meeting” with corresponding objects, and these demands are at once human ones.

It is the first thing. Let’s underlie that all demands in newborn are at once human ones, they, just for this reason, become the demands that are regulated socially.

Secondly, this is the world of interrelations with people. Mother shows the advanced initiative – she sees what is absent in behavior of child but, reacting to real behavior, correcting it, showing to a child by her state, attitude, speech – what is expected from it, she actively forms the motion and, thus, the personality itself. Mother involuntarily puts a child into dialogical, active position in relation to itself because otherwise it turns out to be just impossible.

The personality is revealed in interaction and it is also formed in it. So, it is originally self-intentional, it is self-developed but very soon it is found that it is necessary to go together. And this is pleasant,

effective, interesting and comfortable. A child very early demonstrates the joy from contact as it is realized only in it. Actively, sharply directed to adults, a child appropriates the social experience, inheriting their interrelations but within the aspect of these relations a child comes into subject-centered position and “from itself” as from the center of activity treats adults, and namely here, in this process, it for the first time becomes a real personality as a subject; starts forming selfhood.

In this sense, from the point of social position of child (it cannot yet realizing the attitude of adult to itself but it is easy already to fix relations between close adults), we tell that the most essential relations for its development are interpersonal relations of close adults – as they – are the object of appropriation. It is more important on the part of psychological background of development – namely adults may create the atmosphere of love. A child actively comprehends the world, “catching” and accumulating impressions, which constitute the experience and are the background for inward world.

But this world would not appear without language. A being becomes cultural because it “is impregnated” by this world indirectly, through symbol. The main capability of human – to symbolize the world – is acquired by it through contact and communication with other human. So, the inward world is formed and Ego appears: socially reproduced function for interaction of adults that were the ancestors of child. The appearance of Ego means that a child understood the essence of other people as Ego, it entered into the context of this life.

The course of child life acquires reflexively and subjectively colored state.

The expression “I am myself” means that a child realized itself and the balance in dichotomous pair of the biological and the social in the need has been broken. This means that the social impregnation took place. Now there appears the necessity in autonomous interaction with the world – as the development of psychics is not realized by another way. And a child actively reproduces the world, using cultural means, first of all verbal. This is

the way to grow into the culture, and we think that cultural historical theory understood it most adequately. Most importantly that the new psychological organs, special interfunctional systems, are hereby formed. (Vygotsky called them as higher psychical functions).

The personality is structured. It is interesting that it really means. Let's show this phenomenon only on example of cognitive sphere. In reality, the appearance of psychological organ means that psychical functions stops being bound to a certain sensory system. It is very primitive and wrong when the perception, for example, is linked only with the corresponding analyzer: personalistic perception (perception as higher psychical function) is carried out using the whole psychics, i.e. personality.

This stage of ontogenesis continues up to juvenile age. From the point of view of initial genetic contradiction – biosocial need, it is the flowing period for accumulation of sociality. This period is studied very well and we will not fix upon it in details but just mention that at its end the need again “comes to the stage” in absolutely new important role.

The integrity of the need again appears in juvenile age in unique surprising synchronization of the biological and the social. Sexual maturation means “entry” of personality to the essential stage of development – readiness for own continuation: the need through loving relations with other human may be objectified into creation – other organism and – be continued.

It turns out that this cardinal readiness exists in the uniform ensemble with rapid psychosocial development: appearance of developed self-consciousness, acquisition of social roles, readiness for vital self-definition, availability of perspective life plans – is not the complete list of essential psychological new formations from aged period of development that coincides socially in western culture with learning of child in secondary and senior classes (teenager's and early youth age – in conceptual thesaurus of national science).

Again we meet with unique unity of the need: it is not necessary to argue that the most important thing in teenager's age is sexual maturation or appearance of essential psychological new formations. They are balanced and coordinated in time and space because the

question is about very responsible thing: readiness for continuation of itself as a being coincides with the readiness for full value and efficient social existence – life journey.

The “spirality” in motion of the need may be provided only by this unity, when each next step means the development, other, higher level. We came to the moment, since which, strictly speaking, we started – to reproduction of the ones like us. The personality in real sense becomes the subject of own life. This stage turns out to be so important that we will consider teenagers’ and early youth age in more details and we will try to make it from the genetically-psychological point of view.

Moreover, strictly speaking, we do not consider that further development of personality is ontogenesis in real sense of the word. A human itself defines further motion; there appears the interesting “dialog” of personality and the need, which is realized as such one only by mature human. And this is not ontogenesis but own life journey and establishment of itself.

Absolutely other mechanisms work here, and thus Vygotsky was right when he thought that the start of adult life is linked with cardinally other processes and is not subject to categories of developmental and child psychology of personality.

State of need in juvenile age

Juvenile age may bravely be called as a favorite object in research of developmental psychology. And the point here is not only in scientific interests. This period is very noticeable in life of any child. It is rather long and problematic transition from childhood to mature age.

Children are very noticeably changed during some years, hereby these changes are diverse and many-colored, they are not limited by physical maturation or rapid development of some psychical function or their group as it has been at early stages in establishment of child personality.

In this age everything is changed, hereby, the changes start from integral personality: further establishment of its structure takes

place. Because of such situation this age is always in the center of attention, and namely thus it is fixed in all without exceptions systems for periodization of child development, no matter what different they would be and on which methodological principles would be based.

And at the same time we cannot tell that psychological secret of juvenile age is completely disclosed. There are some reasons that stipulate the actuality for further scientific searches.

Firstly, a great number of empirical researches is rather a diverse mixture of scientific psychological facts, results from pedagogical observations and just life experience, and here serious deep generalizations are very necessary, as well as theoretical works, which, in fact, exist but they, secondly, are directed, of course, not to establishment of real logic of object under study and to development of a certain system of general theoretical opinions (psychoanalysis, behaviorism, theory of activity, etc.) and, in fact, “press” their logic to object. So we have many “psychologies of teenager”, among which a teenager itself and its real psychology as if is lost.

Moreover, (thirdly), a juvenile age is such one that co-varies much with the history of culture, so, the expression “a modern teenager”, should, in fact, be understood literally: the point is that psychology of modern children from juvenile age in many aspects differs from their coevals in the middle of XX century, not to say about earlier stages in phylogenesis (historiogenesis) of human. Genetic psychology tries to overcome the abovementioned defects, relying on clear theoretically methodological provisions.

Here the initial moment is the idea about understanding the development of personality as self-motion (self-development) of complex biosocial system, which activity is enforced by common need – undifferentiated, unsaturated, non-subjective and such one that cannot be objectified, and thus completed, all: this single and powerful intentional motion of substance that arises as a result from loving relations of two personalities from different sex, defines the existence of human in the world, and it is incomplete even with physical death of individual.

A subject, “being impregnated” by this motion – the need, turns out to be capable to meet with objects of the world and the choice among those ones that mostly conform to its deep-rooted need. So, the demands appear. Complex mechanisms for this constant self-motion (unlimited flow of selfhood) were described above, and now we have the possibility to analyze the psychological peculiarities for development of personality in juvenile age.

Here, as in each age period, the genetic law, established by us, is kept, according to which the structure of personality appears and is developed as a system of psychological means for interaction of human with the social world, which activity is enforced by the need. Thus, the most reasonable way to understand the complex and rapid personalistic processes in this age will be the simultaneous study of teenager’s personality in its dynamic and structural aspects. As L.S. Vygotsky mentioned, “in order to answer the question about originality of personality structure in transitional period, it is necessary to mention how is developed, how this structure is formed, what the main laws for its construction and change are” [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 220].

The difference between aged and functional development (according to O.V. Zaporozhets – it is two different processes; functional development means that something that occurs within a certain age period) is namely that the first one is completed with appearance of global psychical new formation, i.e. in fact, cardinally renewed and modified structure of personality. We do not see any sense to analyze here numerous and various theories of juvenile age, and refer a reader to the literature and researches, devoted to this problem [Bozhovych, 1968, Craig, 2001].

The logic of living self-motion in human personality in ontogenesis alone defines the initial points for analysis of age period. Yet A. Walloon established the important fact that each new stage in age development is built and development on the basis of previous stage. L.S. Vygotsky introduced the important specification, according to which this connection of stages in ontogenesis really exists but is complex and discordant.

It means the absence of direct logic for deployment of process of development: new formations from the previous stage are essentially necessary but they do mean any direct and immediate succession in behavior and social interactions. What does it mean in relation to juvenile age? On the one hand, it is clear that we have to be based on something, with which junior school age finished. Its central psychical new formations are well known – arbitrariness of cognitive processes, reflexivity, basics of theoretical thinking, and internal plan of actions.

Each from substructures of child personality has changed thanks to appearance of abovementioned peculiarities. The new interfunctional systems have appeared, and, thus, the whole structure of personality as integrity has changed. It appeared as a means for adequate behavior under conditions that characterize the vital activity of junior schoolboy. And first of all it is a means for successful learning as learning activity is leading.

A child that has the structure of personality, pierced with abovementioned new formations, is, in fact, “ideal further” pupil (it is other case that not many children namely at the end of primary school have the formed central psychical new formations. But it is the question of heterogeneity and heterochronism and individual variants for development). And this is already the social position of individuality that includes the system of values and leading interests and formed ways of actions. It seems that further perspectives are related exclusively with learning and these perspectives are not bad at all.

Moreover, a child really remains first of all a pupil and it is objectively that its single real, socially normalized and responsible activity for long years yet. This external “logic” seems very correct, and teachers and parents strongly believe in it.

If the development of personality was determined exclusively by social conditions, so it would happen by such way. But it does not happen... Quite unexpectedly there appears the moment when the absolute majority of children suddenly lose any interest to study, quickly become tired, especially in those kinds of activity that relate

to active creative work, become irritable and demonstrate uncertain and not prognostic behavior.

It is on the surface. What stipulates such paradoxical, illogical changes?

If briefly – they are stipulated by the fact that development of personality is not determined at all exclusively by social conditions and has its logic and its laws. The appearance of central psychical new formations, and, thus – principally new thesaurus of personality structure at the end of junior school age uses up and ruins the social situation of development, which all (subjectively for a child) “was turning” around learning.

This means that the content of leading social relations, which existed between a child and surrounding (other people and objects of activity) loses the significance and value. The one that used to be important, valuable not long ago – stops being such. And, most importantly, the formed interests disappear. There arises the acute contradiction, which was mentioned for the first time by L.S. Vygotsky: interests of child lose their actuality (in fact they disappear), and at the same time the system of actions and skills, that have formed inside these interests as a means for their realization remains.

A child continues acting but these acquired and automated actions turn out to be unmotivated. That's why the negative experience for absence of sense in activity appears in most children at this moment. “Juvenile desert” – L.M. Tolstoy called this state.

We agree with the thought by Vygotsky that the crisis of interests is the initial and root problem of juvenile age. Hereby, the interests are understood as “integral structural, dynamic tendencies – vital, organic processes, which are deep-rooted in organic, biological basis of personality but are developed together with development of the whole personality” [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 14].

The first, crisis stage in transitional age turns out to be demonstrative namely within the aspect of personality intentions. The crisis as if uncovers these secret and usually deeply hidden processes that confirm a very essential fact that the motivation-demand sphere of human not only determinatively influences on its

development but is also developed. The interest as a kind of motive, i.e. realized demand, aspiration for purposeful state, is changed during ontogenesis, and these changes are stipulated by integral biosocial nature of personality.

There appears the complex discordant knot, in which the central and determinative are three forces, generated, finally by process for establishment of initial genetic formation of intentional nature – need.

These three forces – biological maturation, social conditions for existence and psychological structures of personality itself – complexly interact, leading to appearance of new intentions, and thus – to further self-development of human.

L.S. Vygotsky starts the analysis for sources of human activity by the following way. He writes: “The incentive force for human activity or the aspiration is the sum of separate excitations or instinctive impulses. These aspirations are deep-rooted as if in special nests, which can be called as demands as we attribute, on the one hand, the incentive force for action to them, consider them as a source, the dispositions and interests originate from hence, and, on the other hand, we mention the fact that demands have a certain objective meaning in relation to organism in the whole” [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 14].

At the same time we mention the availability of other demands, established by requirements to adapt a child to surrounding social environment. Hereby the bilateral “objective-subjective nature” of demands is confirmed. [Vygotsky, 1983]. We speak that the analysis starts here because it becomes obviously noticeable that L.S. Vygotsky just had not time to make the next essential step: as these separate “nests – demands” are partial and concrete branches of uniform biosocial force – need that feeds them, develops, changes, “causing” to interact with social surrounding and then it becomes clear that there are no “other” demands, about which Vygotsky writes as about social, and all demands, caused by the need, are originally biosocial, and their development is the establishment of biosocial systems.

The same concerns more general remark by L.S. Vygotsky that juvenile age is the “sample” for very complex of interaction for two

lines of development – “biological and social-cultural” [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 16]. This remark contains the specifically reinterpreted but still influence of cartesianism, as, in fact, there are no two lines, we can only artificially within the analysis divide the uniform process of personality development into biological maturation of organism (1st line) and establishment of higher psychological functions (2nd line).

We have already seen that the uniform biosocial nature of human being originally defines rather the opposite phenomenon as soon as separate abovementioned “lines” start really (but not imaginarily, in the head of researcher) appearing, we shall wait for serious deviations and problems in establishment of personality.

This thought as if seems to be something unexpected, however, fair and important. Its correctness is confirmed not only by empirical but vital facts and conclusions, which we find in the theoretical opinions by such different, due to initial methodological orientations, scientists as L.I. Bozhovych and R. May. L.I. Bozhovych thinks that the harmony of personality is defined by complex and mobile agreement of instinctive unrealized intentions of human (“biological line”) with conscious demands – intentions, i.e., purely – purposes (“social-cultural line”): “The point is about availability of conscious and unrealized psychological formations at human, which correlation, as we think, in the first turn, defines the harmony or disharmony of human personality” [Bozhovych, 1968, p. 264].

L.I. Bozhovych thinks that disharmonic personalities are the people with “double orientation, which are in conflict with themselves, people with split personality, in which the conscious psychological life and life of unrealized affects are in constant contradiction” [Bozhovych, 1968, p. 273]. In his turn, R. May understands the unity of “two sides” for existence and development of human as a human “shall be honest with its instincts” and our attitude to unconscious intentions “shall be not in their suppression or struggle but in understanding and interaction with them in order to use these forces for the good” [May, 2001, p. 193].

Here we more brilliantly describe the unity and integrity of personality in its existence and establishment as the instinctive life is its part but not an independent instance.

It seems to us that real unity of personality is in fact the key and initial problem for the whole juvenile age. A human in childhood is the complex but agreed biosocial integrity. Its development is the realization of the need in the form of appearance and satisfaction of new demands, aspirations, and interests. It leads, on the one hand, to the fact that initial biosocial forces of human being are released, and, on the other hand, – higher psychological functions appear as a result from meeting of modified concretized forms of the need with products of human activity and cultural historical experience, in the whole.

These two processes do not run in parallels, they are interrelated, interdependent and such ones that change each other.

The whole personality as integral system achieves the stressed, imbalanced state, which is the readiness to transition of system into another, higher form of unity, such one, which is based on self-consciousness. This moment of stress and readiness to transition chronologically corresponds to the start of juvenile crisis.

We would like to emphasize that the unity of system is not ruined here but becomes such one that has already used up itself. The achievement of this state by child is natural and determined psychologically, socially and biologically. From the biological view, the necessity in transition to the new form for self-motion of personality is stipulated by appearance of new structure for personality, in which now higher psychical functions prevail. So, the appearance of basics for theoretical (detached) thinking means a very important thing namely for development of motivation-demand sphere (let's mention in the brackets that the real unity of affect and intellect is mostly shown during the period of juvenile crisis as nowhere else).

Abstract thinking allows from a principally new angle seeing the surrounding – things, phenomena, people, world in the whole. A child discovers the new sides of things and processes that assists not only to cognitive development. The main thing here is that these new sides potentially are the object of meeting with the need, so, they serve as the “nests”, where the new demands are born, and further – motives, desires, interests, values. The crisis is called as crisis at they have not yet been generated but the need has already “met”

with this new, thus, the old lost its actuality. Hence there arises the affective stress of uniform integral system.

The important role is played by such new formations as arbitrariness of psychical processes and reflection. The essence of arbitrariness is that it is the real background for capability to goal-setting and maintenance of purpose. The results from empirical researches enable speaking that a child at the end of junior school and at the beginning of juvenile age very vividly separates those actions that are stipulated by own purpose, from actions, which are caused by incentive from outside.

On the one hand, arbitrariness allows a child to be efficient – to concentrate on activity, to achieve the result, etc., and on the other hand, with participation of reflection, it signalizes about insufficiency as a child shall do many actions due to instructions but not due to own decision.

The reflection of those experiences creates the additional stress: as the need, forming interfunctional system with arbitrariness and reflection, requires own decisions and deeds, and it still requires the construction of its ideals and samples, not limited by simple inheritance of social presentations in the form of authoritative due to status adults or literary characters.

So, it turns out that the psychological factors, which stipulate the juvenile crisis, act in unity with social factors. The world is discovered by a child in new manifestations, excites the new demands but, as Vygotskyy mentioned, the system of child behavior remains old yet, purely ... childish. But the world – it is first of all the world of adults and the main aspiration, related with it, as A. Adler correctly mentioned [Adler, 1995, p. 5] – it is the aspiration to become socially adequate being.

The system of “childish” behavior is not adequate to this aspiration, and a teenager, thanks to reflection, feels it and experiences as inferiority. It reflexes the attitude of teachers, parents, and other adults – relation “as to a child that does not also satisfy it. When most researchers mention that once of central contradictions in this age is the aspiration for mature age and impossibility to realize it, it is right only by half: exacerbation, stress are also linked with the

fact that the level in development of thinking and reflection enable a teenager feeling this contraction itself, outliving it.

Thus, it is incorrect to call it as marginal personality as it really aspires for social usefulness and it really worries that it now has no objective grounds to achieve it yet. The acute contradiction of the psychological and social, however, is insufficient to understand the problems of child behavior in crisis stage of juvenile age. When L.S. Vygotsky mentions about exclusion of possibility for separation of some stages of development pursuant to the uniform criterion, he speaks absolutely correct. But we see here that two criteria are insufficient. It should be taken into consideration that “the criterion for sexual maturation is essential and demonstrative for pubertal age” [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 244].

The real unity of three main factors (psychological, social and biological), which is shown in juvenile age and stipulates all its peculiarities as it became clear later, describes the whole problem in interrelation of biological and social in establishment of personality by a different way.

The position by most national scientists in relation to this problem was mostly clear and brilliant described by L.I. Bozhovych [Bozhovych, 1968] and G.S. Kostjuk [Kostjuk, 1989].

The development of personality cannot be reduced to biological maturation of human but there is no sense to deny this process of maturation as it, as G.S. Kostjuk mentions, is the real background and prerequisite for establishment of personality, and, on the other hand, maturation as such one is changed, rebuilt under action of social and psychological factors. As we see, this position certifies a state of affairs but does not explain it that enable O.V. Zaporozhets to mention: “The interrelation of development and maturation is still few studied ... there are grounds to think that such relation exists, that it has not the unilateral but bilateral character” [Zaporozhets, 1986, p. 256]. It is necessary to mention that the problem will be left understudied until two separate aspects and interrelation between them are considered.

In fact, it is not the case at all. We have not two but one aspect in development of integral personality. Just as the sexual maturation

of organism never occurs in the norm by itself and always only within the context of maturation of the whole organism, so as the maturation of human is the process for maturation of human being, and, thus, due to definition, not biological but biosocial process. The integral system – personality enters to the level of capability to reproduce the life under terms of unity with another integral personality from opposite sex.

The need to live, the need in surrounding world is embodied into cardinal demand due to its status – birth of its continuation through sexual contact. And this demand, in fact, is not deep-rooted only in biology, and is defined by the need, in which the social and biological instances are originally the same. Sexual maturation exists in trinity of biological, psychological and social, as any (!) new formation of personality.

It is biologically defined by the time of its appearance, reconstruction in work of internal systems of organisms, first of all, hormonal one, although not less changes occur in the nervous, as well as circulatory systems, etc., changes in morphological structure of the body. But all this does not exist alone, is not added to anything and does not define something, being its background. All this exists in the uniform context of integral personality.

It seems to us that it happens otherwise than that the anatomical physiological structures and mechanisms have grown and after that the sexual drive and readiness to corresponding contacts appeared.

But everything occurs not so as Z. Freud considered, postulating libido as the only inborn and key intentional process of human. In fact, if we speak about development of human, the appearance of corresponding morphological, anatomical, physiological and psychological structures is the original response of human nature to the tendency of the need to embody into the Meeting and to continue the life through birth of another being. The appearance of corresponding structures allows the need to become the demand as it is objectified in the external and internal world. It is not necessary to simplify it.

We do not mean, let's repeat once more what Z. Freud told. Our provision does not mean at all that the sexual desire appears at

individual chronologically earlier than the corresponding structure mature. This desire, this instinctive drive is originally included into the composition of the need but until certain time – in potential and hidden form. Originally – it means not since birth of child but since birth of the mankind.

This drive in ontogenesis (already as mature, sexual) is embedded into human fetus, continuing the existence of general and all human need. And that's why it is originally biosocial and not only biological as two social-biological beings of opposite sex embody it. This potential and undifferentiated drive in composition of integral need is transformed into sexual need (desire) at the same time with maturation of abovementioned structures. L.S. Vygotsky mentions: "The main phases in development of interests coincide with the main phases for biological maturation of teenager" {Vygotsky, 1983, p. 22}.

Already only this points to the close and direct dependence of development of motivation-demand sphere on maturation processes. "The rhythm of organic maturation defines the rhythm in development of interests" [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 25]. And it is completely right as the interest appears, finally, on the basis of drives. It is necessary to specify that we shall speak not about co-dependence but about unity that Vygotsky understands, telling a bit later: "the epoch of sexual maturation of personality" [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 33].

We shall again emphasize that the experience, first of all pedagogical and psychopathological, points to the fact that the problems in development of teenager's personality start then and there, where this unity is infringed, and, as Vygotsky would tell, two lines of development enter to the stage.

Now let's explain what our expression that a sexual need is not originally biological but biosocial means in relation to ontogenesis. It is not everything that it is passed, embodied into a child as a special state, as a component of the need. At his time, C. Marx, underlining the difference between a human and animal already at the level of elementary, so-called "biological" demands, wrote that, so to say, hunger is hunger but hunger, which is satisfied using clutches and

teeth, cardinally differs from hunger, which is satisfied using fork and spoon.

Usually this phrase is interpreted in the sense that individual acquires the special cultural means for satisfaction from social surrounding, including elementary biological demands. And this interpretation is correct only by half. The second part is not less important: the demand itself is another due to psychological content itself! Its experience, image that may satisfy it, purpose, system of actions, objects – all is cardinally changed, it is another experience. But the same occurs with sexual need. Freud rather unsuccessfully and primitively (here for some reason or other the precision and penetration, inherent to him, failed) described it so as if the animal sexual need exists at human and during the whole life it fights with Super Ego that defines the collisions of personality life.

In fact, the animal sexual need of human may be only in the case of pathology. On the part of means, it should be mentioned that the contact of two people, including heterosexual (but of course, without any sex) is the thing, which as necessary means for existence is constantly acquired by child, and, mainly, on the part of interrelations between parents. These means are diverse, and they, among others, prepare a child for that epoch, when the demand and ability in purely sexual contact will appear.

The following feelings are developed in these interactions: friendship, devotion, trust, apprehension, fear, love. And they “fill in” the inward world of child. At the moment of teenager’s crisis they, these feelings, already exist. There are also numerous affiliative demands, which are also included into inward experience of feelings.

All this has exclusively biosocial, human nature. Thus the appearing sexual need in the norm cannot be the animal one, as it is the first demand to love and it is the real readiness to embody itself, its need into the new life through love. Now it is very difficult to say, how much, strictly speaking, unrealized this new for a child demand is.

It seems to us that we should not abuse its “reference” to the unconscious. Lets it be simplified but it can be compared with the demand on the food – a human can always realize what it namely

wants to eat. The same occurs with experience of sexual need, so, where is here the unconscious? Another case – its first manifestation in the internal experience of teenager, when the content of the demand alone and the one that is beyond it has not been acquired yet.

Now we understand the sense of phrase by Vygotsky about simultaneousness in maturation of the sexual and the social in juvenile age more deeply.

On the other hand, it becomes more understandable that so-called “paradoxicality” of juvenile amorousness, in which the absolute Platonic love strangely and unexpectedly as if united with the absolute naturalistics, is nothing else but the splendid metaphor and fiction. It may be the case but not in the norm. And this problem has social sources. The availability of the demand and the absence of corresponding means (we remember that the means of behavior in this age remain to be “childish”) is the conflict combination that enforces a child to seek and to appropriate the corresponding means.

Here arises the question, what do we, the society, offer to such child in this aspect? And we offer the digression of adults from this topic, a great number of facts and samples within childish subculture and simplified primitive ersatzes of sexual interaction in mass media. In fact, instead of help, the modern society sets a problem to teenager: everyone should find and form its own way for realization of this very important radical human demand. Purely animal ways for its solution do not satisfy a teenager as reflexively, let not absolutely clearly; it feels that they do not conform to the need.

Here arises a whole complex tangle of contradictions and difficulties, which should be considered specially.

Now we will only mention that the described integral social situation of development that is formed at the beginning of juvenile age is characterized by acute contradiction that stipulates the crisis. Thanks to already existing reflection, a child for some time can be separated from the social interaction. The main psychical new formation of this crisis state is negativism.

Personality starts from love

The initial methodologemae of genetic psychology define the main lines for research of personality psychology and the central questions: “how does a personality appear?”, “what are the psychological mechanisms for its existence and development?” The answer for the first questions is that a personality is created, so, it is a creation. This is absolutely special creation that during the whole life is in its own establishment. It continues creating itself, complicating (or simplifying), self-realizing, improving.

It self-exists. A personality in this sense is its own author. But the real miracle is that a personality is not only the author of itself as a creation: it is potentially and actually the author of another, new personality – human child. It is an absolutely unique act for co-creativity of two personalities, two loving people and is the real start...

“Personality starts from love” – this thesis contradict to initial provision by national psychology about ontogenesis of personality, as it was embodied into the title of article by O.M. Leontyev: “Start of personality – a deed”, gave push to the whole direction in Ukrainian “psychology of deed”. A deed, if we take it in the meaning of O.M. Leontyev [Leontyev, 1983] and V.A. Romenets [Romenets, 1995], can never be “the start of personality” as it is necessary already to be a personality in order to realize it: to comprehend own “Ego”, “Ego of the Other” and somehow to treat it.

The start of personality is not a deed, it is the love. “The personality, – tells P. Florenskyy, – without love goes into mesh of psychological elements and moments.

The love is the connection of personality [Florenskyy, 1914, p. 173]. The love unites, and, strictly speaking, creates the personality thanks to the fact that does not allow a human to concentrate on own “Ego” but concentrates, embodies it into another “Ego”, hereby providing with existence and development of itself as integrity. O.F. Losev mentioned that the main aspirations of personality are the absolute self-affirmation, internal freedom, integrity and harmony. “It wishes to exist by such a way as the gods exist that contemplate the

endless world and clever silence of its independent, light being” [Losev, 1991, p. 155].

And this existence becomes possible in love. Losev continues: “And here, when the sensual and many-colored sudden history of personality, dipped into relative, half-light, weak and sickly existence, suddenly comes to the event, in which this original and deep-rooted, light assignment of personality is shown, the lost common state is remembered and hereby tiring emptiness and multi-colored the noise of empirics are overcome – then it means that a miracle is created [Losev, 1991, p. 155].

Love, its experiences and its aspirations are that real miracle. R. May mentions that love has unmeasured psychological energy. And it is the most powerful force for realization of influence and transformation of personality [May, 2001, p. 81].

The creative nature of personality and its existence as co-existence was emphasized by M. Berdyaev. He thought that personality is not a substance but is the creative act and is unchanged in the process of change. The whole in personality precedes to parts and is not something self-exhaustive, egocentric: it is transformed into something other than it is alone, into another “you” and is continued by such way, realizing the general content, which is a concrete life [Berdyaev, 1936].

Modern psychology strangely little attention pays to research of love, however concentrating on study of destructive demands and qualities of human, although G. Allport underlines that “affiliative desires are the necessary background of human life” [Allport, 2002, p. 117]. Psychology turns out to be just not ready to study the phenomena of such kind of complexity and inclusivity, which is love but it does not mean that these phenomena should not be studied.

E. Fromm (E. Fromm, 2002) sees the most radical, and, in fact, the only appropriate exit of human from destructiveness, aloofness and isolation in love.

So, what is love? Let’s address to opinions by E. Fromm. He writes that love “is the passionate aspiration for unity with other human, being most strongly than all other human aspirations. It is

the most main passion; it is the force that unites the family, clan, society, all mankind into organic whole” [Fromm, 2001, p. 109].

In fact there are two opposite kinds of love – passive (“love-merger”) and active, pragmatist. The latter, strictly speaking, is such one that we call love as itself. Fromm writes: “Unlike symbiotic connection, the mature (pragmatist) love is the connection that anticipates the preservation of personality integrity, its individuality” [Fromm, 2001, p. 111]. It is a very significant moment for us – status of personalities in loving relations. J.-P. Sartr analyzed it in details, we will address to him a bit later.

The real love is the pragmatist activity but not the passive effect; it is being in a certain state but not “fall” into it. “The most general definition for active character of love, – mentions Fromm, – can be formulated by the following way: to love means first of all to give but not to receive” [Fromm, 2001, p. 113]. Here – central moment and rather delicate nuance. This “to give” does not mean “to give back” in the meaning – to sacrifice, to remain without something, to suffer from losses, etc. Only people, being oriented exclusively to receipt by themselves, understand this “to give” by such way. Such orientation objects the love, reduces it to the exchange “gave – received”. Fromm means absolutely otherwise: “to give” for personality, who is productive, integral and open, means to show its own force, to grant itself, the whole world to another person... and hereby to become richer, more complete, stronger.

It should be mentioned that this nuance is very often not taken into consideration and because of such situation the theoretical opinions by E. Fromm are criticized and understood something simplified vulgarly. So, a reader alone shall overcome with consumptive tradable orientation in order to understand. Immature human, being dependant, not free, simplified, cannot love by giving: as only a full human with diverse and complex inward world can “give”.

A human in love does not only give back but “gives” the most expensive that it has: it gives the life. And it is not a metaphor. To love means to grant its life and to generate a new life.

“When two humans give, something is born, and then both of them are grateful for a new life, which was born from both of them”. [Fromm, 2001, p. 115]. This phrase is very often perceived rather abstractly. We would like to risk and to mention – it is literal when we speak about sexual erotic love.

We give to a human, we love, our body, our soul, ourselves. It gratefully receives this gift and gives its life to us. And this meeting of two devoted, gifted beings shall be finished with appearance of a new life (not in the sense of new coloration of our mutual life with it. But in the direct sense – a new life, a new human shall be born). And that’s why the love is the creativity.

So, the naturally-productive completion of erotic love shall be the appearance of a new being, creation, in which the love as the need to live and to be continued is originally embodied. That’s why, let us to say, O.F. Losev calls the love as a miracle. But E. Fromm rather opportunely thinks that not every human can love by such a way. Such love “anticipates that a personality shall form the prevailing mindset for fruitful activity in itself, having overcome the dependence, self-adoration, disposition to accumulation and manipulation by others [Fromm, 2001, p. 115]. A human shall believe in own forces, be independent in achievement of the purpose. And, besides, to love means always to give, “this “always” also means to take care, to be responsible, to respect and to know ... these are the most important features of love, inherent to all its forms” [Fromm, 2001, p. 116].

Now it is clear that only a mature, open and productive personality is able to love in the right way. But why then do we think that the love is the start of personality? We can reinforce the thesis: the love is not just a start of personality, it exists earlier than personality, and it generates (defines, determines) the process for its establishment (as a miracle).

The love, if we use the terms by A. Maslow, is one of the forms and directions in self-actualization of personality. It means that a human becomes “the one, it can become” in experience of love. Here it is spoken about so-called “being love” (B-love), which is principally different from deficiency love (D-love). In the whole, these two types

of love that are distinguished by Maslou are analogous to classification by E. Fromm.

However, A. Maslou considers the interesting phenomenon, being very important for our research. We mean “peak experiences”.

This phenomenon can be described as the full development and enthusiasm, peak of creative activity, contemplation, frankness and tension of emotional state. “Peak experiences” are inherent exclusively to being love, and they have the following key characteristics. Firstly, the perception of object of love is changed (in our case we mean a loving human as we are interested in love to human of opposite sex). “At loving experiences, – mentions A. Maslou, – it is rather possible to “dissolve” in the object that our “Ego” literally disappears” [Maslou, 1997, p. 111].

We can tell even about identification of percipient and object of perception, about their full union in the new and higher integrity, in super complex organized metasystem. And then a new quality – a new being is born. Secondly, the self-perception of personality is changed “in peak experience” of love. From the point of view of E. Fromm the pragmatist (and “giving”) penetration into another being takes place.

The drive for cognition is satisfied through union. “I perceive you in union, I perceive myself ... I perceive the secret of the whole living by the only possible way for human – experiencing this union but not reflecting about it” [Maslou, 1997, p. 119]. So, in love I perceive (open) and – release, allow absolutely other myself, the one that used to be unknown to myself until this experience, to the active love. And it is the release of vital energy from my initial inexhaustible need. On this occasion A. Maslou writes: “during peak experiences people are mostly identical to themselves, most closely to its real “Ego” and mostly unique” [Maslou, 1997, p. 139].

Thirdly, the peak experience of love is the one that received the name “experience of flow” in modern psychology. A human is caught up and captured by the course of life itself, such purposes as aspirations, properties and anticipations disappear – everything is subject to the flow, motion, which itself becomes the most important, the most significant. It is the sense of existence, which is easily and directly perceived.

A human does not control the course, does not control itself in it – it enthusiastically exists.

We could tell that the flow, course of peak loving experience is that rare moment in human life when original need in fact declares about itself, when it becomes stronger than personality, stronger than anything that there is in the world, when it leads.

The fourth characteristic for peak experience underlies its creative nature: this experience is the insight in its pure, so to say, forms. The world with its constants and conventions literally disappears as the lovers in their mutual peak experience create their special, unique world for a short period of time, where not only social but natural laws do not act; instead, the unique laws of love are in force. They create the new world, new themselves, new life. And a new being, a human child appears as the most strained, open and frank point in peak experience.

... We shall digress and discuss two things, which are very important for readers to understand us correctly. The first of them is partial and it concerns the necessity in clear separation of peak loving experience and experience of orgasm (as we speak about erotic love). A. Maslou strictly insisted on such separation. These two experiences are united by their belonging to sexual contact. But this union is very external

In his time L.S. Vygotsky told about such kind of union that there are behavioral manifestations or internal feelings that seem very identical but due to mechanisms for origin and psychological content they are very “far” from each other as they are included into composition of principally different interfunctional psychological systems. Due to its origin, peak experience is the special form for continuation in course of being love.

Let’s emphasize – by continuation and reinforcement but not by completion and reduction of tension. (E. Fromm, criticizing the theory of erotic love by Z. Freud, rather rightly mentioned that the essential demand of love is union but not reduction of tension as Freud thought [286]. Being original, biosocial due to its nature, the need generates love as realization of two deep-rooted demands in it – in full union with a lover and generation of their continuation – a new being.

They are dominating, “sense-forming” motives, and they are not “deficiency ones”, i.e. do not disappear at their realization.

The latter one, by the way, is impossible as the process for penetration into the other, its comprehension, process for formation of new life, is, in fact, endless (in any case, it is much longer than the life of one human). Namely the moment of discrete satisfaction of these two motives in peak experience stipulates it, colors, floods it. And if we speak about sexual act as “operational aspect” of this experience, the reduction of tension really causes to additional feeling of psychophysiological pleasure, harmonizing to the end, and completing the experience at this stage.

This “complementarity” of orgasm, in fact, is very well noticed by people that love each other by the right way, i.e. on being basis (A. Maslou) or pragmatist basis (E. Fromm). The results from surveys, held by A. Maslou [Maslou, 1997], and some our empirical data confirm this.

In human life, however, it may happen so that orgasm itself as reduction of tension and satisfaction from this “may create own interfunctional system”, having occupied the leading place in it. But it is not about love at all and we will have the possibility to speak about it.

The second moment concerns the style for presentation of material. It became usual in so-called “purely scientific” psychology to criticize the texts by A. Maslou and E. Fromm for their metaphoricalness, absence of strict paradigmatic logic, impossibility “scientifically” to verify the facts about which they write. Being aware that our presentation is very similar with the style of abovementioned authors due to style, we must mention the following. Such contraction of complex metaphenomena to individual separate elements using mathematical logic does not mean their better understanding and perception. Great Goethe told about such researches by Mephistopheles’ mouth:

He who would study organic existence, First drives out the soul with rigid persistence; Then the parts in his hand he may hold and class, But the spiritual link is lost, alas! [Goethe, 1976].

If the modern psychology thinks that the objective knowledge is that one that appears as a result from generalization of empirical facts, which, in their turn, are certain responses of human for artificial stimuli, created by researcher, then, undoubtedly, the works by Maslow, Fromm and so on – do not belong to such knowledge. Of course, it is not only irrelevant but it is impossible to study such phenomena as personality or love by abovementioned method in any case.

But what is to be done? It is necessary ... to replace the terms in order to preserve its belonging to “real science”. So, those usual and clear, beautiful words that describe those phenomena and ideas, associated with it, should be substituted by short, “pseudoscientific” words: “love as correlate of “something” – such formulation fits more. But if we define the abovementioned styles as not scientific (i.e. phenomenological, metaphorical, mythical), and the last type – as scientific, then what do we have? O.F. Losev told about it by the following way: “When the “science” ruins the myth, it means only that one mythology is fighting with another mythology” [Losev, 1991, p. 33].

Actually, the own hypothesis is in fact necessary for such “science” – and that’s all, i.e. this is the integral mythologeme of researcher, who “will put it on” a certain field of reality and will give the new abstract terms.

J.-P. Sartre described this problem interestingly and vividly. In his opinion, if to consider a human “as such one, which can be analyzed and “reduced” to primary data, to define its motives (or desires), to see a subject of object’s ownership”, then it is easy to finish with development of exciting system of substances, which later we can call the mechanisms, dynamisms, patterns, etc.

But there is a dilemma as human existence became “something like amorphous clay, which can accept desires passively but can be reduced to simple bunch of all those unconquerable drives or tendencies. In any case a human disappears. We cannot anymore find the one, with whom some or other experience has occurred” [Sartre, 1988, p. 143].

We are aspiring to stand off from the tradition that was formed almost in the Middle Ages and to try the analysis not due to postulates but due to criteria, being adequate to object of research. The genetically-modeling analysis allows us separating the initial meaningful unit of personality as open system that is self-developed, creating itself.

We determined that such unit is the need as a general energetic force of the life itself, which allows the discordant unity of the biological and the social.

The genetically-modeling analysis allows uniting the ontogenesis and creativity: it turns out that the real force that creates the personality and defines its existence is the love as dementalised need. The disclosure of specificity for this super complex process cannot happen in logic and terminology of reduction as then we lose the essence of phenomenon. On the other hand, the principle for reflexive relativity means that the knowledge, received about system with such level of complexity, cannot be simple and final.

Now we can continue our analysis. The research of peak experiences may lead to formation of notion about availability of original “outbursts” within being love, sensory sharpening, which are changed by calmer course of people’s lives nearby. Such logic is possible if to look at the phenomenon on the part of behavior and human experiences and if to take into consideration that “outburst” shall psycho-physiologically pass that it is very “power-intensive” and the rest and replenishment of energy, which is used up, shall take place in order to avoid the failure.

However all this is only notions. Psycho- and bioenergy of love remains unknown, and nothing impedes us to tell about its complex and mutually enriching character as “giving” at the same time means “receiving”. If we try to look at this process from the point of view of ... love itself, it becomes apparent that discreteness of flowing, in fact does not conform to its nature. This is the ontological state of personality existence, the state as a special coloration of life and its associated experiences, and the state as a constant flow of this life. In other words, (using terminology by A. Maslou) it is the constant and flowing peak experience as a feature of existence.

It is quite another thing that emotional outbursts and calm may be inside this flow – as only “inside this flow” – the usual life of a usual human is continued. Psychology of love, is not, purely, the psychology of feeling that appears, lasts and disappears time from time. This is the psychology of demented need of being near a lover.

The psychological peculiarities (parameters) for being love, mentioned by E. Fromm and A. Maslow and other researchers of this phenomenon, in fact cannot tell much about essence of this human miracle. Heuristics here will be defined by coverage of dynamics – appearance, existence, development of love in the research.

So, as it has already been mentioned, the original cognition of each other by people, if they love, is of principal importance. This phenomenon attracts the attention of many scientists. Thus, R. May mentions: “The meeting with existence of other human (love) contains the force that may cause a strong shock at human and excite a splash of anxiety in it. But it can be the source of joy” [May, 2001, p. 143].

It can be mentioned that even etymological relation between the words “to cognize” and “to love” is very close. In Old Greek and Hebraic languages the verb “to cognize” meant “to have a sexual relation” at the same time. The serious material within this plan can be found in religious texts: “Abraham cognized his wife and she became pregnant...” – there are very many such expressions in Bible texts.

All this may mean that to know another human by the right way, as well as to love it – means the community, creatively dialogical participation in life of that human. Existential psychologist L. Binswanger calls it as “dual modus”: “in order to be able to understand the other, a human shall at least be ready to love it” [Binswanger, 2001, p. 143]. Why does the cognition of the other in love acquire new qualities and become unlimited due to degree of penetration into sacrament of personality (i.e. it becomes adequate to its real limitlessness)?

Let's pay our attention to the fact that in loving human we see the features, which we have not noticed before, about which

availability neither it, nor surrounding people know. What is the reason for it? We are answered that it is we, who grant a lover with good features, create them under influence of feeling and desire. But is it obligatorily the case? Perhaps, it is that ontological state, which is excited by love, and which, in fact, is mostly justified and the most natural corresponding state of human (it was created namely for it!); this state for the first and last time opens our essence itself, namely nature. We do not create it but see with the eyes, not covered by intense desire but clarified by pure need of being.

How does this phenomenon appear? A human being, in fact, prepares for it for a long time. Potentially it turns out to be prepared for this “inspiration” since the very start of existence, already being a small cell, which, at the same time, is the creation of two loving humans and objectivation of their need to life, their love. This cell contains not only compound chemical substances and biostructures, it has the embodiment of everlasting experience in existence of human as a social being, i.e. such one, who, due to definition, is the creation and creator of love and life. (The thing that we do not know still, in which concrete forms this impress-embodiment exists, does not mean its absence but means only that we need to seek and to find them).

That is to say, the love is already in this being that has still started. The whole period of prenatal development is the experience of love-frankness, protection, comfort and growth (of course, no one here speaks about consciousness and higher psychics at all – we speak about what happens in reality). A child in prenatal phase is completely open and completely protected by love of mother and father, which love is protected by mother, and, indirectly, her fetus, their mutual creation.

No matter what we would tell and at what positions we would stand but the experiences is acquired and it is love. Like this the love of generations is united, which is embodied in a child at the level of “social heredity” (expression by P.P. Blonsky), and love-reality as a special construction of biosocial relations. The essential stage is the act of birth itself. The psychology knows very few about it, except the fact that “transition” of child to the world is traumatic (although it is

rather problematic: thus, perhaps, it shall be so, we think, as the environment differs very much, well, of course, the devices may fix the corresponding vegetative reactions. But all this is not the psychology).

Meanwhile, there is no need in special researches to record the huge psychological component of this act. We cannot here discuss this problem in details but we know the impression of many females that gave birth to a child, being expected, desired and conceived in love. Thus, they tell about fear and pain and not only about it. They tell about frankness and openness – they did not know more disclosure, more naturalness and trustfulness to world up to literal feeling of “dissolubility” in it.

They mention about sharpening of love to husband and unlimited love, care, fear for life of child and its own.

It seems to us that this act is an obligatory component of human love; it shall be researched in psychology as a significant stage in ontogenesis and transformation of the need. Psychoanalytical and their associated directions understand the importance of this phenomenon and only thanks to them we have just some scientific information. But the psychoanalysis is a rather narrow-specific, partial flow, and, as we have already mentioned for many times, it is not oriented to attributive features of personality.

Somehow or other, the availability of experience in love, disclosure in it at human being already at the moment of birth shall be acknowledged. We would like to emphasize that we are very far from metaphoricalness. We just fix the facts. It is quite another thing that the essence of these phenomena requires serious researches, which are possible under conditions of new synthesis of natural, social and psychological sciences, which would be based not only on psychoanalysis but on genetically-modeling positions.

In particular, in terms of those positions, in our opinion, it is possible to assess and to a full degree to understand the phenomenon of infantile sexuality, which was brilliantly noticed by Z. Freud but which he interpreted very narrowly and primitively.

A child starts receiving the actual experience in love during the first year after birth. L.S. Vygotsky in post discussion with J. Piaget

absolutely rightly defended the thesis, according to which early ontogenesis (traditionally it was spoken about the first months after physical birth) is the period when social factors are of maximum importance for development of child (a child will not be able to survive as a human being without social surrounding). But Vygotsky failed to tell what the main one there was.

In our opinion, the determinative thing during this period of life is the love – love between parents, and love of mother to child. Intonations, gentle touches to the most tender, most mysterious places, cosiness, satisfaction of deficiency demands and – development, joyful discoveries, new impressions through loving people... All this is the important phase in establishment of love, and, at the same time, acquisition of its experience. When E. Erickson underlines the significance of this period in ontogenesis, telling that the basal trust (or distrust) to the world is formed here – he is absolutely right, regardless of his initial theoretical and ideological positions.

Today we cannot state as it has not also been studied yet but it is rather logical to imagine that being love for a child with basal distrust to the world will be “closed” or excessive efforts will be necessary for this human, and, mostly important, the human that loves it in order it would happen, be realized in this being.

We see that a personality really starts from love. And here may arise rather an essential question what will be with personality if it starts not from love, grows without parents and does not know the love since early stages of development? The answer for this question is in many aspects determinative for confirmation of our concept.

We give it, being based on methodology of genetically-modeling approach to study of psychology of personality, taking into consideration the existing theoretical notions and assuming from experience of therapeutic work in the sphere of age and family consulting.

Biologically, the appearance of human organism is stipulated, as it is known, by phenomenon of impregnation – merger of male and female haploid sexual cells and formation of uniform diploid cell – zygote, which has a complete set of chromosomes, and, accordingly, genes. Innate features for mother’s and father’s organisms, fixed in

genes, create the unique individual connection, and their manifestation stipulates the organismic peculiarities of child.

The moment of impregnation, is, strictly speaking, the start for separate existence of new being, and, at the same time, it is the completion, biological objectivation of biosocial need. The processes, which occur during impregnation and after it, should be considered as components of some uniform phenomenon: the need, embodied originally into embryo of human, organizes and directs the maturation so that as of physical birth there is a human that, due to its level of complexity, differentiation and integrity, is ready for personal way of further establishment.

Modern biology, in fact, does not know how processes and separate tendencies are arranged in ontogenesis, and realization of integrity as initial one, that one, which qualitatively does not coincide with the sum of separate parts, has the same level in biological science as in psychology. In any case, no biologist will not give any precise scientific response for the question about what acts as a source and integrator of dynamic phenomena in human ontogenesis.

We are interested here in some key moments.

A being, which is a system that self-develops turns out to be not only ready for “growing into the culture”, it is still very plastic, flexible and well compensated, so, the availability of significant morphophysiological deviations does not stop this way. Of course, there are the limits.

But numerous data from pathological medicine and defectology testify to really very high compensation. It means that there is something main about which we do not know precisely but it defines this flexibility and huge aspiration of organism system (let it be unrealized) for continual development, life and socialization. This is the need. The amount and diversity of hereditary human material is impressive. Hundreds thousands genes that are in chromosomes – there is more to come: there is the cytoplasmic heredity, there are biochemical processes, which continue existing in zygote, and they also unite the unique specific and the general in themselves.

On the other hand, there are different genes due to functions, and not all of them synthesize informative RNA on themselves as on

the matrix with further biosynthesis of corresponding protein macromolecule. There are genes-regulators; there are at least so-called “silent” genes, which function is unknown at all. It is also necessary to take into consideration that the changes in the structure and functions occur much more often than we can imagine as a change in only one nucleotide means that another amino acid would stand on the corresponding place in protein molecule, the spatial configuration of molecule would be changed, and, thus, its function would be changed.

So, a good many can be changed. And a set of genes is not a fate at all. Only the main and integral should not be changed: if a being prepares to become a personality, a system shall be kept.

The essential fact is that the processes at the level of cell and organism, biochemistry, genetics and physiology of life are the processes of human organism. And this means that already at those levels we do not have purely biological, natural mechanisms. The available social heredity causes no doubts at modern scientists, it is quite another thing that there is no need to simplify and vulgarize this notion.

If we seek for a piece of DNA, which “controls and defines the disposition to crimes or capability to love” – all this will really be funny... in such interpretation of question. And we, strictly speaking, mean quite another thing.

If there is the sense to consider a human body, biological constitution as a “carrier” of the psychical and at the same time as its obligatory meaningful component (substructure of personality), then here we speak about change in form for existence and interaction of two factors: biological and social. Beyond personality and around it they exist as different forces, and in the personality itself – are transformed into one thing – into otherness of one another, into indissoluble unity.

The development generates the new quality. But we can tell the same about hereditary material. The sexual cell that bears the heredity is not only “flesh from flesh” but “spirit from spirit”, it is an integral meaningful unit of that unique unity, which is a human personality. Otherwise, how it would bear the whole personality in

changed-simplified form, it is “a cell”, no matter how it would be called.

Not a set of separate genes (pieces of DNA molecule) but the whole integrated totality of hereditary material, united into uniform system with other components of cell vital activity, creates the qualitatively new structural functional unity, which in changed form, as otherness, bears the informative experience, and initial need to the life of the whole personality.

If we understand the situation in such a way, then it becomes clear that namely the division of human heredity into biological and social is an artificially free intellectual operation of researcher in order better to understand ... But he hereby loses everything... And again it is necessary to remind of Mephistopheles. When Vygotsky proves that real peculiarities for higher psychics as integrities are defined not only by the level and content in development of separate functions but specificity of connections between them, their interaction, why cannot we use this logic?

Then it is necessary to tell that the peculiarities for human hereditary are in general defined not only by the fact, which genes and how much act as its elements and by the fact how they interact, which integrity is formed here. And it becomes clear that dangerous achievements of modern psychology in the sphere of decoding separate genes are in fact very previous, experimental step only in direction of problem on heredity but not the attempt for its solution.

Such point of view explains the fluidity, infinity and succession of personality in the history. So, the hereditary material as a structural functional integrity is not synthesized by human during its life. It is passed, being preserved in a certain form during the whole history of mankind and is added with the history of life of a concrete human.

Hence the eternity of love becomes clear: if a concrete being appeared (was impregnated) without love it does not mean it does not in general bear it in itself.

The heredity of parents has, bears the love in itself beyond their actual feelings: love as embodiment of life of thousands human generations.

But the consideration of love only within the context of personal interrelations is partial, incomplete, and, thus, does not provide with real understanding of this unique and universal phenomenon and realization of its full meaning in existence of human, in generation and course of life in general. Teyar de Sharden once told: “The fact that the area of thought has appeared and grown at the concrete space of the Earth, where the real universal love was not only born but declared, as well as that a living evidence that is psychologically possible and realizable in practice was given, is of the greatest importance for the science about human” [Sharden, 1987, p. 102].

In order reliably to state about availability of love at people, it is necessary, according to the general rule of genetic approach in research, to imagine and to study the possibility for its availability (let it be in embryonic, undeveloped form) in the whole living nature that exists. Philosophers have long ago noticed it and spoken about it accordingly. Thus, in one of his dialogs Plato tells” “The love is the aspiration for integrity and drive to it” [Plato, 1970, p. 112].

Further it is stated that the God of love Eros overflows in the whole world and lives not only in human soul and its aspiration for brilliant people and in many other things – in bodies of any animals, in plants, in the whole existing as he is the great, strange and universal God [Plato, 1970].

Another philosopher M. Kuzansky mentioned that love as a connection of unity and being is natural in the highest degree. “Nothing is deprived of love, without which there would be no stable, everything is pierced with persistent spirit of connection, all parts of the world are internally preserved by its spirit and each is united by it with the whole world”. [Kuzansky, 1980, p. 386]. This spirit of love, in opinion of philosopher, unites the spiritual and physical into unique unity. The genius philosophers in observation noticed what today attracts more and more attention of positive science: the life appears and exists despite of entropy, and this means (as it nevertheless appears and exists!) that there is the force, being opposite due to direction and adequate due to strength.

We do not know what it is and, perhaps, know...

Considering the initial foundations of life, T. de Sharden mentions that the first, simplest manifestation of love is already the phenomenon when physical or chemical particles start drawing one another and aspiring for integrity. So, the mechanisms of development “are launched”; the evolution of materia and life starts. This force of connection is at the same time the force (energy) of being, it means the drive for existence, and we call it the need. Accepting this position means the acknowledgment of non-randomness in biological evolution, its oriented character. This original antithesis of Darwinism but it is accepted in the science, at least in certain its directions.

We do not speak here about metaphysics and spiritualism, the point is about rather serious scientific thought. V.I. Vernadsky pointed out that “the process of evolution of life always went without retreats, although with halts, in the same direction – to the side of specification and improvement of nervous tissue, in particular, in the brain” [Vernadsky, 1988, p. 9]. He tells about what hits the eyes but refers to empirical data, received by J. Dan already in 1855 [Vernadsky, 1988]. And further V.I. Vernadsky underlies: “The most characteristic feature for this process is the orientation from this point of view of evolutionary process of life in the biosphere” [Vernadsky, 1988, p. 59].

This revolutionary opinion by our great compatriot is not much “observed” by modern science through its theoretical weakness. So, V.I. Vernadsky cannot in any way be blamed in mysticism and spiritualism. “The life, taken as the organic whole, is considered not as a totality of living organisms, living natural bodies but as a special manifestation of something that is found vividly in the nature first of all in living organisms but, perhaps, has its place not only in them” [Vernadsky, 1988, p. 169]. The scientist thinks that this provision is very perspective in the plan of theoretical analysis for problem of life and accentuates that this “something” is still unclear.

In general, V.I. Vernadsky leans to the idea that the energy (force), which excites, supports and develops the life, is the general force and has the space sources. These ideas were taken up by T. de Sharden, who introduces the concept of ontogenesis, emphasizing

that it is the general characteristics of oriented complexity in evolution of the living.

And it is oriented to the side of development of the psychical (“consciousness”). It is spoken about availability of powerful energetic force of life (need to being), which defines the aspiration for integrity, harmony and has very many modifications-branches (“fan” – in terminology by Sharden), crystallizing into love at human.

Thought, consciousness appears between two beings, – underlines Teyar, and this “completes the circle” – only love as a drive to union could generate the thought: a human has appeared. “So that the world would come to its completion under influence of love forces, the fragments of the world seek for each other. And here there is no metaphor and significantly more content than in poetry. Whether it is the force or curvature, or general attraction of bodies, with which we are so impressed, – is only the reverse side or shadow for that one, which really moves the nature” [Sharden, 1987, p. 209].

It seems that Teyar approaches very closely and he had only to call this term – “need”. And in order to find the key space energy (V.I. Vernadsky), it is necessary to rise to the peaks of personality, human spirit as “love in all its nuances is nothing else but more or less direct track, left in the center of element by psychical convergence of universum to itself” [Sharden, 1987, p. 209].

Only love, as the experience of life is capable in fact to complete human beings as they are, as only it unites these beings with their direct essence. “Really, – mentions Teyar, – two loving people achieve the complete possession of themselves at that minute when they lost themselves in one another?” [Sharden, 1987, p. 20]. But the union at the same time will be act of creation when it does not occur as union “with anyone”, and “anyway” as the love disappears in contact with impersonal and anonymous.

The love generates the sensation of integrity, feeling of universum in personality, and we can understand and share the surprise of Teyar, when he cries out: “How psychology could ignore this fundamental vibration, which timbre for trained ear is heard at the foundation, or, rather, on the top of any strong emotions?” [Sharden, 1987, p. 210].

This question is not rhetorical at all: it hides the real explanations for destructiveness and “confusion” of modern society.

So, if we accept the abovementioned (and we should accept it, as it is not only obvious but well thought-out by many creators and even studied in empirical science, although insufficiently), there is a riddle: why do people love so few and why is so much violence and destruction? We return to a concrete plane. The love anticipates the freedom of its subjects, and, thus, the roots of the problem are in real non-freedom of personality in the modern world.

E. Fromm solved this question paradoxically but quite correctly and thoroughly: a human, in fact, may have the freedom in any society but it ... does not want it and “runs away” from it. And so, it runs away from love. Very many western personologists studied this phenomenon. E. Fromm himself [Fromm, 2001] proves that a human, in fact, “runs away” not only from freedom and love but from responsibility, which is strictly and definitely linked with them, and for which a human turns out to be not ready.

K.-G. Jung considers another aspect. He conceives the self-development and self-realization of personality (necessary attributes of love) not only as “excellent” qualities and tendencies but as very important. The personality, being self-realized, refuses from conformism and exists as if on the mountain peak – it feels well there (it takes its breath away from delight) but very dangerously – there are violent winds, coldness, height there...

Thus, Jung mentions: “the large majority of people chooses not their own way but conventions as a result of this each of them develops not itself but some method, i.e. something collective at the expense of own integrity” [Jung, 1998, p. 73]. The action of personal development turns out to be rather “unpopular” event, unpleasant way of deviation from main roads of conformism. V. Vysotsky expressed it artistically-originally in his “Ballad about love”:

And originals – they still exist –
Breathe in this mixture with full chest
And waiting neither for rewards, nor for punishment, -
And thinking that they breathe for no particular reason,
They suddenly come into tact

Of the same uneven breath
[V. Vysotsky, 1997, p. 395].

J.-P. Sartre successfully shared a very interesting and thin opinion on love as interrelations. He defines the most significant things in these relations by the following way: “not I should now be considered at the background of the world as “this” among other “this” but on the contrary the world should be disclosed thanks to me” [Sartre, 1988, p. 215]. That is, a loving human really becomes that object-background, within which light the world is perceived.

But this position turns out to be complex and sensitive. The love, being expected from the other, should not demand anything; it is “pure devotion without reciprocity”. However, it turns out that it is linked with freedom and linked discordantly. “The one, who loves, in the first turn, demands (! – author) a free decision from a loving human. So that the other would love me, I shall freely be chosen by it as a loving human” [Sartre, 1988, p. 216].

And we do not notice this nuance – I demand a freedom, and, as I am loved, I make already a human to be not free. And I do not need such not free human as an object of my love: if I was chosen not freely – it rather fears me or provokes the aggression or manipulation but does not assist to love at all.

Sartre does not solve this paradox and it seems to us – rather adequately to modern possibilities. I want to be loved by a free human, to be its free choice – hereby I “drive” a loving human into very difficult trap. In life it often causes serious problems that may finish with break. We speak about jealousies. Leaving their numerous reasons aside, we will consider only this aspect: I want a loving human to be free and faithful to me, hereby being faithful to me not just because I want so but because it cannot and does not want otherwise.

And this may be embodied into “sadistic” (term by Sartre) position in relation to a loving human. And this is the one, for which we are not ready. Let’s finish with the long citation by Sartre without comments: “We know that the term “choice” is used to a loving human in daily terminology of love.

This choice, however, should not be relative, being made in relation to circumstances: a loving human worries and feels inferior when it thinks that a loving human has chosen it among the others. “Aha, well, if I did not arrive to this city, if I did not visit somebody, you would not get acquitted with me and would not love me, would you?” This thought is the tortures for a loving human: its love turns out to be one from many others, restricted by suddenness of meeting: it becomes the love in the world, the object that anticipates the existence of the world, and, perhaps, in its turn, existing for some other objects.

And it demands something absolutely other... [Sartre, 1988, p. 216].

Researchers see the great problems of loving relations in the phenomenon of self-disclosure. We have already pointed out to the thought by R. May, who emphasized that Meeting in love may become a source for splash of very acute anxiety. K. Rogers came to this most closely [Rogers, 1994].

Deep self-disclosure and self-realization, complete openness to the other in love can in fact be dangerous for people, who do not perceive themselves. Rogers explains this non-acceptance, noncongruence by significant difference (sometimes – antagonistic) between “Ego-concept” and “organismic Ego” of human. “Ego-concept” as totality of realized and “allowed” information about itself, is formed in the situation, which Rogers calls “condition of value”. What does it mean?

Starting from early age, a child acquires what kind of person it shall be and what kind of person it cannot be. Its real features that correspond to this “shall” are realized and constitute “Ego-concept” in its totality. Those ones that a human has but they are from the sphere “cannot be had” – are not “allowed” into consciousness and are hidden even from itself. They together with “Ego-concept” constitute the integral “organismic Ego”. Completely functioning personality (term by Rogers) is characterized by practical absence of discrepancy between Ego-concept and Ego-organismic.

But there are not many such people. The tension from availability of hidden, unacceptable properties and demands hinders very much

to existence, generating symptomatology, which in the whole means “psychical ill health”. But this problem is aggravated by many times if a human occurs in the situation, where it is necessary not to open everything to itself but to open “down the hatch” to another human. But these are loving relations: nothing can be hidden there as a loving human will at once feel it, and, on the other hand, it cannot be shown by any way.

So, the fear and lie are born – the greatest enemies of love. Of course, the love is the phenomenon of non-judgmental perception – that ideal of therapy, which, as Rogers proved, allows a human, finally, lose the tension and perceive itself. But the love is not the therapy, and a loving human is not a doctor and not a psychologist.

It is the passion itself, uncovered interest and all-pervading activity. Then hiding and manipulation start, and the love disappears, leaving the place for pragmatism and sexuality. The worst thing is that the modern society as if assists to such turn of events.

One very authoritative modern mass edition recently published the largest pompous article about how the advanced modern surgery provides a young woman with “restoration” of physical features for girlish untouchability. All that was written is in fact very primitive and boring but there arises one question: why to do it? The journalist honestly put this question to some “concerned” persons, and their answers are rather symptomatic, and are reduced to simple one: “I do not want to aggrieve by loving (!?) human”.

Of course, these are the answers of 100% patients of psychotherapeutist. About what kind of love do they in general speak? ... However, we do not solve here the consulting problems, we only wanted to emphasize rather strange orientation of society, although, perhaps, not so strange as everything is the commodity in this society.

The love in fact may worry and frighten, and very often this fear is overcome through sexuality. We have already mentioned about complex relation of these phenomena: it interests us in general context of our problem on research of personality ontogenesis. The impregnation is the phenomenon, which, as if, does not depend on the feeling that future parents have to one another and to a future

child. But why do we then emphasize that it is not the case as personality starts from love but not from impregnation? The problem is complex and large-scale and we only outline it, having touched one aspect, related to impregnation and birth of child.

We can return to religious texts, where the concepts of “generic” and “sexual” are rather clearly distinguished. The first one is considered within the context of love from man to woman not as beings of different sexes but as spouses and future parents. The second one is much more complex. The sexual serves as a necessary component in sexual relations and, in such its capacity, adds them and harmonizes. But exclusively in such quality. The religion absolutely and cardinally is against sexuality beyond sexual (matrimonial) relations and beyond the love.

Taking into consideration the long-lasting existence and the greatest experience, we can assume now that here we see the concern not only to follow to ethical rules of behavior: the religions concerns about future, and future here is a child, a new miracle. And not only the religion. V.V. Rozanov (who, by the way, was not much acknowledged by religious leaders) says: “Having this feeling, generally of cosmogonical origin (non-earthly), they are mostly fertile, hereditary and create “in their image and likeness” further to infinity... Soul from soul as a spark from flame: it is child-bearing” [Rozanov, 1913, p. 41].

Where does the genetic psychology see the essence for problem on ontogenesis of child, being impregnated and born beyond loving relations of two persons of different sex? It seems to us that it is important to mention the following positions.

Firstly, heredity of future child as integrity is defined, inter alia, by specificity of selection – people’s choice of one another as future parents. The history of each culture has certain criteria for such sexual selection, and the features, according to which it passes, undoubtedly, have relation (are deep-rooted) in heredity, both biological and social. But this selection is defined not only by cultural ethnic models and by personalities themselves. And this latter much depends on for what a human of opposite sex is, strictly speaking, chosen.

One thing – surface, short sexual contact, and then we orient to one group of features, and it is quite another thing – love, modeling the mutual future, imagination and forecast of a loving human in it. It seems that there is no sense to doubt that the orientation to principally different features will take place in these two cases (although, of course, purely morphophysiological properties will remain to be important in both cases but how many other things are!..). Thus, already at the stage of choice and establishment of contact, we significantly influence on heredity, and, thus, on establishment of our future “creation”.

Secondly, we dare to state that the potential all-human and all natural love, which is embodied-reflected in those persons, will not completely be opened to the end and will not be crystallized in the new creation if there is no love between the persons, who impregnate a new life. The special state of people always opens and actualizes the deepest and most mysterious.

Thus, on the one hand, our previous remark is correct, according to which this potential all-human love will nevertheless be embodied into a new human being but this nuance is important – we can tell about degree of this embodiment.

Thirdly, the sexual without love means – briefly speaking (using the terminology by Z. Freud, it is the relations, in which very many things occur due to “principle of satisfaction” and very few things (miserably few) – due to “principle of reality”). In fact it means the absence or utmost primitiveness of relations. One of famous psychotherapists (I. Yalom) [Yalom, 2002] mentions that the significant experience in sexual relations without love is violently called forth in the future – a human cannot build relations, even when it wants this very much – stereotypes have appeared, but they are of quite another nature...

The absence of relations means the absence of care, respect, interest, realization, etc. This fact most negatively acts during the first moments of existence (prenatal and, especially, after physical birth). So, the love of parents from one to another may only generate, revive, actualize the love of human itself; it will only mean the full non-judgmental acceptance of child and formation of basal personal new

formations in it such as trust to world, etc. It may happen that the love will appear already after impregnation or birth of child. In such case the relations that will be established significantly compensate its absence during impregnation.

On the other hand, this factor defines that the absence of love is psychologically equally bad for future child both in cases of so-called “unexpected” pregnancy and in case if a woman goes to a sexual contact with the only purpose – to have a child.

At last, we shall not “ignore” the phenomena of psychosomatic sphere. The psychical states in many respects define the peculiarities for functioning of somatic sphere and we know well about it in relation to cardiovascular, digestive and respiratory system. What does not enable us to imagine that they act on genital system of human by the same way?

The absence of empirical data in this case is not the argument. So, such hypothesis can exist. We showed that “peak experience”, being the peak of creativity in love, and, purely, orgasm, – are different states, different experiences.

So, most probably, they would variously influence on genital system, i.e. on its productivity, quality of cells, being discharged, precise mechanisms of impregnation, etc. All this may testify to the fact that impregnation, due to some essential parameters for future child, will be different regardless of psychical state of parents.

In general, our opinion about influence of love on establishment of personality in ontogenesis, although being hypothetic to a much degree, is based on serious provisions. The following question of concrete character may arise: what negative is absence of love between people at their “creation” of a new life? Without getting into specifics (it would be irresponsible when there are no empirical scientific facts), we dare to assume that fear of love and “escape” from it, impossibility to build relations, refusal from growth and self-realization – is this all the consequence from birth of child not in love?! And the circle is again completed.

One more essential aspect. We do not want at all to tell that everything in life and establishment of personality is determined by original act of its creation and the state, in which the parents used to

be. It is in general not the case. The existence of personality as a social phenomenon that is self-developed through growing itself into the culture, actualization of own biosocial potencies and creative comprehension of the world has many possibilities to compensate the existing defect and to grow in love from the others and to the others.

Such possibilities are potentially granted at all stages of personality ontogenesis, and it is its own business to use them. Although the experience teaches that it is not easy to compensate the deficiency of love in early infancy.

In conclusion it should be mentioned that the material of this section is very important but at the same time sharply problematic. Genetically-modeling approach to understanding real mechanisms for personality ontogenesis defines the necessity in scientific psychological analysis of such complex and important phenomenon that is human love. At the same time the absence of empirical researches (and, thus, data) compels to combine the initial theoretical philosophical provisions, observations, which are held in consulting work, and life experience in analysis. Hence there is the difficulty and discussion of the abovementioned, of which we are completely aware. However the discussion is not the worst way for development of science...

GENETIC PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN STRUCTURE OF PERSONALITY

Structure of personality – special arrangement of its functions

The integrity and uniqueness of personality is not rejected but anticipate the availability of its special *structure*. L.S. Vygotsky mentioned: “It is accepted to call as a structure such integral formations, which do not consist of sum of separate parts, being as if their aggregate but they alone define the destiny and meaning of each from those ones, which are included into their composition, parts” [Vygotsky, 1982, p. 256].

The structure of personality as integrity is the objective reality, which embodies internal personal processes. Besides, it reflects the logic of those processes and is subordinate to them. At the same time, in terms of genetic psychology, it is the *result* from activity of those processes. The structure appears as embodiment of function as an organ of this function. Of course, its appearance, in its turn, leads to the change in functions themselves. Thus, the structure of personality is closely related with the process of its establishment: at the same time it is the result from establishment, its prerequisite and factor for further development of personality.

Thus, the structure is the integrity that includes all psychical (conscious and unconscious) non-psychical components of personality. But it is not their simple sum but the new special quality, form for existence of human psychics. This is *the special orderliness*, new synthesis. The structure of personality is discordant in relation to stability factor. On the one hand, it is stable and steady (includes similar components, makes behavior prognostic). But at the same time it is flowing, variable, never completed to the end.

The cultural historical theory proved that the structure of human personality is changed in the process of ontogenesis.

Whereas, there are data, which allow assuming that these changes occur inside the age periods, defining the individual style and reflecting the specificity of life journey for each human.

So, the aspiration for research of personality as integrity does not mean the refusal from structurization of this integrity for us at all. In his time S.L. Rubinstein paid attention to inadmissibility for ignorance of structural aspects of personality. “The personality, – S.L. Rubinstein mentions, – is defined by its attitudes to surrounding world, to the public environment, to other people” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 1]. These attitudes are stipulated by relations between internal components of psychics, including unconscious. Thus, “the psychology of personality includes the study of all those formations in their interrelations” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 273].

Further Rubinstein mentions: “One cannot ignore the dynamics of those relations in consideration of psychological processes, as well as one cannot dissolve everything in this dynamics of relations, absolutely excluding the statics as to steady properties. To dissolve everything in dynamics of personal relations means to ignore the availability of stable properties at human that were formed and consolidated in the process of history” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 273].

In large majority of theories of personality its structure is declared, as well as its separate components. We are inclined to approach to this question by a different way: in our opinion, the real structure of personality – that one, in which “logic of object itself” is embodied, shall still be determined as a result from empirical and theoretical researches. Let’s disclose our initial position. The integrity is first of all the agreed and harmonized *system* of separate parts, which, strictly speaking, form it. That is the integrity anticipates the structure.

The latter can (and shall) be the subject of psychological research as namely insufficiency of reliable scientific data about structure of personality generates that amount of notions about integrity, which can be considered rather metaphors and myths than scientifically grounded generalizations.

(It is worth only looking through modern textbooks on theory of personality in order to make sure that the notions of authors about structure of human personality are real “compositions on free topic” – each has its own logic, its own inclinations, and, thus, – its own structure. Such state of affairs is very far from scientism).

At the same time the scientific study of structure quite reasonably requires the analysis, “division” of integrity. We agree with opinion by D.V. Ushakov that for productive study of personality it is necessary to take into account that the difference in gnoseological plan of this concept from psychological one [Ushakov, 2000, p. 220]. If the personality in gnoseological plan is the integrity, which is not further divided, then such analysis is possible, even necessary in the psychological plan.

The concept “personality” (“subject”) in gnoseological plan cannot be decomposed as it means the real carrier of thoughts, feelings, values (S.L. Rubinstein mentioned on this occasion that it is not the brain that thinks and cognizes but a human as a subject, as personality). “In this sense, – correctly mentions D.V. Ushakov, – we cannot further decompose the concept “subject” as in the whole it is the carrier of thinking and cognition but not its separate part. If we try to divide some subsystems in such clear personality, then a carrier of thinking just disappears” [Ushakov, 2000, p. 220].

The analysis is necessary in the psychological plan as otherwise the old idea “homunculus” will appear in the horizon. But does this contradict to our idea about approach of subject and object in the research of psychology of personality? It seems that a good many depends on clearness and succession of research position. The significant thought in this plan is the following thought by V. Frankl: “The science is not only entitled but shall take out of brackets the multidimensionality, mark off the reality, separate one wave from this spectrum of reality. Thus the projection of reality is more than justified. It is necessary. A scientist shall be able to pretend, as if he deals with one-dimensional reality.

However, he shall hereby know what he makes; in other words, he shall know the sources for possible mistakes in order to avoid them in his research [Frankl, 1990, p. 51-52].

The structure of personality as integrity is the objective reality that embodies-reflects the internal personal processes, i.e. processes of appearance, existence and development. It reflects the logic of those processes and is subordinate to them, at the same time it is the result from their activity.

This is the point of view of genetic psychology. The structure appears as the embodiment of function, as organ of this function. Hereby, if to be consistent, it should be mentioned that firstly it appears as indivisible and undifferentiated, so – undeveloped integrity, which later, in the process of further existence, is complicated and differentiated, remaining hereby the integrity (but now it is already another integrity).

The structure in such form has the reverse influence on function (on existence), directing, limiting and originally developing it. Such way of interaction is the discordant unity of independent and separate parts, which cannot exist one without another. Thus, the logic of object under research (personality of human) for genetic psychologist is the natural processes of existence: appearance, development, and establishment. Namely within this logic we are inclined to consider the structure of personality, and namely within these limits to separate its chains (components).

But the abovementioned is insufficient. The differentiation of personality structure is not the only direction of its development in ontogenesis. Another significant phenomenon takes place: the personality is formed. We have already mentioned that we understand the formation of personality not in the pedagogical paradigm – as organization of corresponding influence on human – but as the acquisition of a certain *form* by personality, which is the integral system of social properties, speaking precisely, the social “organs” of personality.

It is reflected on psychological organization of personality, the social “organs” of personality grow from the latter one as from their subsoil but they never use up the wealth of its psychological properties, states, processes, psychological mechanisms that are constantly generated, potencies that are accumulated during the whole time, correlations that are constantly generated. Thus, the form of personality is constantly incomplete and imperfect.

At the same time the form means the hierarchization, specific union and involvement of different levels of organization in existence of personality.

The levels in psychological organization of mature personality are the embodiment of its integrated functioning and development. The process of formation, being understood by such way, explains the phenomenon of heterogeneity and heterochronism of existence – as the structures, which went “into the depth”, having left the place to the others, do not stop functioning – only the quality and manifestation of their activity is changed.

G. Allport, by the way, understands the phenomenon of personality establishment by the following way: “The establishment is the process for inclusion of earlier stages into later ones or (when it is impossible) the process for the best solution of conflict between early and late stages” [Allport, 2002, p. 180]. Author persistently uses this term “establishment” in relation to personality instead of traditional “development”, and, perhaps, he is right. The phenomenon of formations is important for our analysis to the effect that it explains the multidimensionality of personality, and, in particular, its structure.

It concretely means that any psychical component may be considered as a link (component) of personality structure, if the processes that provide its existence work not at one but many levels of the psychical. The next requirement is that this component shall embody and reflect the whole structure as integrity (i.e. this phenomenon cannot mean impersonal nature). As in water drop, *the whole* personality shall be embodied into it, of course, in the specific “taken” form. This link shall develop both independently and as a part of integrity, shall have own history and own future.

Thus, we come to logical impossibility to use the term “parts” if it relates to the personality structure. A. Maslow told finely on this occasion, mentioning that personality consists not of parts but of sides! L.I. Bozhovych, emphasizing the problems of development, used the concepts “lines (sides) of personality development”, which, in her understanding, are relevant to separate structural elements: “there are the grounds to consider that formation of personality cannot be characterized by independent development of some one side – rational, volitional or emotional ... we may consider that there are certain new formations that consequently disappear and

characterize the stages in central line of ontogenetic development” [Bozhovych, 1968, p. 227].

But let's return to the term by A. Maslou and build the imaginative analogy. We have a crystal as self-sufficient existing object. What are its sides? Each of them is on the surface, at the same time embodying the internal natural logic of existence of this whole and peculiarities for contact (interaction) of these internal natural processes with surrounding environment: the kind to which it belongs is the result from this complex interaction.

At the same time, the side expresses those complex processes, which occur inside the crystal, integrating them in its appearance (form). The side may be considered and researched individually, although it exists exclusively as a part of integrity and cannot be just separated from it. The totality of sides provides the crystal with individually original form, which at the same time is for some reason or other typical for this chemical substance.

The side may change its construction (form) together with the change of the whole (for example, growth of crystal) but may change (develop) relatively independently (phenomenon of crystallization). At last, the side is that least one, which cannot only be studied separately (a concrete subject of empirical research) but through what we can “enter” inside the whole crystal, cognizing it.

The analogy, of course, is rather conditional but somehow it precisely reflects the problem on research of personality: a researcher cannot study the integrity as a subject but it does not need a part (a piece of crystal), it needs the side – that psychological formation, which concentrates the whole integrity of personality structure and thus opens its cherished mechanisms.

Based on these analogies, it is necessary to state once more that we do not know what the psychological structure of personality is – it shall be established as a result from empirical researches.

The problem on definition of separate meaningful components in structure of personality is important and unsolved finally. The difficulty in psychology of personality is the definition of these meaningful links.

In order to understand this problem we will give the old opinion by L.S. Vygotsky [Vygotsky, 1982] on occasion of search for meaningful units of analysis on psychics in the whole. He makes the successful analogy with chemical analysis of substance. If a scientist has a task to determine the real deep mechanisms and properties, for example, for such substance as water, he can choose two ways of analysis.

Firstly, a molecule of water (H₂O) may be divided into atoms of hydrogen and atoms of oxygen and ... we can lose the integrity as separate elements that are hereby discharged will not have any properties, inherent to water (it is so-called analysis “due to elements”).

In the second case, if we try to combine the analysis with preservation of properties, features and functions of integrity, it is not necessary to decompose a molecule into elements but to separate some molecules as real “bricks” (Vygotsky writes – “units”) of analysis, which can already be studied and at the same time which preserve all peculiarities of substance in the whole in the most simplified but sharply discordant, “general” form [Vygotsky, 1982].

If we pass this logic to the sphere of psychology of personality, we will find out that the search for meaningful units of its psychological analysis is not so hopeless as G. Allport thought, sarcastically mentioning that everything in search for units of analysis is very simple and hopeless – everything depends on attitude of researcher: if he likes “features” more – such units will be namely features; if “motives” – the motivational sphere will be the basis for analysis, etc. [Allport, 2003]. For the sake of justice, let’s mention that the same situation is absolute majority of theories of personality. One of the main methodological requirements, which were set forth, in particular, by famous Ukrainian scientist V.I. Vernadsky in relation to the science in genera; (i.e. scientific thought) is infringed: a researcher shall try to define the logic of object under research itself but not to impose his own logic to it (object).

Vernadsky, by the way, specially mentioned about psychology: studying any psychical phenomenon, we should not forget that it has

its own, individual logic of existence, which may principally and cardinally differ from what a scientist thinks about it [Vernadskyy, 1981]. However, the problem is important not only through original substitution of logic of object with own considerations by researchers. K.-G. Jung finely and figuratively told on this occasion: “In fact we find certain facts, which are grouped by specific way, and according to historical and mythological parallels we give the name them ...

Based on this approach, we can build the theory – by Freud, Adler or someone else.

You can think anything you want about actual side of the world but as a result there will be as many theories as there are people that rack their brains over them (underlined by us – S.M.) [Jung, 1994, p. 68].

We note that there is one more essential problem about which Jung also finely wrote: “No one in psychological issues is absolutely right. Never forget that in psychology the means, using which you form the judgment about psychical and observe for it, this is namely the psychical. Have you ever heard about hammer that strikes itself? The object of observation in psychology is the observer itself. The psychical is not only the object but the subject of our science. As you see it is the original vicious circle, thus we need to be very careful” [Jung, 1994, p. 41].

So, although the personality, undoubtedly, is the object of psychological research but is the specific object. And the main specificity is even not in complexity but in the fact that this object is capable of *its own*, free actions (feature “activity”). It means that the personality, acting as an object of study (or influence), at the same time exists as a subject that complicates the problem on its understanding in psychology very much but only complicates but does not make it hopeless.

The separation of meaningful units for psychological analysis is the leading principle in genetic psychology. How can it be applied in relation to personality? L.S. Vygotskyy wrote: “As a unit we understand such product from analysis, which, unlike elements, has all main properties, inherent to the whole, and which is such one that

is not further decomposed, is a living part of this unity” [Vygotksyy, 1982, p. 15].

The approach to units for analysis of the psychical was extended and deepened in last works by V.P. Zinchenko, which result was the formation of methodological requirements to these interesting abstract formations. Let’s mention these requirements with our comments [Zinchenko, 2002]. Firstly, a unit shall be a structural formation, synthetic psychological structure, so, it alone shall be complex and diverse, discordant.

Secondly, it is vividly mentioned in the second requirement by V.P. Zinchenko: “A unit shall be heterogeneous, unite different and even opposite properties” [Zinchenko, 2002, p. 86].

Further a unit shall be capable of development and self-development, so, it shall have generating properties. The fourth requirement is that a unit for analysis of the psychical shall be a living part of the whole. What does the author mean? It seems very essential for our research. A unit shall be the real psychological fact but not abstraction. It shall be mobile, flowing and variable, deep-rooted with all its connections in more deployed phenomenon.

The fifth requirement by V.P. Zinchenko is also essential for researches namely in the psychology of personality. We speak about possibility for availability of potential and real great number of units, which can be organized into taxonomic unity. As it concerns the personality, a researcher is set under such conditions as there can be no one unit. Further requirements concern the fact that the units shall in fact reflect the sides of that phenomenon in research, which units, strictly speaking, they are.

The analysis testifies that it is impossible to separate *one* unit (“cell”) of analysis in personality. There are some different structures due to psychological nature, which satisfy to requirements that are set forth to units for analysis:

- the structure shall be specific and independent but hereby it will exist and develop only in the composition of integral personality;

- *all* personality in its real unity shall be reflected in this structure but at the same time it shall be reflected “deeply and more simply” in the form of essential contradiction;
- this structure is not something similar to “building block” – it is dynamic and capable both to own development and harmonic participation in establishment of integral personality;
- the structure about which we speak shall reflect a certain essential perspective for existence of personality and correspond to all essential features for integral personality.

In fact we speak about notion of personality as open complex dynamic system, capable of self-development, and definition of key meaningful structurally dynamic “knots” of this system.

These “knots” are not, purely, *parts* of personality; according to A. Maslou it is more reasonable to call them as sides, meaning that each side is the reflection of separate aspect for existence of personality in inherence from the whole integral structure.

The notion about personality as about *structural dynamic system* (term by K.K. Platonov), in fact means the combination, at the first sight, of non-combined: the structure anticipates the steadiness, stability, definiteness, orderliness and persistency. The dynamics mean the constant flow – establishment (the situation reminds of the paradox, with which quantum physics once faced: electron – is it a particle or wave (flow)?, and which was temporarily solved by N. Bor using *complementarity principle*).

Genetic methodology solves this contradiction through the category of motion – establishment: personality as a unique integral structure exists only in motion (existence – establishment). Constant changes and *self-changes* are *the condition* for existence of structure. If the personality, figuratively speaking, “stopped” (although it can never be in human life), or the dynamics of its meaningful unit – side “stopped” (that unfortunately happens very often), at once the processes of simplification – primitivization start, and then the ruination of structural integrity. This can be considered as *genetic law* for existence of human personality.

Considering that the structure of personality consists of some *different* “meaningful units”, there is the question about peculiarities for interrelation between them, and, on the other hand, between each such “unit” and integral structure. Here we can formulate *the leading principle* for such interrelation, which later will be “filled” in with empirical data. This is the principle of combination (the term was introduced into psychology by G.S. Kostiuk within the context of consideration of interaction between processes of personality learning and development) [oral conversation].

The interrelation and interaction of some onsets due to principle of combination means, as it has already been mentioned, that each participant in interaction is independent and complete and exists and develops due to own laws. At the same time all this turns out to be *relative* as, on the other hand, the existence and development of each link in combined interaction is possible only on the terms of presence and connection with other links.

They exist as self-sufficient and independent but they cannot exist one without another, adding and completing each other.

The combination anticipates not only the harmony, coordination but the tension, proneness to conflict, contradiction. This is namely the condition for unity.

Based on abovementioned and taking into consideration the greatest massif of scientific data from psychology of personality, we can settle more concrete in relation to the structure of personality (although, generally speaking, as it has already been mentioned, we consider that this question is a scientific problem, and here, perhaps, it is mostly unreasonable, as L.S. Vygotsky told, “to transform the problem into postulate”).

The analysis of numerous national and foreign theories of personality testifies to a great diversity of opinions by scientists on problem of personality structure: from practical refusal to consider this question (K. Rogers, A. Maslow, at us – representatives from theory of activity), to very thorough and scrupulous attempts, which, however, are rather arbitrary, reflecting the logic of authors but the logic of object under study (B.G. Ananyev, A.K. Kovalyov, S.L. Rubinstein, Z. Freud, R. Kettell, G. Allport, etc.). The theory and

methodology of this question in national psychology were most thoroughly developed in works by K.K. Platonov, who uses the expression “functionally-dynamic structure of personality”, considering it as a complex open system, being self-developed.

The dynamic system is the system that is developed in time, changes the composition of components, included into it, and the connection between them at preservation of function. K.K. Platonov introduces the term “substructures” of personality, “into which all known properties of personality may be included” [Platonov, 1968, p. 122]. Author sees four such substructures of personality.

1. **Biologically stipulated substructure** that unites typological properties of personality, sexual and age psychophysiological peculiarities and their pathological changes, which are significantly stipulated by physiological and morphological peculiarities of organism, in particular, nervous system.

2. **Substructure of forms for reflection**, which covers the individual psychological peculiarities for separate psychical processes (cognitive and emotional) that are formed during human life.

3. **Substructure of social experience** that includes knowledge, skills, abilities and habits, acquired in personal experience, through learning.

4. **Substructure of orientation** that unites the motivation, attitude and moral qualities of personality.

The criteria for separation of those structures, mentioned by K.K. Platonov, are important.

The first criterion is “correlation of the biological and social, inborn and acquired, procedural and meaningful” [Platonov, 1968, p. 87]. In fact, the natural dynamics in changes of this correlation may be noticed in provided substructures: from maximum of inborn procedural in the first one – up to maximum of acquired in the fourth one. Author absolutely fair mentions that “this succession helps deeply to understand the correlation of the social and biological not only in the personality in the whole but in substructures of different levels up to separate properties of personality” [Platonov, 1968, p. 123].

The second criterion for separation of abovementioned substructures is the internal closeness of personality features, which are included into each of them and separation “of its own substructures at lower level in each of those substructures, taken as the whole” [Platonov, 1968, p. 123].

The third important criterion for separation of those substructures is that each of them has its own, special type of formation. The interaction of those different types of formation defines the individual peculiarities for development of each personality.

K.K. Platonov considers the fourth one “to be the most significant one”. It consists in availability of objectively existing hierarchic dependence of those substructures. Different connections exist both between substructures and inside each of them. “But causal connections of subordination are more clearly expressed in interaction of different substructures” [Platonov, 1968, p. 124].

The fifth criterion is more “organizational” but also important: the point is that some separate substructures in psychology, as well as their components in fact act as the real subjects of empirical and theoretical researches.

K.K. Platonov remarks that abovementioned criteria “allow considering that four distinguished substructures reflect the objective reality and thus are the main substructures of personality” [Platonov, 1968, p. 125].

The genetic aspect view of research, as well as numerous scientific facts, received for recent period, allow significantly adding and developing this conception, which we consider, in addition to that, rather grounded. If to take into consideration two more significant criteria, we can tell that the substructures, distinguished by K.K. Platonov, are in fact “meaningful units for analysis” of personality. We mean the following:

The sixth criterion is that the distinguished substructure, remaining the specific one, at the same time reflects (contains in the “taken” form) *the whole* integral unique personality.

The seventh criterion means that the interactions between substructures and, on the other hand, between separate

substructure and integral personality are in fact not only hierarchic: they exist due to fundamental *principle of combination*. The analysis of facts allows acknowledging that the status of substructure (here we intend to preserve this term by Platonov) also have *the capabilities*, as individually-psychological properties that define the successfulness and degree in achievement of human in a certain socially stipulated activity. This quality means also *the degree* in possession of ways for activity by human in cultural historical environment.

Thus, taking into consideration the modern scientific data within the context of genetic approach, there is the sense to distinguish *five* separate *substructures* (units) in personality:

- biopsychic;
- individual peculiarities for psychical processes;
- experience;
- orientation;
- capabilities.

At the same time it is necessary to mention that this consideration of personality is not the complete reflection of its structure. The personality has other qualities, which, due to its nature, are the real “units for analysis” (sides) but, unlike the abovementioned, they are much more dynamic (flowing) and do not have, if we can use such term, separate *localization* – they cover *the whole* personality.

We mean “the inward world of personality”, “character” and “psychical states”.

“The inward world of personality, – mentions L.I. Antsyferova, – is individually interpreted, accumulated by modalities of personal experiences, external world, comprehended in dialogs with real and ideal interlocutor, in which the functional spheres with different level of meaning are differentiated” [Antsyferova, 2002, p. 209]. This is the world of senses, life plans and essential experiences. But the inward world of personality, in fact, is much more discordant and dramatic as it consists not only of the conscious but of the unconscious.

Instincts and drives, archetypes – all this is, so to say, the second pole, the second component of inward world. Namely the discordant

contradiction “conscious – unconscious” constitutes the subsoil and generates this side (“unit”), which as if *fills in* the inward subjective space of personality existence.

We consider character (literally from Old Greek – imprint, “chisel”) as a unique individual shade of all qualities of personality, which is shown in steady (usual, typical, “characteristic”) ways of interaction and emotional response of human. Character is the one that “grows” to the surface, the one that defines the “form” of personality; defines the personality from the point of view of another human and social world in the whole. Character is the meaningful unit of personality in so far as social action (interaction), deed, – reflects *the whole* personality, the whole its psychological and psychophysiological thesaurus.

The psychological state is the integral characteristics for functioning of human psychics for a certain period of time, which reflects and stipulates the originality in flow of psychological processes depending on reflection of reality, previous state and psychological properties of personality. The psychological state as if covers and runs through the whole personality, integrating it and “coloring” the context of existence itself.

The state may influence on adequacy in reflection of the world, efficiency of activity, maintenance of vital purposes and orientations. The fact that the state may pass into another form of existence, namely – into property of personality is very essential as namely in this sense we tell that psychological state is something that may be realized, take place (into the sense – to be realized in behavior, feature, etc.).

Thus, the structure of personality may be imagined as such one that consists of eight meaningful units (sides). The analysis testifies that these units are different both due to meaningful fullness and general thesaurus – there are five substructures and three continuous dynamically flowing general qualities. Hence the real heterogeneity of personality structure appears.

The stated material may be considered as a classical (typical) approach to the problem of personality structure. It seems that there is the sense to separate and to sharpen those aspects that interest

purely genetic psychology. In particular, it is necessary to consider such important questions as: why does in general the necessity in study of personality structure appears. It seems to us that the concept of structure is actualized in personology considering that the personality, as we have already mentioned, turns out to be very complex object of research, and this complex integrity, which self-exists, cannot be covered by modern science as something whole: indivisible (i.e. as it is in fact).

Each concrete research requires dividing the personality and concentrating on its separate elements. And in order it would be a really meaningful element it is necessary to imagine the structure, into which it is included. Hence there is the necessity to study the personality structure as initial abstraction.

At the same time the structure generates the interest in itself because it includes and unites as in unity different components of the psychical and non-psychical. The one, whom a human is as integrity, constitutes a certain form of personality, which, however, should not be understood literally, simpler. It is not the material form but it in fact exists, and it is something another in each personality. Thus, the consideration of any separate component of personality as personality in the whole requires setting the corresponding scientific tasks. On the other hand, we can tell that there is a separate task for research of structure and its establishment.

So, the personality is a unique unity, which is self-developed, and the research of personality structure will allow us solving the problem for origin of personality itself, mechanisms, directions and sources for its development, and important practical issues, related to interaction of personality parts.

It is especially important for genetic psychology to understand the structure as such one as it is in fact in living motion-development. It is necessary not to create it artificially, having included three elements into it as Freud or four elements as Platonov, etc., but namely to understands it as such one as it is in fact. But in order to understand the logic of object it is necessary to understand how it appears. In general, our central thesis is that the appearance of structure is the very sphere of research, which may open the real

meaningful foundations of personality. It appears when personality is differentiated in its functions, providing with its existence in the world.

We consider eight structural components not because it seems to us right, well, beautiful, not because we like this figure but because we orient to the real functioning of human in social surrounding, assuming that for this it is necessary the ordered and integral structure and it naturally appears from collision with life itself. And so we have that each element of structure is natural in terms of human existence.

Having lost even one component from integral organization of personality, we will lose the whole personality. Although we do not state that this model is complete, at this stage of research it is correct and sufficient.

While researching the substructures of personality, it is important to pay attention to necessity to follow to some essential provisions for genetic psychology. The study of personality structure always means the integrity, and each performed research shall introduce some meaningful aspect into integral understanding and correct interpretation of personality. This methodological opinion, as well as those ones that will be mentioned below, directly appear from provisions of genetic psychology in relation to personality.

By experience we can tell that when the term “personality structure” is used, it is usually expected that now we will speak about what the personality consists of. But we speak quite about another thing: using the term “personality structure”, we mean a complex arranged integrity and the question about its division into parts is already a secondary one for us.

These substructures are not units of personality in fact because it is impossible in general to separate a unit in personality.

They are special unions (Vygotsky called this as interfunctional systems), which are responsible for functioning, speaking precisely, provide with functioning of personality in some or other section of existence. Strictly speaking, substructures should be considered not as “units” of personality but “units” of its integral structure. So, the fact that the concept “personality structure” is first of all the

reflection and acknowledgment of complex integrity is important for us.

Within the context of this provision it is obligatorily necessary to underlie that personality is firstly changed as integrity and already then its parts are changed. And this is the thing, which is underestimated by many researchers. Thus, for example, the personality structure in juvenile age has already been formed, already integral and has all components, which shall be, and their set will not change. But if the accentuation of character appears at teenager (that happens very often due to complex interaction of biological and social sphere), it will mean first of all the change in the whole personality. I.e. the integrity will remain but it will change the form. Hereby the content and dynamics in all other components will be changed, and the whole personality will become another one.

Let's stop on this example in more details as it, on the one hand, is model one, and, on the other hand, – the phenomenon under research has the principal practical importance. The accentuation as “an utmost variant of norm”, “as protrusion of some feature” – *what* is behind these, as it should seem, obvious and correct but purely shallow definitions? And why namely in juvenile age do we usually have the real “parade of accentuations”?

A feature of character is the stable way for interaction of human with environment and, strictly speaking, a way for satisfaction of won need by human. I.e. the intention passes a very long way (long psychologically but not chronologically), and at each step in this way it meets the environment – internal (organismic peculiarities, experience, system of values, opinions and senses) and external – there is a wide circle of circumstances, strictly speaking, the one that is introduced into concept “situation” in modern psychology).

Each such meeting stipulates the changes, and, finally, the individually specific “trajectory” for motion of intention from generation to satisfaction: behavior is formed.

These complex significant, nuanced processes at a certain stage of genesis are however stabilized, there appears what we can call the ensemble, i.e. agreed integrity (usual, expected ways for response, prevailing inclinations and purposes – all this is the integral

personality and we have all this in child at the end of junior school age).

This integrity, of course, may be assessed (“good boy”, “bad child”, etc.), we can tell about harmony-disharmony (that, strictly speaking, is nothing else but our assessment) but the main thing is the agreed integrity. Juvenile age opens deeper background and enforces to introduce other essential indices of analysis. Various, quick and violent infringement in correlation of biologically and socially internal integrity – it is what mainly happens. The powerful protuberance in biological branch of need changes, first of all, the intentional sphere. In fact, it brings the whole system of integral personality to the tension state. But, on the other hand, the social is also reinforced through the change in social opinions, standards and aspirations.

Thus, it seems to us that this powerful “discharge” of the need in consciousness of teenager to own continuation as purely biological being is reflected not as purely sexual drive but as its union with aspiration for social full value. The balance is however achieved but there is a very large force on intention. It can change, ruin (“reduce”, “lay the ways of direction”) in that ensemble that has already formed and then the new connections may appear at another level between biological (already as a “carrier”) body and social as a system of relations, priorities and values.

So, let’s say that the “way” of hysteroid is not only the realization of aspiration to be the center of attention (social) but the corresponding neuropsychological, temperamental properties and tendencies that do not provide with adequate way for a certain society to achieve this aspiration (weakness, sickliness, rigidity, etc.), and, thus, hysteroid behavior is the original compensation for impossibility to achieve the real success.

A certain achievement appears, the corresponding behavior is fixed and the personality acquires something another form. Thus, we observe the complex and diversified phenomenon: the whole integrity is changed twice at origin of accentuation.

Firstly, it concerns the initial genetic background – need, and underlying informative dynamic processes cover the whole

personality, acquire another, more powerful, otherwise directed motion (1) and after that the partial changes take place (strictly speaking, character, some features that psychologically means the ruination and reconstruction of super complex interrelations in some components of integral ensemble) and already the result from this situation is the principal changes in behavior that excite the corresponding changes in form of integral personality (2).

The fact, whether the accentuation remains the fact of behavior in the future really depends on the level in correlation of the biological and social (corporeity – surrounding) (accentuations in most teenagers disappear after puberty and Vygotsky meant namely this fact when he wrote that the new formation of crisis period are not often left in behavior and as if withdraw into the shadows – by the way, it is interesting, did he mean “shadow” in understanding by Jung?).

But in any event a teenager “will come from crisis age” as another human, and it is the first thing that we consider to be important from the practical point of view: it is not reasonable at all for parents and teachers to regret that child that used to be not long ago as these nostalgic experiences are not so harmless – they unconsciously set the style of education that returns a child to the old and it already looks less attractive for it within the context of experienced crisis. So, this delay is the one that may be a source for conflicts.

On the other hand, a psychologist-practitioner that deals with accented character of teenager if he considers the accentuation only “here and now”, without considering and realizing knowledge about mechanisms and dynamics of its origin, is doomed to very primitive “correction”, which will again very labor-intensive and not sufficiently efficient. As he perceives the situation so that this teenager has some bad feature and it is necessary to remove it. But in fact the situations is quite another – it is not “he has” but “he is such kind of person”, that such behavior and system of experiences is inherent to him.

The whole form of personality is different: this new thesaurus, new coordination and correction shall in fact consist in the fact to remove it (“to dissect out appendage”, “to draw out a thorn”, “to get

rid of headache”) but to form the behavior and system of experiences for this personality (with accentuation), which would be positive, productive and efficient.

Did K. Rogers mean the same when he wrote that “organismic Ego” is not the one that it is necessary to exclude or to get rid of but the one with which it is necessary to learn to co-exist in open congruent dialog?

Thus, it is also important to understand the difference between concepts “structure” and “form” or their relevant concepts. The structure acquires the form, being differentiated and at the same time agreed, united near central, nuclear formations of personality. That is the forms serves as a feature, as a derivate of personality structure. On contrary to this, the structure in common logic means some form of personality within the context of tasks for formation and development.

We distinguish these two concepts: something whole is developed due to its laws and due to its rules, and at this time it acquires the form, which appears in this process, considering that this latter one encounters with surrounding reality, on the one hand, and with internal, biological prerequisites, on the other hand. A certain form appears by this way.

The personality acquires it in its main manifestations and now the form is the manifestation of structure. So, the structure, on the one hand, is a derivative of the whole and includes the main compulsory components, on the other hand, it has individually-specific peculiarities in these structural formations, and it is manifested as a form.

In addition, we emphasize once more: the structure is not only the integrity but the indivisible integrity. We cannot find anything impersonal in human psychics. Thus, when we artificially, for analysis, distinguish different links of personality and study them, we should not forget that the indivisibility serves as the main and essential moment. The personality is born, appears all at once as integral, indivisible. It is another case that it is later differentiated into separate parts but obligatorily within the whole.

It means that personality is structured, and this, in its turn, means that it is differentiated. It was found out that undivided whole,

which keeps original certain capabilities, potencies for further existence, at contact with surrounding, into which it got, with necessity forms the parts in itself, being not similar to each other.

For example, let's say, in order to exist in the social surrounding a modern human shall obligatorily be able to do something, and – the structural component, which we call abilities, appears.

All happens by the following way: some unstructured whole, which is the personality at origin, at generation, already in postembryonic existence, contacts with social surrounding, which sets certain requirements to it, some conditions of life – it is, on the one hand, and on the other hand – the internal biological prerequisites work during the whole time. And namely “contact” between these systems leads to origin of separate, unlike each other, sites, parts of this whole.

The differentiation takes place by such way. Analogously, such process at biological level exists in impregnated cell: firstly it is divided and very gradually the organism in the whole acquires separate structures. Exactly the same occurs in personality: firstly it acts as a whole undivided, and, thus, – primitivised whole, and with the time it is differentiated in the course of its existence, its development.

The internal conditions and conditions of life, into which the personality gets, play the equal important role in this process. The integrity is determined by such way: the same may be told about personality, as, having started “crossing out”, “objecting”, “rejecting” some certain structural component of personality, we cross out the whole personality. Such indivisibility is attributed to the fact that the function appears earlier than structural integrity, as there are some compulsory functions, which personality shall perform in its existence, when it comes to this world.

We can list them: it is the function for performance of a certain activity and growing into socium, thanks to this – continuation of generation and oneself in others (during communication process). It is the acquisition of skills and abilities. We can show the importance and obligatoriness of any function in formation and development of personality. For example, the function of people interaction between

themselves: communication, exchange of information, exchange of feelings, – it is in general the development in the process of contact. And these interrelations that appear, some stable forms of communication for this human are so specific, and the character appears there.

The stability in interrelations of this personality, stability of its abilities and skills generates capabilities, and the same logic is inherent to the process for origin-separation of other substructures. Here it is necessary to stop and to pay attention of reader to availability of essential, we would say, methodological lexical problem in the sphere of personality research, as this, to a great extent, concerns our notions, i.e. remains in the sphere of concepts. In fact we perceive only human behavior. For example, we fix: “a human communicates with others” and we can describe the stable ways of communication.

Let’s say that it is usually respectable or usually irritated or usually uneducated. We see this and we speak about it: “it is stable forms of its behavior”, – and unite them in a certain term. These qualities are united into one substructure, which is called “character”. And already later, having distinguished the stable ways of interaction, we can cognize a human due to those ways, predict its behavior. We hereby speak that it so happened thanks to the fact that we took into consideration the character.

But we can observe that a human can well play, for example, the violin or the piano, that it does it by very specific way, achieves certain successes; we see how it is done, feel and hear the result. And again we unite it, and “tell” that the whole complex of what we observed is defined by term “abilities”.

We define any substructure by this way. In fact, each element of structure is rather conditional because it is very complex but it is derived from function. Of course, the compensation is possible; there is the sense to tell that a human may have the bad character but be very capable in some field, and we “stand” this human because it really achieves some successes: this is the compensation through integral structure.

It is again necessary to emphasize that the integral structure exists only at mature personality, and each substructure only in it has

all other substructures. Here we discover another and absolutely infinite space for existence of personality. The search “into the depth” is not obligatorily factorization: it may be the discovering of initial and basic structure-tendencies that are as unique and integral as the whole personality. This “microworld” of personality is still waiting for its researchers!

The context for consideration of personality as integrity allows clearly separating and integrating such concepts as “personality structure” and “development of personality” in the aspect of genetic vision at the new level. When we speak about existence of personality as integrity, it is necessary to take into consideration that its development occurs due to certain lines (“lines for development of personality”). These lines are in principle known. In particular, L.S. Vygotsky, A. Vallon, L.I. Bozhovych, etc. told about lines for development of personality.

A line for development is not the development of separate substructure, component – it is the line, direction, according to which the whole integral personality is developed. It is necessary clearly to understand: when I speak about development of personality I mean the existence of certain directions, according to which the whole personality is developed, its integral form is changed and the substructures are changed only in its composition.

According to this logic it is wrong to say, for example, that the human character is developed separately, capabilities – separately, cognitive sphere – separately, etc. In fact, nothing in personality is developed separately. It is developed only the whole, only as integrity and it is developed due to some lines. This does not mean that we reject the availability of unique and specific mechanisms for development of separate substructures but according to this point of view these specific mechanisms are able to act exclusively in the composition of uniform global super complex mechanism that provides with development of personality as the whole.

Let’s say, there is the line for development of interrelations of personality with surrounding world – with other people, subjects, phenomena, etc. If we take it as a separate line, the whole personality is presented in it (in its “passage”): firstly the

interrelations and the whole integral personality are changed, and then – available substructures: character, orientation, capabilities, cognitive sphere, etc. At the first sight, it may be unclear, for example, the meaning, role of capabilities in this process.

But it is only at the first sight. In addition to special capabilities, such as communicative, we shall take into consideration that development of capabilities opens the new unique sphere of relations – professional relations to a human. Their availability and the new level in development of separate capabilities quite otherwise describe these relations, influence on the place of human in them.

On the other hand, so that it would happen, the capabilities would play their role in this sphere, the changes in relations themselves shall previously take place and the integral structure of personality should be changed (for “inclusion” into professional environment and formation of capabilities a human shall “leave behind” the sphere of learning, ripen as individuality, acquire the social roles, etc.).

It seems to us that understanding the correlation of structure and lines for development of personality (lines for development) is very important for realization of peculiarities for existence of human itself: personality is structured originally as potency, and continues being structured during the whole life. Already even unborn child, earlier – when fetus only acquires a human appearance (morphological), already there are separate “substructures” (sensorics, biopsychic background, drives, etc.).

We call them here “substructures” as, let’s say, by term “sensorics” we mean not only sensation (in the sense, accepted in modern science) but undeveloped, syncretical unity of rudiments for all psychical phenomena that enable reflecting reality at a certain level also as integrity (undoubtedly, incomplete, insufficient and diffusive).

In general, potentially, the structure already exists. If we do not accept this how can we explain, let’s say, those facts that 6 and 7 year old children turn out to be ready for human existence, as well as those ones, who are born in time? By the way, these cases may be considered as the evidence for powerful compensation of those

biological mechanisms and structures that had no time to mature by the social.

Genetically-modeling method, which we apply here to analyze the structure of personality, anticipates taking into consideration not only the integrity but self-development of personality. Only the integral approach can enable understanding the phenomenon of self-development, and on the contrary, understanding self-development as a function exclusively of integrity. The insufficient attention to internal, individual sources for development (the cultural historical theory is fairly criticized for this) is caused by the fact that a human was refused in initial subjectivity, and, thus, integrity.

We are based on the genetic provision that initially (potentially) existing biosocial unity: integral personal structure – has the initial property (function) for self-development.

This function is stipulated by its biosocial nature. If the structure appears as a result from differentiation at adaptation of child to social life – it is only one half of the truth. Another part is that this initial being bears the need as the initial intention that includes the biological and social carrier as unity.

Its social component that gets into fetus from parents during impregnation acts “inside” this being itself and it acts by very specific way – it generates the aspiration to self-develop, to self-move and, at last, to self-realize. This provision is almost not discussed in the science about personality, first of all, due to absence of empirical researches but in our opinion it is high time to perform them and to receive the corresponding scientific data.

Accenting purely human, personal nature of intention to self-development, we, remaining within the genetic psychology, realize that it appears and, thus, has its roots. But it is not enough to tell that this intention is deep-rooted in the social, it is obligatorily to take into consideration that the social was also developed and is being developed. It appears as interaction, and, thus, – in some forms, in some appearance it is inherent to the whole existing, in particular, living one. So, any living being (mostly simple, plant, animal) is also self-developed, and this is the indisputable fact.

And thus – it has this drive, this need to self-development as the only possible way for existence. And this intention here also has exclusively social background – social in the sense that it is stipulated by interaction of living beings as compulsory (attributive) factor of life as it is. That’s why it will be more precise to speak about extension in limits of self-development at human, as a result from coverage of the whole Universum by it (human) and receipt of property, which means that a human is a natural being that can change the whole nature, appropriate it and hereby change itself.

Here we have an interesting and urgent problem, which is even not set by modern science: the availability of intention to self-development leads to the fact that any living being is in general structured (it is the structure), and a human within this sense is not an exclusion, and, strictly speaking, does not differ from any being. The difference is not in the structure itself (as its availability) but in specificity and difference of this structure.

The sources for these differences should be sought in peculiarities for psychic energy and informative processes, inherent exclusively to human.

It is, undoubtedly, the state for establishment of Being, Existing, as Being cognizes in it, understands itself (within this sense reflection – it is rather not the cognition of itself by human but the cognition of itself by Existing through mediation of human). Human is not because it is allowed to realize itself but because principally all Being may concentrate in it, cognize and understand itself through it and a human is able to understand it, and just by this – it is higher than Being: as it is not the mechanism, which is used but the one, what it wants and can do it.

And that’s why it is not “thrown” to the world but is its initial transcendence. The integral structure of human personality is, undoubtedly, the “organ” that provides with fulfillment of transcendental function, and it is such one as it is mostly suitable for performance of this function (this function in modern science is represented in concepts “consciousness” and “self-consciousness”, which tell very few to this science because are considered by it in isolation from this function).

The point of view that modern psychology “takes out of the brackets” the phenomena of consciousness and self-consciousness is wrong.

We can state, for example, that psychology in fact is not the one that does not study the consciousness, – it does not study anything else, except the consciousness, but how does it do? That is just the point. The largest mistake, in our opinion, is that the principle of development does not cover the consciousness. And it, meantime, appears, is developed, has its roots. And taking this into consideration, at last, will allow understanding with what we deal.

In opinion of such various (but equally outstanding) philosophers as O.F. Losev and T. de Sharden, we find the roots of the consciousness already there, where a thing has the external and internal, which do not coincide, although influence on each other, mutually existing in the unique combination.

Teyar de Sharden was in general inclined to call the internal of any subject as the consciousness, if only it differed from the external and if only interacted with it. And, as it is not surprising, there is the sense in this. However in any case namely this phenomenon makes each subject to be unique and unrepeated.

Something very essential and unknown for us occurs within this correlation at transition from non-life to life, and something (more essential) – at appearance of human. We know only that the biological evolution is the oriented process, its orientation is orthogenesis – i.e. complication. The nervous system (internal) is hereby complicated. The complication at human achieves such level that the whole world may be concentrated (immediately and “non-materially”), or, in other words, a human is capable to cover the whole world thanks to this. It is the personality as it personifies the whole Being in itself.

Returning to the problem of self-development we shall once more emphasize that it is the initial attribute and opens all significant peculiarities for ontogenesis of personality (as it alone contains them in itself). The development of personality is not the adaptation to socium. Everything is much more complicated: a child that appears in the world originally experiences two drives (but not one as Freud

thought) – to adaptation, which will be continued during the whole life and, on the other hand, the process of self-change and self-development starts working in it at once.

At each moment this process acts, thus, at each moment – it is another (although, simultaneously, the same) being, and the development of personality principally differs by this. And just now we finally understand the essence of structure as integrity: personality differs from impersonal forms for existence by the fact that initial intention – need – has as if double mission – it, on the one hand, is purely natural, biological intention and is such form its stipulates the development of mechanisms for entry to the world, and it is the same processes, although very complicated, that occur in the living world in general.

But the social component of the need that self-develops this being from inside, from itself alone is much more vividly expressed at human. Speaking more precise, – from eternal experience in existence of human generations.

So, a child appears as a being that self-develops, and not only because it meets with the external, first of all, social environment, as it is presented in classical variants of cultural historical theory. It looks like the “engine” that works during the whole life (as the human heart works) from impregnation to physical death. And it leads to the self-change.

Thus, there are these two processes: adaptation (socialization) and self-development. These are different processes, which cannot exist one behind another. It seems to us that the complexity in understanding the personality, its structure and development is stipulated namely by availability of those two discordant to each other active mechanisms. Not one as Freud mentioned. And the most theories in any event “roll” to Freud just because they mean one mechanism, one “wing” of the need.

The thing is not that the personality meets with social environment but that the social comes to it, stipulates it – from its parents together with their sexual cells. This energy, social due to essence, is in child since the very beginning in the same manner as purely natural energy. And only now we can assess the real

complexity in structurization of personality and in general its existence in the whole.

Developing own logic for analysis of personality structure, we took into consideration numerous critical remarks, and, in particular, rather fair and sound criticism by V. Frankl in relation to artificial concepts in the field of personology [Frankl, 1990]. We are not inclined at all to divide the personality into separate elements; in the research we do not separate certain components of personality (“sides”) from integral structure. The process for cognition of personality means for us that the dynamic maintenance of the whole integral personality takes place at solution of concrete scientific (partial) task, for example, study of experience, capabilities, etc., in so-called active imagination of scientist.

Only providing that concrete received results within the context of this integrity are considered we can tell that the personality is researched as it is. The point is about two principally different research tasks and procedures for performance of research. Let’s give the elementary example: I can study the difference of mechanical and logical memorizing, apply concrete experimental methodologies, receive data and analyze them in relation to peculiarities of human memory.

This is the concrete psychological procedure, and it is, strictly speaking, finished on this.

However, I can put another task – to study certain peculiarities for personality through specificity of mnemonic mechanisms. Such task may be set but in this case everything is cardinally changed. We can confine ourselves by known experiments but for research here the principally important aspects are other indices and phenomena: a researcher shall worry how namely and why a concrete human perceives namely those words-stimuli, in which form the stimuli material is perceived better. Is the content of words, which, finally, is now the state at testee – and many other, purely personal issues, important?

A researcher assumes that the memory is included into context of the integral personality, and he uses it as original “window”, through he can see something in this integrity. The change in subject

of research takes place – the peculiarities for memorizing and procedures, related to their study, are now the means for penetration into the world of integral personality. In such statement it turns out that a researcher receives the access to the whole original ensemble of personal components “through” separate phenomenon (process).

The essential moment in such approach is that the integral, personal is not finished building by researcher “in his own head” due to laws of logic but is studied in the process of rather concrete experiment. Methodologically and methodically there is the principal difference between the study of concrete “side” as it is and the research of integrity through mediation of this side. In the last case we make what is called “section”: the experience is filled in with enormously complex attributes because a researcher has not just “to keep” but to take into consideration many unknown variables for him in it, to define the logic for performance of procedure namely with this human, strictly speaking, “to catch” the individual logic of testee.

This is the clinical form for experimenting, and it is very complex not only technically but professionally psychologically: the experimentalist shall have very high qualification. Perhaps, the researches of such type are not practically performed in modern science, instead of it, the integrity is just imagined pursuant to concrete partial materials (data of experiment, test, etc.).

Such state of affairs was criticized still by L.S. Vygotsky in the 20-ies of XX century, and it remained namely such one: we receive the concrete results but we do not study the psychology of its origin. As in this example – the elementary experience testifies that the logical memorizing is more efficient than mechanical one but it tells nothing why it is so, which mechanisms work in both cases (and perhaps, this personality has its own logic and a researcher cannot call it as the logic at all!).

It is possible to answer this question only when I will make the experiment, in which the model for existence of integral personality will be built and memorizing will act in the role of “window” to real nature of this integrity. Hence there is the necessity in genetically-modeling method: we shall create the integral model in its development. It is necessary to introduce all components of

personality namely at the level of concrete research into it: orientation, character, biological processes, internal experiences, state of personality at a certain period of time. All this should reliably be fixed in the experiment – then we can make a step to understanding the psychological nature of personality.

Let's emphasize once more that the method does not anticipate any "section", it anticipates the creation of the "entry" to the world of integral personality, and it is logical. G.S. Kostyuk not in vain already in the 20-ies of XX century mentioned that however the psychology would not strive for study of personality integrity, this object is so "large" and complex that in any case it is necessary to separate certain particularities. The question is not only in what should be separated (L.S. Vygotsky solved this) but how to use it (unfortunately, no one solved this).

The application of genetically-modeling method will allow overcoming with disadvantages in traditional "sectional" approach: when we speak about genetically-modeling research of personality structure, life of personality, we mean the model reproduction of the whole complexity in concrete experiment. It is very important, now it is impossible to call any research, in which this logic was followed to the end – we only start studying these possibilities as we understand that it is a principal way to real cognition of personality.

Let's remind that the genetic psychology considers the personality structure, taking into consideration the thesis that the structure appears rather logically and absolutely naturally.

Here it is necessary to distinguish: the personality as it is does not appear, it is created – continued. We do not have any such fact when the personality is born from non-personality either in the nature or socium, the whole history in existence of mankind does not give any such fact to us.

Thus we speak about motion of personality within generation and its transition from generation to generation. So, there is no sense to speak about origin of personality in genetic logics, it is the continuation, it is something that develops. At the same time as it was shown the personality structure appears as necessity for provision with human existence in the whole world.

So, the clear determination of integral structure and each its element proceeds from the fact that personality at early stages of ontogenesis is already integral but not differentiated, it has no components. This is the structure but very simplified, undivided, and it provides the simplest functions, accordingly. Later these functions are complicated. This moment is very important and essential. The structure appears and it concerns each link and each element.

Next. It is necessary to realize the division of three concepts, which are in fact not divided in modern psychology of personality. I mean the concepts of the biological, social and purely psychical. The personality integrates and unites these three spheres and is the unity. How do the abovementioned phenomena correlate in personality? We, still hypothetically, set forth the following statement: that elementary, undivided, primary structure, which is the personality at the first stages of ontogenesis, consists in fact of two forms for existence: biological form and social form.

They are united between themselves and further motion, development of personality to the side of complication and differentiation generates the psychical [2] as a certain vector, as a certain union of biological and social forms for existence in general. The psychical is formed on the core of these two directions. At the stages of early ontogenesis the one, which will later become a developed human, is some material body, which is the integration, sum of social and biological tendencies, motions, levers. The psychical, as personality, does not appear each time and at each human.

It is created on the vector for union of the biological and social, at the being, which is developed, as a result and in the process of its interaction with surrounding environment.

The psychics appear as function that stipulates the possibility for existence of human being in this world, in this surrounding.

Genetic psychology at analysis of personality structure takes into consideration the infinity in existence of personality. It can be explained by the following way: the individual life of human is final; it starts and finishes with the physical death of body. If we speak about existence of personality within generations but not within the single

life, we meet with the phenomenon of infinity in existence of personality. Do not confuse the life of a separate individual with existence of personality within the generations as its life is discrete but the existence of generations is infinite in its change.

While considering the personality in terms of its structure it is obligatorily necessary to bear in mind that personality alone is such formation that has the internal content. Any subject: physical, chemical and biological – may be analyzed in terms of its external and internal but when we speak about personality, this analysis is very complicated. The personality is such object, in which namely the internal is such instance, which in principle defines the whole existence of human as it is.

And thus when we speak about elements of structure and the inward world is separated; there is no need to understand it as if there are elements beyond inward world, which are not related with it. When a personality at some stage of ontogenesis is differentiated all parts of structure concern the inward world, it as if covers, runs through the whole personality. Existentialists were absolutely right when they spoke about absolute reality of the internal in personality: the same as external reality.

The internal not only exists, it calls for expression, and this is the absolute law for personal life. To express its internal, hereby to change it, to develop and to make a step in life, – this is the imperative for existence of personality in general.

The structure, which we will study, is always in motion. It is changed, developed but this development occurs within the form, structural components and structure of integrity as it is remains unchanged during the whole period of its life.

The one that Vygotsky called as “interfunctional systems” appears at the level of form, at the level of individual changes, thus – the changes take place.

We would like to emphasize here one serious thing: the changes do not run in a circle, they are the spiral, and each stage in development of personality is somehow higher than previous stage. The spirality of this process is achieved by uniform energy initial value – need, which is not only the energetic one but informative. And each

time when some period of existence of personality passes, all changes that occur with it during this time do not disappear but are fixed on this carrier, which continues its motion further.

And all information about what happened with human for this time is kept and passed in the same or modified form to further stage. Thus, further stage is always something higher, something another than previous stage. The spiral has appeared namely by this way. It concerns, strictly speaking, the structure: each age period, if we speak about age, is the contribution into the structure. There is the opinion that the transition to another age period marks the change in personality structure in the whole. This is, in our opinion, the careless remark: the structure still remains constant but the fact that each age stage changes the form of personality is absolutely true. It changes the integrity, appearance, and dynamics of the whole personality.

While considering the structure, we shall always bear in mind that the most interesting and the most essential moment in personality is instance-Ego. And while constructing any notion about structure it will be absolutely incorrect from scientific point of view to pass by instance-Ego. We refer instance-Ego to the inward world of personality but rather conditionally because it is in fact essential and all-personal. Instance-Ego is in fact the central moment in personality and in its structure as well. While describing the structure we would like to give the proper place to it: there is no need to ignore it, reducing only to one of substructures, and, on the other hand – there is no need to make a fetish of it, telling that all the other has no such meaning and it is necessary to study only Ego, that it is some super mysterious structure.

It is important to understand for description of all other substructure. Instance-Ego is not something super mysterious, super natural and inaccessible for science.

We shall deeply understand this than U. James, who postulated the impossibility for cognition of “Ego-subject” [James, 1994] (here as we can see again the idea of “homunculus” appears). Instance-Ego is that phenomenon, which defines that a human understands its difference from surrounding world. Hereby it calls itself by the

following way: Russians and Ukrainians call it “Ya”, Englishmen – “I”, Germans – “Ich”.

But the roots of such separation are in the animal and vegetative world: we do not know according to which mechanisms but due to behavior of animal and even plant it is obvious that they do not confuse themselves with similar and other things. That is, they received their separation from the external world. When O.M. Leontyev tells that a child at the first stages of ontogenesis does not distinguish the attitude of people to itself and attitude of itself to them, as well as its attitude to people and things he is right but something careless: we never have something merged and “amorphous”: a subject that lives and, thus, self-develops, already feels its aloofness. Thus, at human it is sophisticatedly compared with animals but Marx told correctly that the key to anatomy of monkey is in the anatomy of human but not on the contrary.

However, any animal does not identify itself with another animal. It does not copulate, for example, with itself, it seeks for another, and does not copulate with individuals of the same gender but seeks for opposite gender, i.e. it distinguishes, and, thus, in the most undeveloped, most primitive form the one, which we call Ego, – is given to animals, the roots of this instance are there. They feel it by a different way, they turn with it by a different way, it is not developed, undivided, not established in speech, – no one disputes with it but it is also impossible to give some supernatural features to it. The point is (again we return to Marx) that we really understand instance Ego not then when we will seek something in “nirvana” and go somewhere into the depth (as there are only instincts there) and further already molecules go, – such situation has already occurred in biology with cell.

We will understand instance-Ego not then when we will set hopes on “space” force. Within this sense Marx very clearly told: a human, at first, as in the mirror, looks at another human and only having understood that he sees human Petro in front, a human understands that it is human Pavlo. There is no other way. It means that the availability of the other and interaction with it is the essential factor for origin of own Ego.

It is interesting that R. May thinks on this occasion that the real unit of analysis for personality in existential psychology is namely its interaction with the other personality.

So, Ego-instance is something, which is born in interaction with other people. Namely the interaction with the other enables a human to understand that it is not the other. Vygotsky wrote that when a human acquires the experience of mankind, only then its own world appears at it but not as a result from “diving” into its mystical chakras. Instance-Ego appears in interaction. Interaction exists always and it means that this instance also exists always, with different degree of realization, with different degree of representation, with different degree of understanding and use.

There is no such stage in ontogenesis, when a human confuses itself with surrounding and even the cases when mentally handicapped people confused themselves with surrounding are unknown and this means that instance-Ego exists in them. And there is no need to make a fetish of it, it is absolutely normal attribute of personality and here there is no super mystery: all is absolutely natural – a human, in order to exist, shall separate itself from others.

The stated notion about personality structure may easily be transformed into “one” from many others, and, as it is, it will give few to the psychologist, who is interested in personality. But the principal and essential moment both for theory and psychological practice is not the statement of some or other structural whole but the realization of real psychological mechanisms that stipulate the existence (functioning and development) of human personality. The answer to this question is not in the description of structural formations but in detection of origin of natural interactions between them and inside each of them.

The long history in study of personality in national and foreign psychology testifies that psychology can now give very few in this aspect. It turns out almost impossible within the traditional experimenting “to detect” complex and multilayer interactions between separate substructures of integral personality. L.S. Vygotsky in his time faced this fact, having found the impossibility really to understand the nature of some higher psychical functions, if

to study them in mature, established form with application of usual experimental procedures in psychology.

He understood that the higher psychological function at the stage of maturity is specifically reduced, transformed into “fossil” (term by Vygotsky), and deep and essential mechanisms for its functioning in such form are not subject to scientific cognition. Namely this fact defined the direction for further search by Vygotsky, which was finished by creation and implementation of genetic method into psychology.

The logic here is simple and genius at the same time: the real structurally-dynamic nature of the higher psychological function may open to a researcher, if to study not formed, not “ready” function but the process for its appearance when all components are open, even “uncovered”, when relations are still multi-variant and are only created, selecting the most optimal variants from many possible ones. That is the process for formation of the higher psychological function as a component of interfunctional psychological system takes place.

So, modern genetic psychology uses the principle, discovered by Vygotsky, realizing it in the field of psychology of personality. In order to understand the essential issues in existence of human personality, it is necessary to digress from phenomenological opinion on its structure: real mechanisms of this very complex phenomenon will be open, as it has already been mentioned, when we come to its study from the point of view that *personality structure in the form, in which it exists in mature state, – **appears** and functions. And this process of **appearance** is naturally stipulated and strictly determined by quite objective (in the sense – really existing) circumstances.*

In other words – if we fix the structure of mature personality as such one as described above, then, in order really to understand its essential nature (of personality), it is necessary to answer the question – *why* does a human personality have namely *such* structure and *how* does it appear. These questions and the answer for them are important not only as such – the mystery for establishment and existence of personality in the whole is hidden in them. It should be mentioned that, although the process for

development of personality is studied very long ago and rather actively in psychology, namely the moment of its *appearance* (appearance of natural and stipulated-determined) remains behind the attention of research).

It seems quite clear as this act, first of all, cannot be fixed empirically and is not verified experimentally, secondly, its explanation obligatorily means the contact with the problem of the biological and social, which, as we have already shown, although exists in wrong statement but in this statement it is usual, traditional and ... such one that absolutely has no solution, and, thirdly, it turns out possible to explain (and mostly important – to understand) the phenomenon for appearance of personality, if really and declaratively to be based on the logic that the integral appears, exists and is developed *earlier* than its parts.

The last one requires the special explanation and here we will refer to the old and as if “partial” research by G.S. Kostiuk [Kostiuk, 1989]. In modern psychology there are many researches, which fix the moments of generation, appearance of psychical phenomena, interruption of gradualness (insight, products of intuition, etc.), their vital transitions to the new state, to the new way of actions. Within these terms the researches by G.S. Kostiuk are purely genetic due to essence of subject of study, method and product, received as a result. It differs with nuance and originality as it opens the integral, complexly related and stipulated character of sensory-perceptive process on rather “simple” material.

The subject of research was the process for formation of image at perception of subject under complicated conditions. The model of process was the image of a thing in the dark chamber, which was regularly illuminated by splash of electron-pulse lamp. The short duration of illumination did not enable looking at and seeing the thing in full: a testee received something that was too difficult for understanding in the terms of form and content.

As a result from numerous illuminations by light pulses, the accumulation of information in field of vision by testee took place and the image of the thing that was perceived was gradually built up. G.S. Kostiuk mentioned such peculiarities for generation and appearance

of image of the thing when it is perceived under complicated conditions.

The complex interaction of reflectory acts, which acquire the form of specific cognitive acts (sensory, perceptive, reproductive, mental), directed to solve the perceptive task, vividly come forward in the process for construction of image: separation of features of object, being perceived, their structurization, realization of class of objects, its reference to a certain category.

The judgments, hypotheses, which influence on the course of this process and at the same time undergo certain changes regardless of results from perceptive actions appear at subject pursuant to the past experience and fragmentary percepts. The inadequate hypotheses that are not confirmed by perceptive data are substituted by reliable assumptions.

The solution of the task under such conditions is often the process for solution of contradictions *between expectations* that appear at subject, anticipations and perceptive information, which it receives. It is a complex cognitive activity, which is verbalized to some or other extent at all their stages, starting from realization of the task and finishing with its confident solution.

This is the vivid example for establishment of “subjective image of objective world”, which is impossible to understand without psychological, strictly speaking, personal components. Let’s pay the additional attention to this fact. Already reflectory act, as the answer to irritation, is changed in this situation. However, the perceptive *task* that was set to a testee provides this act and the whole sensory perceptive sphere with the principally new content and dynamics. The task and a set of sensory perceptive and mental *acts*, actualized by *subject itself*, *mediate* the whole process of perception in this situation, which becomes purely subjective.

Thus, the purpose (task) and ways of actions as purely social acquisitions of integral personality, in this experiment *change* purely biological characteristics for sensory-perceptive sphere (sensitivity, concentration, scope, etc.). Further – actualization of personal experience, development of special human *state* under conditions of experiment bring the new aspects and nuances into the act of

definition and construction of image for irritant – in this case we meet with unique phenomenon of the “other”, strictly speaking, mediation of activity.

This *double* mediation stipulates, at last, the new form and dynamics in work of organs of sense and the creative act for human construction of *own* image of the thing, being preset. We now have already not only the subjective but *personal* situation of research. In fact, namely the personality as the whole defines the cognitive activity of human that was meticulously shown by G.S. Kostyuk in this research.

So, the situation is deployed not in the manner, in which a stimulus (poorly illuminated thing) acts on organs of sense, exciting response-image. The peculiarity as integrity chooses (defines) alone the stimulus, actualizing its all available psychical components – researches (uses up) it, sensory-perceptive sphere, at the same time, and provides with information, correcting initial subjective (purposeful) and personal (notional) intentions, and namely in its functioning it is corrected by personal structures.

Thus, the originality of the psychical can be better understood if to approach to it genetically, if to look at it before the real interrelations of living being with external world are changed in the course of development of reflecting activity by the brain. However, in reality, in this experiment we observe the development and generation of the new interfunctional system, and, we emphasize, first of all – purely personal system.

What is the gnoseological sense of mentioned results? Below, in brief, see the main stages in establishment of subjective image in those special conditions:

First – sensitivity of visual analyzer, which received the energy of external influence, turned out to be insufficient through its low capacity, thus, the analyzer was incapable to transform it into the fact of consciousness at once.

Second – silhouetting the thing, being perceived, – its appearance on the eye retina and *establishment* of its outline turns out also incomplete, with indefinite borders and cavities in its integral image.

Third – already existing subjective perceptive *task* stipulates the complex transformation of reflectory acts into genitive actions (sensory, perceptive, reproductive, cogitative) that make the *changes* in image and fixation of differences, thanks to which the transformation of energy in influences into definite image takes place.

Fourth – *motion* of available but not sufficiently complete information about thing causes to actualization of purely personal structures (experience, state, orientation). The *hypotheses* – images, which are substituted by more reliable ones, are created.

Fifth – *development* of image as a result from reflection of thing and its objectivation through separation of its features, structure, its reference to a certain category, verbalization and even up to detected solution of perceptive task.

Sixth – *creativity*. The analysis of psychological components, which is necessary at transition of human from perceptive tasks to more complex manifestations of cognitive, spiritual and productive activity.

This moment, “caught” in the experiment by G.S. Kostiuk, and the mechanism is methodologically very essential. It confirms not only the fact that the development has its own laws and mechanisms. Another thing is more important – the development of any process at human is always and exclusively *personal* phenomenon as only integrity generates the new integrity inside itself as a complex interfunctional psychological system (temporary or stable). The abovementioned research, in our opinion, separated that “drop”, in which the main mechanisms and laws that may be transferred to the whole personality are focused in concentrated form.

Next. It is difficult to understand the structure of personality as such one that appears quite naturally and strictly determined. It is quite reasonable to use the analogy with existence of living being (animal) for real comprehension of meaning for this thesis. Its attributive properties, such as nutrition, irritability, separation, reproduction, etc. “require” the appearance of corresponding organs (structures). O.M. Leontyev convincingly showed this in his time in research of phylogenesis of psychics [Leontyev, 1984].

The succession is the same: the essential property (function) appears earlier and in its existence and development it in fact generates the organ (let's say, the motion appears much earlier than morphoanatomical formation – extremity of mammal, etc.). We have no grounds to consider that the formation of personality structure is not subject to this law.

The importance of this provision is that its realization displaces the accent of research: from statement and description of existing (such one that is steady) structure, it is necessary to come from study on process of its establishment, the real deep and essential mechanisms and laws that provide with appearance, existence and development of personality structure as integrity are opened namely in this process.

On this way we at once meet with the significant problem that remains unsolved in psychology of personality, despite the fact that most psychological theoretical and empirical researches are devoted namely to its solution. If namely the existence as active self-motion of human being generates the structure of personality, what is the necessary condition for this existence and development, there is the top-priority question about origins (sources) for this activity. This is really cardinal problem, and it is not surprising that any theoretical construction in the sphere of psychology of personality obligatorily includes the consideration of sources for activity of human.

At the same time we find ourselves in front of very interesting and significant fact – it turns out that in modern psychology there is no scientific grounded and generally accepted opinion on this, as if most essential aspect of science. The interpretation of sources for activity and mechanisms for their action turns out to be so diverse and versatile that only their analysis alone requires very large efforts and massive texts (we can here refer to one of rare successful attempts for such analysis, which was made by H. Hekhausen [293], however this analysis did not lead to some common opinion). In such state of affairs we see some essential reasons, if we do not consider seriously the aspirations of some researchers “to impose” own logic to the object under study. We speak not about those attempts but about serious researches.

One of reasons is in refusal from genetic aspect of analysis. “Sectional” techniques and theoretical generalizations, built on results that were received with their help, cannot just, so to say, “due to definition” answer the question about real sources for personality activity. We will not here list the reasons for this, which were analyzed still by L.S. Vygotsky [Vygotsky, 1991].

In the genesis of development we can hypothetically anticipate that a newborn child is not just a very complex biological system [3]. It is a human child as unique interactions of the nervous system and corporeity define the special state of this being – state of readiness *to enter* the social world and *to become* a personality.

But his state is caused *not only* by unique biological structure.

The genesis of such phenomenon is that the onset of human birth is in social conditions for interaction of two persons, who physiologically paired for further birth of biological being as continuation of its generation. Later it will become the social attribute of the whole total ontological being.

The born biological being is the embodiment of the need as initial tendency – drive in demand-motivational apprehension of the world. This need is, in its turn, transformed into demand, and as realized demand – into motive. So, the personality since the start in its establishment has the double incitement – need and some inclinations, which may be realized. This generates the demand-motivational sphere and later grows into structural components of personality.

Even world outlook component is born from sensory-perceptive field, which is generated in the *meeting* of the need as a certain biological dynamically-informative formation with the social world. We understand the need as it has been mentioned as a certain basal state of biosocial being that expresses the objective necessity in addition, which is behind it. We speak that the need is the *basal* state, meaning its *priority* as source for stimulating activity of individual, its *depth* and initial unity (synthetic character).

The initial need of human being is set and determined by specificity in organization of life itself and is sufficiently constant during ontogenesis. In fact, this is the need to live, to exist, to be

realized and to be continued in another personality, as well as in its creations.

The need generates and defines (outlines) the demand-motivational space of each personality but the demands and motives do not use up and do not cross out the basal constitutive nature of the need. Each demand is the partial and concrete satisfaction of the need (in order not to tell fragmentary). Thus, for example, biological demand on food is very essential, complimentary but it is only the part, fragment of general need *to live*.

The same may be told about other demands and motives. In this sense the need, unlike demand- *is not subjective*.

Namely the concept of the need as a basal stimulating force explains the diversity of demands and motives of human (that in general usually *is not explained* but only stated and classified).

The need meets that circle of biological and social phenomena, which differently, in different degree may partially (always namely *partially*) satisfy it.

The demands appear by this way, and thus they are *those ones* that are in human. The fact that is really so is very well seen if to compare the demands of human from modern western culture with the demands of people from different epochs or different ethnic groups. Then those influences, which we call social, pedagogical, etc. enter into force. The one, which we call psychical processes, psychological states, psychic properties, is born here. And they pass the way through demand-motivational field.

Expressing, carrying out, realizing through psychical activity, they become our characterological, absolutely unique properties because the alloy of biological and social generates the character. Temperament as a genotype in general is the initial, set in the need, in demand-motivational field, deployment of capabilities. Not in the sense “that a human is capable of some or other” but just a human turns out to be fundamentally and *directionally* capable.

When we put the question how the personal development is carried out in genesis, how, strictly speaking, the biological person becomes the personality, – it is necessary to take into consideration the following moment: this initial sensitivity and a certain

manifestation of the need is realized through social influences in higher psychical functions, creating the unique, unrepeated, absolutely striking system of interactions for sensory-perceptive, imaginative, motor and other manifestations. The complex interfunctional mobile dynamic systems, which in totality constitute the one that is accepted to define as the structure of personality, are created.

When we put the question where the sources for psychical are, the answer is as it follows: the onset of the psychical is in the need that later grows into demands. In its turn, the demand determines the social influences, which satisfy it. So, at the personal, integral level we have the unique mechanism: not stimulus acts on human but it alone, already very early, chooses some expected stimulus from many others and namely that one, which corresponds to its actual need (demand).

On their part, these initial demands are the manifestation of fundamental anatomic physiological basis, which is manifested in inclinations.

They have the property and capability to be developed exclusively in the social environment. In general it seems to us that the genetically initial, repeated by many times, in establishment of personality is the psychosexual personal interaction between two people, as that construct that is shown in biological product of this interaction (human child) and appropriates the social as that one, which has its own sources and functional purpose, and, strictly speaking, capability to development in order to become a personality.

Perhaps, O.M. Leontyev was right when he told that the meeting of the demand with the object bears the birth of the psychical as it is. And when we speak that the need was born in the pair of loving humans, who have the mutual demand to give birth to a human, we mean that it itself acts as that genetic background that generates a subject or individual or biological person, who repeats the way of its parents.

Thus, the need of loving people of opposite sex one in another and their demand *to continue* one another through establishment of a new human grows into some just striking personality. But how? It

turns out to be very simple: the *third* that bears the *vector* of their, strictly speaking, essential forces, is born between two individuals of opposite sex. This is, in my opinion, the fundamental initial genetic fact, which is not noticed by psychological science very long and “diligently”.

If we speak about love it always generates a new *vector* being, which is *desirable* and *expected*. If the birth of a new being occurs without love, without its expectation, desire, without hope for it, then this is the act of simple (animal) birth of biological organism, which does not bear the forces of manly attitude to the world because eternally highest spiritual manifestation of human – love are not embodied in it, and the high levels of anatomical physiological capabilities, which can provide a future human with capability to become beautiful, necessary, kind personality are not embodied in it.

The social persons, who appropriated the experience of generations in their establishment, which became their biological essence, in its paired interaction, which is based on sexual basis, in brilliantly acute moment, which is directed and capable to reproduce the posterity, family, create and deep-root only what they can into the world.

Whether a genius, talent or mediocrity or in general homelessness grows in these interactions. All is defined by that *real* need that united those people.

The world is recreated in human child, who bears the primate of the whole and the need in this whole generates the selective function in relation to the *socium*. And *socium*, adequately reacting to the need of human, develops, strictly speaking, its demands, its orientation, its sensory-perceptive sphere. And this is the *key* to understanding the development: this is the genesis of development, onset and functioning of personality. This provision allows significantly specifying one from initial ideas in existential psychology about “throwing a human in the world”, hereby, existentialism does not mean “non-necessity”, “homelessness” of personality. We speak quite about another: “throwing” means that a human *alone* did not define the year and place of its birth, level of development and peculiarities of culture, into which it “got”, its nearest surrounding.

It gets here, so – “is thrown”. And it has two principal possibilities – maximally to adapt, “to go with the stream”, – to become a “small screw”, i.e. to dissolve in this billionth mass, – to become “a slave of its own world project” (R. May tells about it). Or, this is the principal alternative, – to realize itself, to carry out the transcendence, “to go out” the circumstances and ... to come true, having overcome, finally, with the state of “throwing”.

Our specification, which arises from fundamental provision about genesis of personality, related to the fact that “throwing” will be of different degree and different intensity in aloofness, depending on how the need led to birth, appearance of this human in the world. If it is expected, desired, if it is a fetus of real love and a result from embodiment of social biological historical potencies from two people (parents) – this human cannot be called as “thrown to the world” as it already initially does not just exist, it co-exists in it as it is biologically, socially and spiritually not alone.

The fact, what type of interactions between two loving people lead to birth of such personality, may be considered as a central problem for transformation of the need into socially significant human demand. We are not alone in the world and cognition. The abovementioned analyzed thought by M. Buber testifies to this. In fact, the process for establishment of personality as integrity is as if dredging of those possibilities, which potentially could be in individual, from existing need (need – to live, to exist).

But they do not exist due to different reasons. The thing is that socium in that concrete time and concrete historical economical conditions, when this personality comes to it and exists, rather strictly determines the manifestation and development of some capabilities and suspension and non-realization of the others.

Social individual (i.e. individual, who becomes a social being, carrier of general historical capabilities) firstly uses up itself in its possibilities in order maximally to absorb those potencies, those forces, which are inherent to it, from that environment. And then these forces return to the social environment in quite other images. They return in social, mediated, subjectively significant for society and individual, demand-motivational forces.

Initial need as general human intention does not only stipulate the activity of child. The development of integrity and its essential meaningful components starts very quickly and early in this activity. Due to some empirical data, as we have already mentioned, a human child already during the first months after birth principally differs from animal in the sphere of feelings. This difference is shown in unusually early development of feelings, which are called higher: esthetic, intellectual, moral. These feelings appear from the general sensory undifferentiated state, which Gaffding called as “feeling of life”. Already this state has the special imprint, which puts it higher than instinctive life of animals.

Namely the “feeling of life” can be considered as the sum of physical senses, which come from all points of organism, but at the beginning it is defined mainly by existence and satisfaction of purely vital demands. But thanks to the fact that the need dorms other, purely social and spiritual demands, the feeling of life acquires the higher imprint, which should be considered as the embryo of the future prevalence of spiritual over animal life. This new direction may be noticed at child starting already from the second half of the first year of life.

The unique integrity of human being covers not only affective sphere (demands and emotions) but the field of intellect.

The principal unity of affect and intellect, in our opinion, is constituted already at early stages of ontogenesis by unity of biosocial nature of the need. The need incites the activity, in which the meeting of individual with different objects of social world takes place. The choice of object that mostly corresponds to the need is the essential *event* in life of child. The need is not only born in it but the act for cognition of the world takes place for the first time, when conditionally reflectory (so, purely natural) mechanisms for sensory perceptive, mnemonic, intellectual sphere, are specifically “impregnated” by the need and demand (affective) and the image appears. That “key experience”, which Vygotsky thought to be the real “unit” for establishment of personality, appears only now.

The complex combination in the meeting of affective and intellectual components generates the action, i.e. oriented and

purposeful activity, which already originally, as we see, has the character of *personal action*. So, the personal action is that psychical phenomenon, which in fact realizes a certain aspect of the need, “retains” affective and intellectual components of personality in unity and provides their binding interaction. No matter what could be the subject of psychological research – motorial actions (“living motion” – according to Bernstein), work of analyzers, personal deeds – we shall always realize that it is finally the *personal actions*, which in unity of their internal psychical content reflect and realize the uniform biosocial essence of the need, and so – personality in the whole.

Further development of personality as acquisition of internal specificity in interrelations of intimate adults, and, on this background, the change of interfunctional systems, is linked with differentiation of inward world. The impression about separation and divergence of affective and intellectual spheres of human appears at a certain moment. However, we are inclined to state that it is only the impression. There is no dichotomy there, there are two united processes there, providing with the single unique phenomenon – life and development of personality, being incited by the need.

And if psychology does not see, let’s say, any ways of mental actions with single biological nature of personality behind formation, which, finally, needs (or does not need) those ways, if, on the other hand, it does not see that each demand, each motive is generated and realized in obligatory discordant interaction with cognitive sphere (each time realizing the same single need), it is the problems of psychology but not its single object – human personality.

At last, we shall mention that after birth the genetically initial, constitutive factor for development of integral personality at child is the meaningful peculiarities for interaction of its parents, other adults that surround it. A child in its activity, excited by the need, meets with a great number of nuanced systems of interrelations from the closest surrounding. *Meeting* means not only the satisfaction of the need, appearance of demand; it means the *choice*, acquisition of social ways for existence and development. The one, which a child met in surrounding, defines the availability of the first

undifferentiated experiences, which hereby are not insignificant in any case.

Thus, personality as the higher form for existence of human psychics *is defined* by social relations and spiritual interactions of two people that give birth to it. A being that is born under certain conditions turns out to be ready to enter the socium not only due to its anatomical physiological parameters but due to available special psychological state and has the situational prerequisites so that to become a personality.

Higher interfunctional interactions (higher psychological functions) *are realized* by the whole integral biosocial individual and *are relied* on higher nervous factors that have ripened at that time. This process occurs as a dichotomic pair, in which, on the one hand, there is the development of individual capabilities, which is based on inclinations. On the other hand, the need, getting into the social environment, which is adequate to it, brings to life the personal qualities and properties. They *are born* by complex interrelations with social environment [4] and the constitutive, genetically initial factor here is the relations between adults that surround a child.

Further *formation* of personality as a system of higher psychological functions is carried out under conditions for extension of space in public life for a child, which assists to *origin* of new functional systems, according to which it *changes* its activity and the biological – in particular, nervous system of human.

It is essential to mention that this motion – development of the primary – starts from the change of integrity, and, thus, is the *personal* at *all* stages of ontogenesis.

Biopsychic substructure

K.-G. Jung in his time rather vividly spoke that we are just not able really to understand and to express the unity of the biological and psychological in existence of human. He thought that this question is not psychological but philosophical one, and, thus, it is necessary to accept and to work with it at the level of positive science. This work told much enough about problem on interaction of the biological and

the social but in fact it is mostly important to distinguish some other aspect – tendency, functionally-dynamic phenomenon for coexistence of the biological and the psychical.

Traditionally the psychical is understood as a totality of psychical phenomena, which are known to everyone. The biological is the one that concerns the life of organism, life of body, its functions, and structure. But in fact we do not have a separate existence of some or other; they just unite between themselves by a different way at different stages of ontogenesis.

The correlation of the biological and the psychical in personality always changes its configuration, changes its content: it is one thing when we speak about this correlation at very deep levels, in existence of root drives, organismic demands, and it is quite another thing – when we take the unity of the biological and the psychical, for example, in activity. Here they are undoubtedly united but united by a different way. If at the deep level this is the biopsychic strained unity, which parts cannot exist one without another, so at more surface level we can tell about another nature of interaction.

Some researches showed that the correlation of the biological and psychical changes in personality in the process of ontogenesis. It was already mentioned that O.R. Lurye [Lurye, 1974] showed that it is not unchanged. The opinion by O.R. Lurye, unfortunately, is used not often in modern psychology. It is traditionally considered that the biological component prevails in activity and operation of a child at earlier stages of ontogenesis, and social factors become prevailing at later stages.

O.R. Lurye, who performed the researches on thinking and memory of children and adults, showed the opposite picture, hereby it was proved by empirical facts and in fact causes to no doubts.

The processes of thinking and memory are mostly socialized at initial stages of ontogenesis; they maximally depend on conditions of education and that activity, which a child, strictly speaking, is taught to think and to memorize. These processes only gradually start acquiring the individually-unrepeated nature, purely hereditary and genetic factors are mostly shown in it. If to follow to logic by Lurye,

the individual appears because the biological, hereditary occupies more and more place in activity of some or other process.

It seems that it is possible to extend this to the whole processes, although it will be only the assumption because other empirical researches in this direction have not been held. It is unclear why the biological, hereditary at the first stages of ontogenesis is as if suppressed by social experience, which actively captures a human, and how it is released further, how the social enters the new interrelations with the biological. These mechanisms, processes and phenomena require empirical researches but it seems to us that it is necessary to pay attention to this within the context of this problem.

The peculiarities for interaction of the biological and the psychical within the substructure of personality are that its “responses”, consequences are reflected in the integral personality in general, and any phenomenon, any peculiarity contains this correlation as the expression of their unity. The concrete manifestation, for example, is the phenomenon of psychosomatics, which attracts the most attention of practitioners in present times. Those ones, who are engaged into applied researches, practical psychology, medical psychology, discover very many unknown mechanisms for correlation of personality development in the whole. Medicine now knows the facts that, according to statistics, up to 80% of gastric ulcer have the psychogenic nature, there are also many other facts.

But again we do not know the mechanisms that psychically influence on the work of somatic organs and we can give many facts when there is the feedback: somatic state, state of systems of organ influences on the psychological functioning of personality in the whole. It is clear that such things are the serious confirmation for real unity of human being.

But, on the other hand, they require deploying scientific psychological researches. However, in addition to statistics and purely life observations, there is now no other knowledge about real mechanisms for such phenomena.

It is necessary again to recollect Vygotskyy, who put the following task to psychology: not to theorize at the level of those life facts,

which are obvious but to receive scientific facts and to push already from them for cognition of real psychology of phenomenon. So, this work cannot give some meaningful characteristics for psychosomatics because this phenomenon requires serious empirical researches, which are practically absent, as well as in medical psychology. In particular, in the section, devoted to ontogenesis, we speak about love and mention that the sphere of psychosomatics does not study how psychical states and psychical peculiarities of parents influence on production of sexual cells and thus – on further growth and development of child, being developed. But it does not mean that there is no influence but that the researches in this direction are not held. We do not have such researches even at surface, statistical level, although it is not so difficult to perform them.

Very interesting theory of leading tendencies by L.M. Sobchuk [Sobchuk, 2000] attracts our attention within analysis of this substructure. It distinguishes the temperamental properties in personality, which embodies the real combination of the biological and the psychical in the most pure form. Each property of temperament is as if a “kernel”: it shows very clearly and distinctly “what is there from biology and what is there from psychology”. L.M. Sobchuk emphasizes that this is not the properties but tendencies, i.e. they have energetically-dynamic nature, are developed, and, while developing, orient and form the stable qualities of personality in the sphere of behavior.

Author continues this logic to characterological features, to communication and intercourse of personality in socium, showing that the manifestation of tendencies, their grouping provides with quite different behavioral styles. Temperament as a kernel, as a cell of the biological and the psychical is considered not only by L.M. Sobchuk. These are, perhaps, the oldest and traditional researches. In national psychophysiology we can mention B.M. Teplov, Nebylitsyn and their school.

These are the theories of temperament by Krechmer and Sheldon, who, indeed, considered the unity at the constitutional level. And there are very many works in the sphere of physiology of

brain, and they all have the “exit” namely to dynamics, i.e. temperament.

We recollected L.M. Sobchik because she, in our opinion, makes a step forward, speaking about tendencies, that they run through the whole personality and its peak levels such as, values, orientation, character, experience. Tendencies stipulate the individual style of activity and behavior, thus, at present moment there is sufficient empirical material in traditional psychology so that to speak about availability of a certain theory about biopsychic unity of human.

The problem of corporeity exists something separately within this substructure. Traditionally in modern psychology, analyzing the biological and the psychical in personality, they speak about nervous system, except, perhaps, abovementioned names: Krechmer and Sheldon, who analyze the corporeal. It seems to us that the works by Freudian Reich, works by Krechmer, O.M. Sikorskyy in the sphere of physiognomy, and philosophical grounds, to which O.F. Losev and very many other scientists paid attention, shall return to psychology as personality is not only a set of non-material bodily structures due to nature.

We speak about personality, bearing in mind obligatorily an integral human, and a human without body does not exist at all: without face, without physical structure. And we speak not only about influence of bodily peculiarities on personality or psychics, we speak about unity. Recent researches by O.T. Sokolova [Sokolova, 1989] vividly show that the image of bodily Ego, image of body and body alone are very important psychological components and at the same time the reason for numerous deviations in behavior of teenagers and adults, development of various complexes.

It means that psychology gradually returns to consider a body not as a carrier of psychics, ideal carrier but as a component, just necessary component of personality in the whole. The thing is that the logic prompts us: all bodily in human – is the psychical at the same time. Of course, here it is necessary to mention that the most important construction is the theoretical construction by M.O. Bernstein [Bernstein, 1966]: his “psychology of living motion” and it confirmed this really actual unity of the bodily and the psychical: these are two names of the same thing.

Any motion, most elementary, most primitive manifestation of articulation or motion in the space – this is obligatorily the psychical phenomenon, as well as the physical one. And the constructions of body, peculiarities of body very early enter the thesaurus of personality. A child very yearly gets acquainted with its body, its image “Ego”, self-consciousness does not absolutely separate the body. It means that all bodily is the psychical.

And here we agree with Maslou in those terms that a human does not have exclusively and purely natural body as it is. The body defines the image “Ego” by the same way as the spirit does it. It means that corporeity is the structural component of personality, and, as it is, it shall compulsorily be included into psychology of personality as we cannot imagine personality as the “head of professor Dowel”. O.M. Leontyev told about it in his time and he, besides, did not belong to the scientists of physiological direction. He belonged to that direction in psychology and philosophy in national science, which, on the one hand, was afraid by politicized pressure of Pavlov’s study, and, on the other hand, he himself was aggressively disposed against it and thus it is quite impossible to blame him in physiologism. But his considerations about physiological and biological, physiological and psychical show that it is the initial unity [Leontyev, 1983].

E.V. Ilyenkov correctly writes that we cannot seek for a psychical process in construction and physiology of the brain as it returns us to the idea about “homunculus”, which we, of course, will not find there but it is the extreme and polemically sharp point of view, already long ago the physiology of the nervous system, in general physiology, do not speak in such terms, as if it is really necessary to seek for some mysterious process or substance of the psychical.

Let’s repeat, this is the extreme point of view. The point is quite about another thing: speaking about personality, we cannot separate it from the body, as fantast Belyaev separated the head of professor Dowel. And this means that all bodily is run through by psychics, human intellect, which are the symbols, and, thus, it passes through the whole consciousness. We would like to pay attention to this.

And at last, analyzing the biopsychic substructure, we shall not pass by the traditional, old opinion by U. Stern [Stern, 1986] about convergence. U. Stern made very much for psychology of personality, he is the greatest personologist, in general the science of personology started from him.

Considering the central problem of the biological and the psychological and their correlation, which was traditionally presented as confrontation, Stern for the first time suggested the idea about convergence, i.e. combination.

It means that the biological and the psychical in human function together: these are two processes, which co-exist, which work one for another. They are relatively independent, and, converging, uniting, create, strictly speaking, the one, which we call personality. In principle, we can agree with this point of view, if to ignore our initial idea that in fact the psychological in personality is the vector, which appears on the combination of the biological and social. And we would like here to accentuate this.

Considering the biopsychic substructure, we should not forget our initial logic about ontogenesis of personality. We understand the appearance of personality as the integral carrier of human psychics, as a result from combination of the eternal, very old union of biological and social processes.

Namely the psychics, in our opinion, is the resultant force, resultant vector for union of those two wings, and in such understanding, if to bear in mind our notions about ontogenesis and need as energetically informative force, thanks to which all living exists in the Earth, the concepts of the biological shall in general be taken because all biological in personality is humanized, it is not purely biological, it is social at the same time.

On the other hand, all we know about personality, undoubtedly, is social: these interrelations, activity of human, its relations, and its ideas. All that occurs thanks to that not only the brain exists but the body as the whole. Thus, we imagine this structure as initial, primary, psychical.

Inward world

We will start the analysis of personality substructures from consideration of the inward world. In general, these concepts do not belong only to psychology. The point of view that only psychological objects have the one, which we call the inward world, is wrong. In fact, as it has already been mentioned, any phenomenon of life and even most physical bodies have the outward and inward.

The availability of the outward and inward – is the general principle for structurization of nature, and according to this principle a human personality not much differs from all known natural phenomena and bodies. We speak about level in development of the inward and accuracy in separatedness of the inward and outward in human psychics. This is the first moment.

L.S. Vygotsky [Vygotsky, 1983] gives very interesting and vivid definition of personality: personality – is the one, what a human becomes for itself in itself, through the one, who it becomes for others. If we analyze this opinion, we can define that Vygotsky meant, speaking about personality in the whole. Of course, he meant first of all self-consciousness, he writes namely about it in some works: we explain the real appearance of personality as it is namely with appearance of self-consciousness.

But a human being has the inward at first, since the very beginning of its generation as a being, already since the time of impregnation and appearance of the first cell – it already has the inward and outward. And it exists always, during the whole human life. L.S. Vygotsky tells about the following: until some moment this inward in human and only for this human is considered as “a subject in itself”. That is the one, who bears the inward, has not yet become for itself because it does not know yet that it has the inward. And Vygotsky binds the appearance of person with this transition when I understood, saw that I have the inward, when I understood that I have the experiences, when I understood that I have thoughts, when I understood that I have ideas and saw them, felt them, learnt them, then, strictly speaking, I appeared, personality appeared. In fact, let's repeat, we speak about appearance of self-consciousness.

This transition is cardinally and principally important, and here Vygotsky mentioned the way for this transition. He tells that a human comes to this through the one, whom it becomes for others, and this means that when I do not know yet about this my inward world, about what I have in myself, other already know about it, they already know my character, my thoughts, my feelings, they already see them, they know: whether I am clever or not, calm or uneasy, whether my inward world is rich or poor, which images prevail at me, which temper prevails at me.

Thus, I firstly become for Them. There is a very interesting thing: the one, which is called personal interrelations, is established at small child with close relatives since the very beginning of childhood.

A child in these interrelations does not only achieve the satisfaction of its demands, caused by its need, and uses hereby other people; it also reveals itself in these relations. And it makes it unnoticeably for itself, of course, not specially. A small being has not yet what we call the process of self-presentation in social psychology, when a human alone works on how to present it to others, it just shows itself – and that's all. And it is somehow reflected in it. Marx was right when he told that personality at first looks at another persons as at mirror, and only after that turns attention to itself. I am reflected in those people, and according to them I know, what I am. According to the way they speak about me, which communication they build with me: they behave, accordingly, they include me in some deals.

The main thing is what they tell and compare, and namely this leads to the fact that after them I start looking at myself with my own eyes: firstly I look with my eyes outside, at them, saw them, turn my eyes and look at myself firstly with their eyes, into myself, and then turn already my eyes into myself. And thus I learn myself, and become a human for myself. Vygotsky fixes these three stages, three moments, and they mean the following: I become a person when I transform from a human in myself into a human for myself: through the one, whom I am for others, through a human for others. This is the first thing we would like to tell about inward world.

As it concerns the content of inward world itself, it exists at small child since the very beginning and is not discovered by it. It

represents the one, which we, according to Freud, after his great discoveries, call unconscious. It means that it is the instances, demands, images, which are not realized, but they hereby excite the activity. The demand, which appears in the meeting of the need with the object that can satisfy its concrete branch (of need), is realized by child.

For example, a child now can even not know what it wants to it, it just worries about deficiency in something, and only the meeting with the food occurs, this worry disappears, the first moment for realization of demand, state of demand appears. And then it is differentiated namely into demand on food. Other demands appears by the same way because the need is satisfied using other things.

So, already at the beginning of intention it is not only the one what Freud saw: violent, gloomy, unclear, *Id*. Originally there is the shade there and it is the shade of the social. We never have only the biological in the inward world of small child. And this is the largest mistake, which, after Freud, is repeated by everyone and which they do not want to realize. This purely and exclusively biological is only at sick human, inferior personality, and, by the way, deeply inferior one because already at first the whole drive, all desires are formed from the biological and the social, put into it by parents.

And thus the inward world is not represented in child, it does not know about it but it expresses it: by cry, actions, and other kinds of activity. It expresses this world, without knowing about it yet.

There is the interesting notion by I.O. Sikorskyy [Sikorskyy, 1911] about the first acts of realization: a child seeks to repeat new motions, positions of body, etc. because it relates with simultaneous appearance of inward experiences. The repetitions enable “studying” them, getting accustomed to them, making them to be its own. This is, as Sikorskyy thought, the first rudiments for inward world as the special and rather real content. This is the first “splashes” of consciousness.

At the same time, the one, which I know about myself, appears from outward world. And here this unity of realized and unrealized, complex, discordant but still unity constitutes, strictly speaking, what we call inward world. It is really discordant in this confrontation: initial

genetic confrontation of unrealized and realized. The consciousness appears at relation as cognition of something about itself by human.

The mechanism for this phenomenon is well studied within cultural historical concept, so we will not discuss it. It is more important for us “to retain” the notion about genetic motion.

The initial contradictory unity of the biological and the social generates the demands, purposes, and then it generates values. Meanings and senses appear, and all this is represented in the form of image. What is image, what does the availability of image at human mean? P.Ya. Galperin, by the way, told that the real subject of psychology is the image [Galperin, 1976].

It is a very brave declaration, and as if very far from globality of psychics but if to think over, what does the appearance and availability of image mean?

And this means that there is some subject, who builds and observes the image. That is, there is Ego, personality, to which this image exists, and it is already super difficult for modern psychology. This means that in the inward world there is not only conscious but unconscious and namely the conscious was very difficultly divided, and there is the object (image) in it, and there is a subject that sees it, – all this is extremely complicated variant.

How does an image appear? He appears not from that I see something, hear and this is as if an image. It is still not an image. Let's remind what the experiment by G.S. Kostiuk showed. It was a long, very long process: the image appears as a result from very long integral active process, and as if the exhaustion of reality occurs in this process, and the one, being adequate to this reality, is built again.

The availability of image means the availability of person, means the availability of conscious and unconscious in it, so, means the unique complex situation and unique complex structure. We now speak that the whole wealth of inward world at personality is remade, acquired by it from surrounding reality. But there appears a very important question: how do the images of those things and phenomena, which a human has never perceived, appear? Why can I imagine the remote galaxies, remote planets, can I imagine the laws

of universal processes, which I have never seen, about which I have never heard and known? We think that such constructions, namely their possibility have a great meaning, not assessed by psychology yet.

The variegation of the world is much larger than we can imagine; when we speak that a human includes the whole Universe in itself, – it is true. So, we can really think over and see what we have never seen and heard about. But it cannot be explained only by the process of imagination, in any case by that one, which is understood by modern science. It is really a problem.

In any case, when we speak about inward world, we face very serious mysteries, and one of them is the mystery of the spiritual. Spirit is the absolute reality, if we speak about personality, its inward world. It would be wrong to speak about personality and not to speak about spirit. It seems to us that it is wrong to impose such restriction on psychology as if the spiritual, soulful exceeds the limits of this science: the problem here is in methods and theoretical positions. And namely the spiritual is the essential attribute for personality, and, in this capacity, it shall be studied by positive science.

We speak about spirit as about one that differs a human from the whole living nature, that makes it a being, which can be continued, give birth to value, give birth to the ideal, can act despite the biological demands. And this being reaches for love, for arts, for morality. We speak that these are very difficult things and they exist and constitute the inward world of personality.

What is the spirit? It seems to us that we will find the response some time, when we understand how the social life in fact contacts with biology. How does in fact this contact generate the psychical and how does this psychical, developing, become the spirit. The point is that the national psychology for a very long time was not in general engaged into these questions, expressions “inward world”, “experiences”, “state” were not in general included into scientific terminology. There was the greatest “fear of substantiality”.

That is, when we speak about inward, we tell what its real carrier is and the searches for “homunculus” start; if it is not homunculus,

so it is the soul and search for the soul. It is closer to theology, it is closer to religion. L.I. Bozhovych was the first, very brave woman, who during Soviet times, in his monograph, which was published in 1968, has overcome with this fear. She told about experiences as one from elements of inward world, and very important element. It constitutes the content of soulful life, inward life of human.

In fact, these questions are very delicate, fine but we will never receive the answer about essence of personality, if we do not bravely study everything, which is at human. At last, the science shall not be afraid that it shall discover: if we have the problem, so we shall solve it.

If to speak about inward world as the structure of personality, it is necessary to mention the following: there are mechanisms for its appearance, it has the tendency to make apparent, to be expressed and the expression is the line for development of personality. The expression of inward through outward (O.F. Losev showed this very precisely) is the essential feature for human life: we seek in vivid motion in personality, vivid words, vivid actions because the inward exists, as it is not surprising, because it is expressed. It is expressed through experiences, states, actions, words. If the inward world is not expressed, it will not exist.

When the inward is formed, it immediately changes; this formation is the development at the same time. And we speak about expression of thought, so, expressing (embodying), it always “involves” another thought, is self-specified, complicated or simplified. It is always changed. It means that the expression of the inward always leads to its change.

So, according to Vygotsky we cannot speak definitely that personality appears only when it realizes the availability of inward world in itself i.e. becomes a person for itself. In order this would happen, this inward shall already exist. It shall be expressed, otherwise there will be no one and in no way to realize it, it will not be developed.

Thus, we shall seek for a start of ontogenesis much “lower” (early) because otherwise there is the break of uniform motion. If there were no inward, it would be expressed, and, so, it would not be

formed. That is, the inward in personality is always and we speak about its development-complication.

Experiences

The important place in analysis of inward world may be allocated to experience, which acts as the central component for what we call the inward world of personality, and this phenomenon in psychology was studied rather long and very differently. Traditionally, experiences are interpreted as a synonym for emotional reaction. However, Yu. Vasyliuk in very interesting book “Psychology of experiences” provides with understanding of experiences as a process of active pragmatic overcoming, going through some unfavorable situations by personality.

We can formulate somewhat other point of view. The experiences should be considered (due to logic of the word) as transferences of something into living state, i.e. the conversion of event, some feeling, subject that surround a human into the state of living perception, into the state of living attitude. That is, if to decode this interpretation, we can tell that the process of experience is in fact the representation of consciousness of the one, which occurs in surrounding world, or in biological body, or “inside” personality itself.

Thus, the term “experiences” is in fact relevant, i.e. almost corresponds to the term “consciousnesses”.

On the other hand, we can tell about experiences as about such original bridge, which binds unrealized and realized processes. And if, for example, we speak about states (we will discuss it in more details in the corresponding section), so, it is necessary to separate them by the same way as experiences. The experiences in this dichotomy, in this confrontation of concepts acts as bringing the state to consciousness of human, i.e. speaking simply, what I can be in the state of affect but not to undergo this, and not to know that I am in the state of affect.

When I go through the state of affect it means that I am represented with this state. In this connection there are some very interesting aspects in general about interpretation of inward world as

it is. If the experiences take the central place in it (Vygotsky was inclined to this thought during his last period of creativity, numerous personologists are also inclined to this, strictly speaking, V. Stern builds his theory namely on understanding the experiences as a central phenomenon of personality), so, for example, the interpretation of image looks by a different way. Earlier we told about it as about central phenomenon of psychics and reminded of P.Ya. Galperin, who thought that the image was in general the subject of psychology, and, perhaps, he was right but we would like to tell about another thing.

Traditionally it is understood that some image of subject, thing, situation is formed at human, and then this image is experienced, filling with some personal sense, some emotional reactions. It seems to us that it is necessary to understand this somewhat by a different way.

In researches of consciousness its functions are usually reduced to generation and reflection. It is possible a little to diminish them in size, speaking about sense formation but in general it is the generation. They are for some reason or other separated, including in new works, devoted to consciousness, from very important function of consciousness, about which O.M. Leontyev reminded [Leontyev, 1983]. He wrote that a human consciousness is passionate. We shall speak about such function of consciousness as the experiences of what is reflected. We can tell that between reflection and generation there is the moment (function), the stage of bringing to human as it is the sense of what it reflects. Perhaps, it is not the case.

But as it concerns the image, we would like to tell that succession of events is not such that a human firstly builds the image, and then goes through it, and, in fact, the construction of image, image itself and its experiences – this is, in the whole, the same. The image is impossible without experiences. And if we again remind of that experiment by G.S. Kostiuk, about which we have already mentioned, and other researches, i.e. purely scientific empirical data, and if we speak about vital knowledge, everywhere we meet with the same phenomenon: image is always passionate.

It is always mine. That is already that fact that it is my image means that it passed through the whole personal structure, through the whole experience, the whole past and future of concrete human. And thus there is just no sense to separate phenomena of experiences, reflection and generation of image. We do not go through the image; we build the image after and in the process of experiences, so to say. And, in general, it is just a simultaneous act in time (this is one act). And, by the way, the simultaneity in construction of image was broken in experiment by G.S. Kostiuk, he had the successive process through very difficult conditions for construction of image, and quite another thing is observed: the image there is firstly experienced and then built.

This experience is very well seen in human behavior, in its statements, even due to psychophysiological indices, such as pressure, increase in temperature, pulse rate, etc. That is the image is experienced. The experience goes through practice. The notion about it as a subject of psychology within this context, of course, is somewhat tendentious. If the form for existence of human psychics is personality, or, as S.L. Rubinstein wrote about this, the human psychics is personal, it means that all processes that occur in human psychics, are personal processes (and V. Stern and L.S. Vygotsky were right when they told that the whole appears and develops earlier than parts).

So, human psychics should be studied namely “on the top”, i.e. from personality, and then further up to its components and only such way of research is adequate), in such case the system of experiences is the real object: not subject but object in study of psychology of human, even not psychology of personality. L.S. Vygotsky was inclined to the thought that experience is the real “unit” for analysis of personality.

As it has already been mentioned, his opinions were supported and developed only by L.I. Bozhovych, who thought that experience is the most important psychological reality of personality. “Experience, – she mentions, is as if a knot, in which versatile influences of internal and external circumstances are tied” [Bozhovych, 1968, p. 154].

Unlike L.S. Vygotsky, she did not acknowledge experience as a “unit”, i.e. the whole, which is not further divided but, on the contrary, she set the task for analysis and study “of those forces that lie behind it and stipulate the process of psychical development” [Bozhovych, 1968, p. 154]. Unfortunately, such analysis was not made. However, we have some conceptual models for this phenomenon, neither of which arises from actual scientific data and is the free interpretation of opinions by authors.

The main problem in experimental research of personal experiences, of course, is the impossibility to achieve completely adequate representation of what and how a human experiences. Because when we set a task to human to describe its experiences, so, hereby we generate only other experience and quite another image at it, and, thus, this bond, splice will never give the objective picture to us.

Let's repeat that such problem exists and it is not absolutely unsolved. It is just the reflection of real super complexity of phenomenon and at the same time the result from partial and narrow approach to experience. It seems that it exists and is expressed, so, it is necessary “to catch” this expression in experiment and to interpret namely the experience “according to it”. It will not be successful and it is not successful in such statement of question. But there is another side of the process: “not experience, – states M.M. Bakhtin, – organizes the expression but, on the contrary, the expression organizes the experience, for the first time it gives the form and definiteness of orientation to it” [Bakhtin, 1979, p. 86]. (If we compare this statement with provision by Vygotsky that a thought is not just expressed in word but is formed in it, so, it will become clear that the general psychical mechanism opens). Matching the experience with expression, in our opinion, opens the real way and space for existence of this psychical phenomenon.

The expression is not just a function of personality but it constitutes its necessary and basic attribute. According to O.F. Losev, let's remind, personality is first of all, the expressive form, i.e. it is the form of expression.

And “expressive being is always the synthesis of two plans, one – most external, obvious, and another – internal, comprehending, such one that is assumed. Expression is always the synthesis of something inward and something outward” [Losev, 1991, p. 45].

In opinion of philosopher, the expression of personality represents the identity of its outward and inward. It is shown, for example, that perceiving the personality purely externally, at the same time we as if cover the inward, the one, which is shown in outward.

So, we have three worlds of personality: “inward being” – essential, notional (“prototype” according to Losev), “outward being” – appearance, face, behavior of personality, and outward world – space of being. They constitute the uniform mobile integrity, and experiences appear “at junctions” of those worlds. So, on the one hand, the expression generates the experience, forms it, and, on the other hand, – the experience is not *expressed* but defines and fills in the expression with real content.

The relationship of experience with expression allows making the assumption about its construction. It is undoubtedly that the experience has its own structure, i.e. it is the psychical substance as it can be presented in consciousness of human namely as a form. But at the same time it is undoubtedly that it is constantly in motion, and is as if indistinct in all “worlds” of personality at the same time and thus cannot be a structure and is the constant establishment.

Such duality (simultaneity – succession) of experience makes the impossibility “to catch” it in the tradition experimental research to be understandable. Hence it should also be added that the full merger of experience with personality does not allow separating it even artificially for analysis as we do this with other psychical phenomena.

So, personality itself, under no conditions, can distance itself and stand in opposition to own experience. In cases when it seems to it that such operation was successful – the point is already about another experience but not the one, on which occasion the “confrontation” has appeared.

The special problem is the process for origin of experience. We have already mentioned that it appears at the border of collision of “worlds” of personality but there are certain peculiarities in this.

The expression and its higher personal form – *embodiment* – generate principally new form for co-existence of human and its surrounding world.

Embodiment – “it is the caulking of activity as the process for life of human essential forces in subject, – mentions G.S. Batyshev, – it is the transformation of logic of actions by subject into own subjective-fixed representation and determination of its reality in objects by subject, which bear on themselves and keep the image of this action [Batyshev, 1969, p. 99]. The result from such process is that the world stops being *in front of* and *opposite* a human and it is transformed into *its* world, which exists *around* it. S.L. Rubinstein tells: “A human is inside the being and not only being is outward for its consciousness” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 262].

We can state that experience appears namely when the outward world became the world *around* but not *opposite* me. And this is, in our opinion, the absolute condition for its appearance. At the same time the way for existence of personal experience arises from this. A human embodies itself as the individually unrepeated social whole, as the original totality of its sociality: “The result from its embodiment is its creation” [Bakhtin, 1979, p. 100].

The creation is the one that makes our life and our personality to be eternal. Hereby “creation” should be understood widely – this is all that a human leaves around itself and after itself. So, embodiment is creativity. O.F. Losev follows to the same thought: “Antimony of consciousness and being is synthesized into creativity” [Losev, 1991, p. 177].

So, if expression – embodiment is creativity, so, the latter is the way for existence of experience, which is born by this embodiment. It is necessary to mention that relations, which are described for personality and outward world, are, due to nature, the same in attitude to its inward world, which is also *created* by personality. And it is exclusively the world of experiences as, unlike outward world,

there is nothing objective in it (of course, only for this personality). So, experiences appear in three processes.

Firstly, in the process for *transformation* of outward and remote world into my world around me. Secondly, through creation of own outward (face of personality), and, thirdly, in the process for establishment of own internal Ego (individuation).

The world of experiences, despite its complexity, is never chaotic (the issue about personal orderliness of experiences is a separate and fundamental issue, which we will not discuss here).

Moreover, thanks to expression-embodiment, as a general attribution of personal existence, and experiences that are hereby born, outward world is not chaotic (my world, which covers me but does not stand opposite. Chaos may be generated only and exclusively by civilization, the chaotic state is absolutely not inherent to the world itself. And in any case a human cannot live either in chaos or near it, as well as it cannot stand it in the inward world.

According to the thought by M.K. Mamardashvili, a human may exist, “if there is the possibility and condition of the world, which it can understand, where it can act as a human, be responsible for something and know something. And this world has been created”. [Mamardashvili, 1990, p. 100]... then what for is chaos here?

The abovementioned vision about nature of personal experiences allows, in our opinion, defining the object of psychological research. Let's make some assumptions. K.G. Jung in his time mentioned that experience is the indissoluble unity of feeling and understanding [Jung, 1994, p. 23]. But, being based on creative nature of this phenomenon, it is necessary to introduce one more necessary element. The structure of experience may consist of three components – feeling, understanding and action. Hereby, the latter is not automatic, not subjective but free personal, i.e. purely creative action.

In this assumption we rely on the theoretical construction by L.S. Vygotsky, who in one of his last works outlined the solution of central problem for unity of affect and intellect for himself namely through completion of this system by action: “degree of development is the degree in transformation of dynamics of affect and dynamics

of real action into dynamics of thinking” [Vygotsky, 1982a, p. 252]. It seems to us that this structure has the general meaning for any psychological formations.

The experiences belong to such psychological phenomena, in which all components merge in single and momentary act. So, there appears the integrity, which further exists, not decomposing more. Even these experiences that stopped being actual are kept in such integral form, creating the practice of personality.

The experiences are presented to other people and subject itself in the form of symbol. According to Bakhtin, “the experience cannot be shown using a symbol... but in addition to its manifestation outside (for others), the experience for the one, who goes through, exists only in symbolic material” [Bakhtin, 1979, p. 31].

The symbolic nature of experience may mean only one: personality marks its experiences, i.e. we deal with one more specific form of activity. Besides, it also tells that experiences in human life are specific psychological means for acquisition of own inward world, behavior, and, finally, construction of higher psychical functions, and, on their basis, complex interfunctional systems.

The experimental model for psychological research of personal experiences can be such one, it is necessary to create the conditions for manifestation of creative activity at human and its expression – embodiment. Namely experimental situation shall model “the world around me”, in which it is possible “to enter” and to realize free (creative) actions. The situation may be deployed, i.e. represent the specific modification of genetically-modeling method.

It is necessary to fix experiences not due to self-reports but exclusively indirectly, determining their contours and content in specific products and processes of creative expression. The experiments that are now held may give answer about psychological nature of personal experiences, having confirmed, specified or rejected the stated assumptions.

Below we will consider the specificity, individuality for experience of works of art and attempts for experimental study of this phenomenon.

Esthetic experience, in opinion by L.S. Vygotsky, remains unclear and hidden from human due to its essence. “We will never learn, – he writes, – why we liked some or other work. All that we imagine for explanation of its action is the later assumption, absolute vivid rationalization of unconscious processes. The essence of experience itself remains a mystery for us” [Vygotsky, 1983, p. 20] (*emphasized by us*).

Since that time the psychology learnt very few new about esthetic experience, although it seems now that the work by L.S. Vygotsky shall just become a powerful impulse for research of this phenomenon.

But it has not become... However, the science, especially pedagogy, made very much to bring a human away as far as possible from free, not charged with stereotypes and instructions for perception of arts.

It is now surrounded by very powerful and wild aureole of abstract intellectual constructions and their consequences – didactic instructions what namely it is necessary to perceive, how namely it is necessary to do and what experience should be considered to be really esthetic, and, thus, – of full value. As it concerns the latter one, there is a great problem as, if to collect all definitions, which relate to this mysterious experience and to try to generalize – we receive something that in principle cannot be experienced and even imagined.

It happens when the scientific research of psychical reality, which part is experience, is substituted by “work” of researchers on their own logical schemes and constructions. Perhaps, there is another way to solve the mystery, noticed by L.S. Vygotsky. This way shall be in the field of psychology but not in the empyrean of researcher’s own thought. Probably, it is necessary to try to study namely the experience of art as absolutely concrete psychical phenomenon.

It is necessary to try to answer the question how a human goes through the arts but to answer not abstractly with detachment (studying a great number of developed definitions and schemes) and not introspectively (following only to own experiences and applying

them to all people) but to answer, *having asked a human that experiences about it.*

Here we touch a very acute, discordant and old aspect in problem on cognition of psychical reality (and cognition in general), formulated by E.V. Ilyenkov as the question about relation of “world in the consciousness” and “world beyond consciousness” [Ilyenkov, 1991, p. 49]. This eternal question, although it was principally solved already by B. Spinoza, however, the psychology for this solution is as if unnoticed, except only by L.S. Vygotsky.

Let’s remind that the contradiction is that the evidence about thing, phenomenon, which is beyond a human, compulsorily concern the inward world of the one, who cognizes, and thus objective knowledge of those external phenomena, independent on subject, seems rather problematic, and speaking precisely – just impossible.

Due to this, it is clear that many different explanations and interpretations of the same phenomena appear. “All this rather sufficiently testifies, – writes B. Spinoza, – that each judged about things according to organization of its own brain, or, better to say, accepted the state of capabilities of own imagination as the things themselves” [Spinoza, 1997, p. 400]. But is it possible to judge about things *only* according to *their* organization, ignoring the organization of inward world for the one, who cognizes? Of course, *no* as a result of cognition is always a “picture” in consciousness of subject of cognition.

But if it is so, we will never receive the objective knowledge and always deal with the myth, in which the parts of objective reality and our own psychical processes and states are fantastically interlaced. It is especially exacerbated during cognition of psychical reality, as the one, who cognizes, whether it strives or not, obligatorily “verifies” the evidences about certain psychical phenomena of testees, who, accordingly, have their own inward psychical space. And it is impossible to avoid it.

So, the psychological knowledge is mostly mythologized. But it turns out that it is not only it. The most advanced spheres of cognition (quantum physics, molecular biology, astrophysics) generate the real mythologemes (let’s remind at least about complementarity principle

in quantum mechanics). So, the problem in fact exists, and this justifies our address to well known philosophical antiquity, as it may seem.

The attempt to solve the abovementioned problem in psychology leads to a very interesting and paradoxical phenomenon – construction of numerous “authors’ theories”. L.S. Vygotsky described this processes in details [Vygotsky, 1982]. It is rather simple and exists in two main forms: one can build its own theory, having studied many other theories (in general it is not the theory but just a *scheme*), it is possible to add the description of a certain totality of psychological factors to study of foreign theories.

Most importantly – to create its own scheme (as imprint of researcher’s inward world) and then, as if lace, to put it on the whole diversity of psychological phenomena, considering some of them to be “correct” (i.e. such ones that correspond to the scheme), and other, of course, – artifacts, and to ignore them. The phenomena themselves, of course, are not studied here, so, everything is according to Spinoza (see the citation above).

So, we still have the myth, although as if from the other side. Thus, the myth about esthetic experience of personality has appeared.

Meantime Spinoza really solved the contradiction. Let’s remind that its solution is that approaching to cognition of nature of phenomenon (i.e. *objective* cognition) anticipates the active reproduction of trajectory of “body” motion, being cognized, by subject. And the more complex the theory is, the more unexpected it is, so, the activity of the one, who cognizes, shall be more diverse. If we use modern terminology – subject of cognition shall “use up” the phenomenon with its own activity.

How should we apply this to psychology, which studies not just the “body” but “thinking body”, i.e. another subject? It seems to us that for this, firstly, it is necessary to refuse, at last, from stimulus-reaction paradigm of research and to acknowledge the interaction and dialog with the same free and active subject (“thinking body”), which is a researcher himself as the only possible form for cognition.

And, secondly, it is necessary to refuse from creation of schemes-myths, having acknowledged a testee to be an inexhaustible and integral individuality, having understood – the scientific generalization in psychology is possible only when the facts – these are the facts of personality life but not some separate phantoms are received. It is necessary to work with human but not separately with its thinking, separately – with memory, separately – with emotions, etc. It is necessary to put questions to it, “to enforce” it to ask us – it will be our motion according to its “trajectory”, it will be its “exhaustion”.

M.M. Bakhtin and K. Rogers follow to such position: unlike natural scientific subject, personality may be understood only through putting questions to it and having a dialog with it. As it concerns our subject of study (esthetic experiences of personality), we assume that each human, if its organs of perception are normally developed, experiences a work of art in any kind of arts and at any level of complexity.

It is indisputable, if, according to V.K. Viliunas, to understand experience as a real carrier of psychical images. As it is, subjective experience is the compulsory and essential property of psychics but at the same time it is purely individual and specific. This contradictory union makes it especially interesting.

To experience – this does not mean just subjectively to feel and compulsorily to feel specially, somehow specifically, and this “somehow” is directly “caught” by subject in initial “language”, which it understands.

Is it possible seriously to hope that “having caught” the peculiarities for experiences of different people, we will be able to understand something about esthetic experience and in general and not to “dissolve” in “nasty infinity”? We hope to prove that this way is possible, and, moreover, much more efficient than the attempt to build up a certain theory-scheme with further “matching” empirical facts to it.

But the difficulties here are purely methodological and for experimental science – it is a usual thing. So, in order to clarify the specificity of esthetic experience, we refused from orientation to any

schemes and studied the individual peculiarities for subjective experience of work of art at different people and only after that we tried to generalize it.

The main but the only methodological difficulty in such approach is in the problem on verbalization of won experience by subject, which originally has the nonverbal character. Hereby the following expression by Tyutchev “a thought, being told, is a lie” – this is only a part of problem. It is also very essential that the speech (Vygotsky and Potebnya agree with this) – is not only the statement but at the same time the change in that one, which reflects this statement and grows in the word, hereby being significantly changed and built up (“thought” is here used in wide understanding as in general any subjective psychological practice, including experiences).

When a human tries to express experiences, it cannot only do it precisely but hereby really starts experiencing another thing: the original duplication of experience takes place. It is important that, expressing experiences, a human, whether it wants or not, rationalizes it, and there is the impression that the emotional component of experience disappears (if we ask a human, who is glad, to explain what it experiences now, it can try to do it but hereby it stops being glad).

This phenomenon, by the way, was very successfully described in fiction literature. In particular, Kostiantyn Levin (character from “Anna Karenina” by L. Tolstoy) very deeply experiences the beauty of nature but it is intolerably for him to speak about it and he does not like when others tell about it.

Verbalization (read – rationalization) ruins his experiences, making them unpleasant, rough and irrelevant. All this, thus, is the unconquerable obstacle for study of psychological experience, however, exclusively because a researcher and a testee, speaking about experience, internally, unnoticeably for themselves, divide it, pay attention only to rational component and hereby ruin the experience as it is.

When we tell “experience”, we almost always mean *understanding*. As the experience of work of art is the integral psychical structure, “unit”, and thus the attempts to divide it into

parts destroy it. Such attempts are the mistake of our life logic, which “prompts” that, perhaps, the experience consists of understanding and emotion as independent autonomous elements. K. Jung very precisely calls a work of art, which is born in human psychics, as an independent indivisible complex, which exists independently on consciousness, although, of course, can interact with it [Jung, 1996].

This interaction is the experience but not understanding because “when we are captured by the process of creativity, we do not see and do not understand: we shall compulsorily not understand because there is nothing more destructive for direct practice than study” [Jung, 1996, p. 23]. (By the way, this thought contains the answer to the question about peculiarity of that activity, which allows adequately *experiencing* a work of art: “direct practice”). The remark by K. Jung, as it concerns not only a creator but any human, who perceives a work of art, enables significantly specifying the subject of our analysis, i.e. to answer to the question, what namely (what psychological structure) a human experiences.

As it concerns this psychical structure, the notions by K. Jung, L.S. Vygotsky and O.O. Potebnya coincide, although they had different theoretical “world outlooks” and, of course, used different terminology. The one, which K. Jung called “autonomous complex”, was understood by Vygotsky as own artistic image of fantasy that appears at emotional influence on human in work of arts.

O.O. Potebnya clearly emphasizes the following dynamics of appearance: a work of art does not cover a human by definite image and preset experience but influences on it, stimulating the formation of individual specific fantasy, which this personality experiences.

Of course, we can neglect that authors, to whom we addressed, do not just use different terminology but interpret the nature of structure under discussion by a different way. It is, of course, right, especially if to be based on stereotypical interpretation of analytical psychology by Jung and cultural historical theory by Vygotsky. But it is not the discrepancy, which is important now, but the fact that these three most competent classics in psychology of art determined that the real psychological phenomenon, which appears in human at

perception of work of art, is certain integrity, psychological product, which the personality itself created.

It is common for all people. The individual concerns the fact what this product is, what namely appears in consciousness, whether its existence is limited only by psychics of subject; whether it will be materialized and will become a Creation, how vividly and sharply it is experienced.

Having settled most generally with the subject of research, we can now return to purely methodic problems. Firstly, our expression “to ask a human about its experiences” should not be understood very simply and literally, as in this case, as we have shown, the task is re-defined and the subject becomes not experience but understanding. We shall speak about certain interrogative situation, which would cause to explication namely of experience. Secondly, we consider the problem on statement of experience and its change thereby not as artifact but as index for psychological peculiarity of experience. And this peculiarity, hypothetically, may relate only to *verbal* statement, while other its ways may be more adequate.

On the other hand, psychological product (we deliberately here and there, when we speak about “product” or “structure”, do not use the concept “artistic image”, although it would be more appropriate. The thing is that this concept is used in literature, without relating it to the psychical reality. Unfortunately...), created by human in the process of perception-creation of work of art, is being built up during the whole time, remains in constant establishment.

And if this establishment occurs in the story about experience, so, it is again not a shortcoming but just the form for existence of experience, and hereby – namely the individual form.

Now we can fix upon some previous results. Considering the natural thing that the author experiences most brilliantly and sharply his work of art, we held the survey of those people, who create works of art (free survey was applied – description with further content-analysis). Studying the texts-retrospective and oral stories of people, who create works of art, we were not interested in their interpretation of motivation for creativity and authors’ interpretation of content of work as it is only “assumption”. We would like to determine, how

psychologically a human feels at the moment of creativity, which it experiences.

Authors are very original in understanding emotional well-being but the following moment really attracts the attention to itself. A work of art, when it is created, is experienced by author as separate, existing in his psychics, living spiritual subject (quasi-subject). It is detached, the dialog is run with it and hereby it is very active, has the expressed motivating function, to such extent that “it does not care about my problems, difficulties and desires – use up me in any case!” Such “coexistence” sometimes provides with joy, sometimes frightens but is always very emotional.

Besides, it is rather dynamic, controversial and is in development during the whole time. The objective confirmation for such specific dialog is rather larger, than usually, development of internal speech at authors, regardless of the field of arts, in which they create as the art at this level is amodal. (By the way, the development of internal speech can be considered as a very essential psychological index for experience of art, and it is reasonable to deploy the experimental research in this direction).

The type of interrelations between an author and a work of art at this stage is the experience of one another, which is not reduced separately to understanding or emotion. The availability of this complicated complex at human defines the individuality of experience not in relation to its difference for others but in relation to the fact that such thing may be experience by a human, who is a developed individuality.

We based namely on this approach, providing with definition for specificity in experience of art. Besides, the answers of our testees point out to the fact that experience itself consists not of two but three elements.

This third one is imagination. “The image of imagination, – thinks Yu.M. Shvalb, – is the embodied experience” [Shvalb, 1997, p. 65]. Moreover, this is namely mine, individual experience as the image is always purely individual.

Imagination as if “completes” the psychological structure for experience of art and “explains” why it could be *only* and exclusively

individual. It becomes clear that the appearance of this experience requires from human the free, not burdened by stereotypes and tasks, contemplation-immersion into work of art as it is the condition for creation of own image.

Returning to researches of authors, it is necessary to speak, on the one hand, about level in differentiation of Ego: it is less differentiated in those ones, who feel the **merger** with work of art (“I and work of art – are the whole”); here the experience of work of art is lost and transformed into experience of itself. On the other hand, there is the sense to speak about force of Ego: a human either controls its experience, interrelations with “complex-image”, or it is subordinated to the latter one.

It is clear that experiences of authors are the highest level of interrelations with art. It is important because it sets the essential criterion: availability of internal psychological subject of experience – artistic product. Our researches on peculiarities for perception of music and fiction literature by children of different age testify that such product is created only at certain stages of ontogenesis and depends in its complexity (brightness, maturity) on many internal and external factors.

In particular, only insignificant part of children in junior school age can create the internal artistic product and is able to reflect its own experience. We call this peculiarity as esthetic activity. The literature provides with evidences about peculiarities in experience of work of art due to availability or absence of esthetic activity. As a very vivid (although somewhat original) fact for such discrepancy, we will mention, for example, the difference in experience of novel by D. Joyce “Willis” by character of E. Hemingway, boy-teenager, son of artist (E. Hemingway “Islands in the ocean”) and by psychoanalyst K. Jung that is described in his article, devoted to this novel.

This unexpected and far comparison is still very significant. The boy liked the novel, something attracts and pushes off him but the main thing for him is the incomprehensibility and hope that sometimes he will understand it.

The internal artistic product has not been created but there is the emotion, motivation and hope – these are the experiences in

character by E. Hemingway. K. Jung, on the contrary, demonstrates the highest type of esthetic activity. He as if carries out a simple and rational analysis of work and such work, which he does not like.

But the whole text of work is really super difficult and super delicate experience of that “monster” – internal image, which is created and as if does not want to be completed in the consciousness of scientist. Jung in fact reflects a complex dialog-experience, which he carries out with incomplete image, generated by his psychics under influence of “Willis”. There are here very many nuances, feelings and symbols, hypotheses and disappointments. It is seen how experiences of author are changed in statements, he himself understands this and treats to it by a certain manner, and he cannot stop and finally breaks his sketch without completion.

The acquaintance with this work enabled us looking at the reason for difficulties in perception of works, like “Willis”, by a different way. We assume that the main thing here is not in some so-called special preparation of reader but namely in correlation of understanding and experience. The stereotype of perception in most people is that they firstly seek to understand the creation, i.e. to realize the logic of author by their own logical system, “to bind” the particles of own life to it and then to experience all that.

If the logic of author is very difficult and is not subject to this procedure (i.e. it is just boundary individual and thus is not stereotyped), so, the perception is mostly often finished after the first unsuccessful contact. And the point here is not in the level of development of rational onset but in its dominance. The boy – character by Hemingway – wants namely *to understand* the novel, cannot do it and... the experience does not take place as it is ruined by subject itself in fact before start of perception. K. Jung, on the contrary, declares the desire to understand but in fact wants *to experience* the novel and, thanks to artistic (we cannot tell otherwise) talent, tries to verbalize this experience for reader.

But these two figures are similar between themselves because the internal artistic product has not been created at them – the third element of experience – imagination – has not “worked out”. Thus

Jung, despite his talent, moves inside his feelings during the whole time but does not experience the work

We can run the longitudinal research of human, being usual due to level of intellectual development, without interruption, starting since early childhood, during 20 years already. Along with the early development of certain disposition to painting (which has not received further development) and good musical capabilities, it is distinguished with impressive easiness in perception of traditional “difficult” works in fiction literature, in particular, by such authors as James, Kafka, Bulgakov, Nabokov, Hesse, Misima, etc. Our special conversations with testee testify that here there is no dashing and “tear”. He really likes it and it is easy for him.

Mostly important, author should be a real artist, creator. “I as if speak with interesting and kind human that sees the world by such way. It is interesting for me to compare. I feel that there are these worlds in me. There is no need only to ask, what the writer wanted to say, what he teaches and which methods he uses”. It seems to us that in this case we deal with prevalence namely of experience in perception of work of art, when understanding as purely rational operation turns out be just unnecessary. Everything is “clear” already in the act of experience. Perhaps, there is the sense to speak about special capability of contemplation as the necessary condition for experience of art. We understand contemplation as the special, free and not pragmatic perception, which is not directed to search for “useful, strong” sides of object (according to S.L. Rubinstein).

One more aspect in study on individuality of experience of art relates to methodological procedure for receipt of original statement of experience in situation of quasi-creativity. The idea is in the exteriorization of psychological product – result from perception in forms of other kind of art. This process, on the one hand, stimulates experience, and on the other hand, – facilitates their expression, omitting the monological verbalization. In the abovementioned approach there is one more meaningful layer of analysis, which we cannot consider here – this procedure really puts a human to the position of creator and specifically unites the contemplation and esthetic activity in it.

Such position is inherent to professionals-interpreters (producer, conductor, choreographer, musician-performer, translator of fiction texts, etc.).

We asked the testees (pupils of the 10th form) to read a small work (it was the story by O. Grin “Aquarelle”) and then to imagine, how they would make a film by this story. So, we tried to create the position of author, i.e. it was necessary to create a product – result of perception – and to demonstrate its experiences. The experiment proved the existence of mechanism for experience of work of art, described by us. It also showed that this experience is known for each and all pupils, although it has individual peculiarities.

It is clear that our work, so to say, has the production-search character, it should be considered as our experience of problem to more extent than scientific interpretation. We do not analyze here the qualitative individual experiences of work of art but at this stage it could not be a part of task for our research.

But the main thing may be considered to be proved: if we digress from preset abstract theories-schemes and from epithets, from which “gave a thrill” (oh, this is the real (!) artistic experience), and to return to personality, to collect empirical (i.e. scientific reliable, verified) facts, we can study the mysterious phenomenon for esthetical component of our consciousness more efficiently.

So, the experiences appear at us as a result from perception of art, and this definitely means that they are esthetic. Further already – the issue about their content and possibility of research that as we tried to show, is the problem, which can be solved.

In general, the problems of experience within the context of research on establishment of personality could be revealed in expression “experience of need” or “need in experience”, or, if we address to the research on esthetic experience, described here, “experience of beautiful” or “need in beautiful to be experienced”. Let’s consider these explications in succession.

Need as unique intentional informative source and carrier of life, psychics, may recognize itself if it becomes the fact of my personality (my practice, life).

It alone creates the structure, the knot in its eternal motion, being complicated, which is able not only to learn about it but to accept and bear it further but already subjectively.

So, Ego shall appear as embodiment of the need from two loving people in each other and in me – in the future – in order to be able to stop, to rise and – to go through the one that gave birth to me. It is the real transcendence. To experience the need as a source and force of your life is not the same as to realize it. To experience is not only to recognize and to understand but to feel, to reveal, to accept and to change; on the other hand, to experience the need is not the same as to experience intention (demand, motive, purpose, etc.), although the psychological mechanism is the same.

We really experience the need when it becomes impossible to live but ... very, extremely necessary, and we get up, renew, live... And we experience rather rare, although this experience returns. The process of appearance, progress, suspension, new appearance of experience of need discovers many things for genetic psychology of personality.

First of all, let's repeat this, although the need is the universal source – carrier of any life (the whole life!), only a human can experience it as it is, and it becomes clear that the experience anticipates the personality (the one, who experiences). The difference between feeling and experience passes by this border – feeling is the reflected reality and experience is the transformed reality, which became mine. The experience of the need not in vain appears in crisis, critical times – I can already exist just as object of its embodiment, I either in general stop existing or, revealing, accept it, make the step towards it and experience it. And hereby I make it mine (myself) and hereby I become the other one myself.

And it, the need, for a short period of time, will become the object of my experience (transference by me into mine – living), and then we will become the whole but I will already know about it. Thus, it is necessary to have the object (being experienced) but this is the

special object as I will be able to experience it only in the case if it exists in some relation to me before this, originally and potentially. The need shall, if you want, “require the experience” and only providing that it has such quality, in general someone sometimes will be able to experience it.

Likewise “the beautiful” shall have certain attributive characteristics that define its “aspiration” to be experienced (V. Solovyov in his time insisted on it very much). So, I will be able to experience only something, only someone, who already originally somehow definitely enters my life. And, at last, what does it mean “to experience”, what is namely this process? First of all – this is the process itself and not the act, this is the flow. We can feel (i.e. reflect) only immediately, the experience obligatorily lasts. And during this time I define it and recognize, open and reveal myself, change and am changed, and this is the creation of my inward world – myself.

In general this is the process of interaction: meeting (high emotionality, tension) – study (internal work) – habituation (introduction into inward world, structurization) – transference into practice (attenuation, loss of actuality) – new meeting.

And namely hence we have “need in experience”, when the need, experienced by me once, is transformed and the new vector appears “on it” – “it” also requires the experiences. Do not confuse this with demands on expressions, in fact, need in activity on creation and development of myself, this is the way for self-development of me as personality.

SOURCES FOR ACTIVITY OF PERSONALITY

The important component of inward world is intentions, within the wide meaning of this term. All that is united in concept of driving forces, sources of activity, and sources of development is called motives, demands, dispositions, instincts in the science. This component of psychics, component of personality, shall undoubtedly, be considered as a component of inward world. In the psychological science there are many approaches to consideration of this phenomenon. Perhaps, it will be correct to tell that psychology of personality and in general modern psychology – it is almost by 90% psychology of motivation.

Each theory of personality considers the motives as one of the most important components. It is necessary to mention that in different theories they are considered so differently that it is impossible to determine almost any correlation among them. In principle, it is a natural process; we cannot tell that this is bad. Something similar was with biology, when the epoch of conquest of new lands, epoch of discoveries took place in the middle ages. The largest material about plants and animals was collected. And the scientists did not know how to be with them. Thus, the task for systematization has appeared. Darwin's theory has appeared through researches by Linney and Lamark and people started understanding something about biology.

Within the context of our approach to understanding of person we also may express our opinions on intentions, on motive-demand sphere of personality as a component of inward world itself. But firstly let's explain why we refer this namely to inward world of personality, although traditionally in national psychology it refers to orientation. We think that this is a mistake because, speaking about orientation, we speak about consciously set distant purposes, senses and values of personality, and this, of course, relates to demand sphere but as to all other sphere, not more.

There is the largest distance between demand and purpose, between demand and motive, between demand and value. We cannot tell that we shall include instincts, dispositions, aspirations,

demands, etc. into the system of orientation. Thus, we think that this is the inward world. On the other hand, of course, if we speak about experience as about constitutive phenomenon of inward world, so, first of all, a human experiences namely the intention.

The initial component in motivation-demand intentional sphere of personality is constant, stable, dynamic, energetic state, which we call the demand. This is some carrier, energy consumptive, some force, which provides with motion, existence of living being in general, and makes it arranged, anticipated and infinitely existing, that one that develops. That is in fact its development, its growth is finished only when a physical body cannot already exist further. But this carrier, this demand exists always.

We think that it is very close to understanding of orthogenesis, which exists in modern biology and which means, in principle that the development of any living being is always oriented. The researches of scientists at the beginning of XX – end of XIX century, scientists biologists-evolutionists determined a very interesting thing, which contradicts, in principle, to Darwin's law. The point is that in fact the evolution of living is not surprising. It is directed.

Hereby, it is interesting that here we do not speak about any theology and supernaturalness. The absolute empirical orientation was found out. For all that in all systems of organism there is the chance – in morphology, physiology, internal structure and in all others, there is one system without any chance. This is the nervous system. The whole evolution of living in the planet is directed to the side of complication and development of the nervous system. This is the definite, absolute clear index and vector of existence and life in the Earth. This is the orthogenesis. That is it means the orientation of development and it means the complication of development.

In fact the theory of orthogenesis is not specially accepted in modern biology and in general is not considered in modern psychology. However, we think that fact show that it should obligatorily be considered.

And in this connection we have a very interesting phenomenon for development of personality. We see that the form for coexistence of the biological and social is always in human, directly starting not

since birth but since generation as a living being, passes through its whole life, its death and proceeds into something else. This form for connection is changed. It is the same during reproduction at merger of two cells of human, which obligatorily bear some social influences, social peculiarities of those people, it is absolutely different when organism develops inside the mother but again these are obligatorily biosocial connections.

As we know that a fetus very early starts hearing, a fetus very early starts perceiving. As all systems of organism, which are linked with the mother are human systems, and, so, in the nearest future they all the same originate from biosocial beings. So, a person, in principle is infinite in that sense that it is always included into the process for unity of the biological and social. Thus, unlike Freud, who thought that the initial, intentional element of human is purely biological, purely biological demands, we think that human has no purely biological demands and never had, and cannot be. And we really agree in this with Freud.

But the thing is that originally this is not the biological force. Maslou told, polemizing with Freud, that instinctive, biological demands really exist at human but they, in opinion of Maslou, are so weak that unlike the rest of animals they will not help a human to survive, and it is enforced very quickly to acquire some other intentions, which appear through combination of the biological with the social surrounding. The attempt by A. Maslou seems very interesting but it is somewhat mechanistic in the terms of disproof of Freud's point of view. Everything is much deeper.

In fact, the initial intentional force (here we are referred to the first group of theories according to Allport) – this is the demand as energetic carrier. The demand is just the aspiration to live, aspiration to exist. But, unlike Freud, we think that this aspiration is not purely biological, it is namely biosocial because it is the aspiration of biosocial being. And it is transferred to this being by social beings and not biological. It principally changes the case.

Based on this approach, the whole further theoretical concept by Freud shall undergo to serious changes because it turns out to be incorrect and one-sided.

And then it is really clear why this theory is the theory of neurotic person. Since really such personality has purely biological demands, although we do not know anything about such peculiarities.

The intentional sphere is built up at human by the following way. This is some desire, which exists at once. It is transferred into impregnated cell from two cells of parents. The function is transferred together with the structure, as well as aspirations. It is never objectivated in the whole. And this is a very interesting law. L.S. Vygotsky in his time was very close to such point of view.

Describing juvenile age, he suggested a very interesting scheme that as if blank centers appear at human on the single intentional carrier. And when this carrier, which excites the activity, a child exists in this activity, meets with that subject or phenomenon, which can partially satisfy this desire, which is caused by this carrier, so, the demand appears in this center. So, for example, the demand on food, demand on impressions, and demand on another human appears.

We have already mentioned above about how Lisina found out that there is no initial demand on communication at child, it reduces this demand again only to biology. And an adult stands to the way for satisfaction of this demand. The demand on adult appears on the eighth-tenth week of child life namely as demand on adult because he just stands nearby during the whole time. Thus, these centers are branched during the whole time. New and new demands appear, and they, unlike general demand, are already visible and concrete. But these specifics appear only when the initial demand meets with the one, which partially satisfies it.

Namely partially because it, in whole, is objectivated only once, at mature human at meeting with similar mature human, and then the whole biosocial demand is objectivated one on another. And as a result from this objectivation is the product, and this product is a new living being – child. So, we think that the demand in the whole at human is objectivated only once in life.

Well, in principle, not once if there are many children, so, some times. But the love shall obligatorily be present.

That is, it shall be the valuable and integral attitude to another being. In the rest of cases this carrier is never satisfied all in the

whole. It is satisfied partially, remaining energetic during the whole time. And here the demand appears namely by this way. It can appear by a different way. It may appear, for example, when there is no definite, directed desire but the image or subject that it wanted may just appear to a human.

The meeting with demand may occur not inside when as if searching activity is run, when I meet with the object, and then the demand is born, and it can be in calm state when there is no such searching activity but the object appears suddenly, and a human understands that it wants this object. And then the demand appears. Thus, perhaps, the demand of toy appears at child. This is absolutely not the demand on communication.

The demand on communication naturally appears inside. And the demand on toy may appear from outside. Thus, a great number of other demands appear at adult, when, speaking roughly, my neighbor has something that I do not have and I wanted this as well. But again it is the layer. The demand always has, and again we refer to Vygotsky, who really very close came to such interpretation of life, collision with social system, symbolic system, when in fact the duplication of psychological world of personality takes place, and then we speak about self-consciousness.

In the whole we come to the following understanding of intention: the intentions starts being experienced when the demand appears. That is this layer is filled in, and then the experience appears. We cannot tell about unrealized demands, undoubtedly, we cannot, likewise we cannot tell about unrealized motives. It seems to us that all this relates just to multivalence of approaches in literature. But if we take the clear, strict genetic, orthogenetic criterion, so, we can tell that the demand would always be experienced.

And it means that it is realized. And it means that, generally speaking, we are in position that the question about appearance of consciousness shall not be put in the correct psychological research.

It, undoubtedly, does not appear. This is precise. As the whole personality. It does not appear from non-personality, as well as a living body does not appear from not living, likewise the consciousness does not appear from unconscious. There is some

constant process; the form for representation of those phenomena is just changed.

Character

Character – it is certain stable forms for behavior and emotional response of a certain human, which are shown and exist, first of all, in its communication, social relations with other personalities, and they as so specific, original and various that their totality is the original integral “picture” – unrepeated picture of personality. And it is not in vain that character in translation from Old Greek means “stamp”, i.e. a complete original imprint of a certain concrete being. So, speaking about character, we mention those stable, unrepeated, unique connections and relations, which are crystallized in this human into features.

Very many researchers considered the structure of personality as a set of features (Allport, R. Kettel, G. Eysenck, and many other). Thus, it is important and really essential but what is behind a feature? The whole structure of personality is behind it. When, for example, we speak about a certain feature, in fact we tell about way of behavior, way of interrelations of human with surrounding. It receives the name of word in culture. A feature – it is a definite image of action, which characterizes the way of interrelations with other people. Behind it there is the orientation, biological background of personality, which is expressed in it; practice, which is very important in this case, and at last, the sphere of capabilities.

And, of course, there is the inward world and internal experience is behind it: how can I see this world, how can I see other people? Can, let's say kindness, as a feature of character, be born at inadequate perception of other persons, other people? This is problematic. So, a feature is really a very important and essential quality of human. This is the stable quality, stable way of communication and interaction.

It crystallizes the whole personality in itself, is the manifestation of it as integrity. And as personality is unique we have a diversity of features, unrepeated features of character. But mentioning that the

past interrelations of human, past relations are expressed in character, we tell only one half of the truth: it is necessary to consider the character not only from the point of the past but from the perspective future.

There is the sense to distinguish those features, which assist to further motion of human, its new purposes and ways for their achievement. The character should be considered from the point of future but not the past because features – it is the forecast, as they are stable, and thanks to this they make the behavior anticipated and expected. The features of character are formed, being based on the future, as not only the available system of interrelations forms a feature. The one, for what a human strives, forms it.

There is the third side: a feature of character is a motivator itself. That is I behave by such a way so that it would correspond to my features of character. If I am an honest man (i.e. I have the corresponding feature, I commit honestly, I feel the desire to do namely like this, and then I feel well and comfortably. We all know from life: if we act against our feature – we feel a very serious internal discomfort. This occurs because the motive is frustrated as a feature motivates the behavior. And here we have one more, deep bunch of all substructures. It turns out, if we think over, that they all are linked each with other functionally.

So, a feature – this is the way of behavior and motive. Very often a feature – this is a capability but if we speak, for example, about working capability, perseverance, tension (disposition to strained work), we speak namely about feature but at the same time we speak about capability. In general, we very often come to these combinations: a clever man – this is a characterological feature but, on the other hand, this is a capability, and on the third hand – this is a process yet.

Here it is seen very well that in fact our terms and names, these are really concepts, they are so polysemantic that everything depends on the starting point. An experienced human – this is a feature of character and this is a capability. The connection of substructures is very important and it shows well that in fact they are

linked not only between themselves but with the integral personality as it.

Genetic psychology is interested first of all in appearance and development of character. Of course, the appearance of character relates to biological substructure. The features of character that are formed at human very often depend on the nervous system, temperamental peculiarities of human. It is in general indisputable. But the question is in another thing: how does a feature appear? There is the idea that a feature appears as a way for achievement of purpose. What does it mean? There is the purpose and the ways for its achievement and as a rule there are some ways.

For example, the purpose of student is to receive the positive mark at the exam. What are the ways for achievement of this purpose? One student sits and scrupulously and assiduously learns everything what a teacher requires, what is necessary, what is in literature and questions to exam. He prepares and, strictly speaking, goes to this purpose. The purpose remains the same but we take another student, who decides that it is possible to go another way: to address to competent relative or friend and to try “to contact” with this teacher so that the requirements to him would be mitigated, and the purpose will again be achieved. That is, the way of motion to this purpose is another one.

The third student decides that he can just pay and it is not necessary to seek for anyone and achieves that purpose. The fourth student decides by a different way, he can manipulate, may pretend to be ill, or, on the contrary, very “clever”, be very interested, worry about teacher, its subject, etc. It means that we can notice some ways for achievement of the same purpose. The question is what way this concrete human chooses, – this is its feature. It is already an adult, and the features of character have already formed at it. It will choose the way, which will be comfortable for it. It may choose another way and then this will be related with discomfort for human.

“Its” way is formed in childhood when a child has not stable features of character that have formed yet. For example, a child wants a toy – it may ask the mother but she does not buy it, then it can again ask the mother and can ask the grandmother or it can be

naughty and suddenly: the purpose is achieved. This is the way and later we will call this way as adherence to principle, frankness, and slyness or by some other way. And further the stable way of behavior is formed. It is clear that this way depends on the nervous system, surrounding, intellect, other properties: on experiences of this human and the whole practice as well.

And then it is stated: it is founded by this way, although, this is, undoubtedly, the potency: necessary action, success and consolidation of comfort experience.

In any case, the formation of feature proceeds as formation of way for realization of purpose. A human always has the purposes because they are not related with demands. And it is the purposes that are important but not the demands, i.e. the one that a human plans itself. Thus, the strong connection of character with goal-setting and consciousness in general is shown.

The question about level in development of features is important, and here we speak about accentuation and psychopathy as about certain deviations and as about levels in expressiveness of features. This material is widely presented in literature. It is important for us that here the relation with integral personality is seen very well. But, if, for example, we mean such accentuation as ostentation (hysteroïdness), its availability means that a human obligatorily wants to become a center of attention, it is as if nourished by attention of others and cannot exist by a different way.

Very strong displacement is inherent to those people, they often do not remember any failures, believe in themselves when they are ill, and other people believe in this. All this is made in order to attract the attention but it does not mean that ostentation is not only the characterological feature, here the whole personality is expressed as in drop of water: this is a special flow of experiences, original system for perception of the world in the whole, specific hierarchy of values, this is the practice, which tells a human, whether it is necessary to move forwards. Here the whole personality is concentrated here, and we start again seeing the integrity in manifestation of human natures in accentuations, in psychopathies.

The problems on study of character in psychology first of all relate to indetermination in subject of research. On the one hand, the features of human character are traditionally in researches identified with properties of its temperament. In particular, this tradition is stable in clinical psychology: E. Krechmer, U. Sheldon, K. Leongard, M.P. Gannushkin, K.-G. Jung studied in fact the conglomeration of temperamental and characterological properties, calling it all by one term “character”.

On the other hand, another tradition is to try to identify the features of character and features of personality. G. Allport, for example, in general considered the concept “character” to be not so important for analysis of personality: “... the psychological fact is that human qualities – this is just that it has.

Due to that reason and according to our own definition, we prefer the conception that character should be interpreted as assessed personality, and personality, if you like, as non-assessed character” [210, 239]. Thus, we speak about character as a social assessment of behavior (personality in the whole) on the part of other people. In fact, the phenomenon of character in such statement is brought beyond psychology. Both extreme positions may easily be explained by practical tasks (in case of clinical psychology) and theoretical opinions of authors (in both cases). But does it mean that the concept of character “suspends” and in fact has no adequate psychological subject?

We do not think so. L.S. Vygotsky in his time mentioned that the freezing of researches on character is stipulated exclusively by static approach, within which it is in fact necessary to be engaged exclusively in classification of characters and to dispute what a feature is, strictly speaking: a part of character or construct of personality. Let’s listen to the logic of L.S. Vygotsky. The study on character through observation and description of separate features, properties and manifestations is, by Vygotsky, necessary but the initial and insufficient stage of research. It is impossible to understand the main thing – psychological essence of phenomenon by such way.

There is the comparison and classification. L.S. Vygotsky, however, writes: “It is in vain that character analysis from Hippocrates to Krechmer struggles over classification as over the main problem of character. The classification can only be scientifically grounded and fruitful, when it is based on essential feature of phenomena that are divided into different classes, i.e. when it originally anticipates the knowledge about essence of phenomenon... But “the essence of affairs” is the dialectic of affairs, and it is opened in dynamics, in process of motion, changes, establishment and destruction, in study of genesis and development” [Vygotsky, 1991a, p. 154].

In order to understand the peculiarities for character of martyr, who goes to execution with joy, hereby defending his ideals, himself, it is necessary, – tells Vygotsky, to determine how, under which conditions this character has appeared, what makes a martyr be glad, what, strictly speaking, history of this joy.

“Statically the character equals to the sum of known main features of personality and behavior, and it is the cross section of personality, its unchanged status, its available state” [Vygotsky, 1991a, p. 156]. We have the ideal abstract scholastic model for “stopped” personality. The misunderstanding is overcome in it: character is the sum (i.e. the one that unites) of properties and states of personality. Of course, such model is the scheme, which object (i.e. the one that it reflects, “schematizes”) does not exist in such form (“stopped” personality, in fact is a dead body, and it is clear that it does not have any character yet).

But at the same time this scheme allows understanding something very important: character – this is the only psychical phenomenon, which we can directly observe as a behavioral manifestation for sum of personal features. The only thing we need to add – this is not sudden but typical, inherent, “characteristic” behavior of human. We can see a feature of character, unlike a feature of personality but these formations are cardinally different, despite that they can be called by one term. A feature of peculiarity has the value-notion nature (and not directly-motivational) and shall be considered as a human readiness to act accordingly.

Joshua of M. Bulgakov is undoubtedly right within this sense in his statement that each human is a kind human. A feature of character is a real way to solve vital, first of all – pragmatic and communicative situations by this concrete human. The existence of kindness as a feature of character means that the abovementioned readiness has passed a long way, “entering” into different interrelations with other numerous properties of personality (including with biopsychic, temperamental tendencies), “having met” with different and ambiguous reactions of external environment (first of all – social) for many times, formed the complex and stable interfunctional system, which defines such way of actions and interactions, according to which any harm never made to another human.

It is difficult and not already highly probable. Within this sense (let’s return to M. Bulgakov) vis-à-vis of Joshua – Pontius Pilate was more right. It turns out that interlocutors told about different psychical phenomena! A feature of character turns out to be related (and dependent) with a great number of factors and causes, so, within a certain logics namely its existence is problematic. Even the term “feature of character” is rather indefinite as long as absolutely inappropriate and incorrect.

At least, we tell: “a kind human”, “a malicious human” but not “a kind character”, etc. On the other hand, we use expressions “good” or “bad” character. It seems to us that it is not surprising. “Feature” of character (“kindness”) crystallizes not only the whole personality with its real complexity in itself but the whole character, all other, so to say, “features”. And that’s why we tell about kindness as a universal quality (“a kind human”).

On the other hand, is it always the definition “a kind human” and “good character” are the synonyms in the terms of assessment, i.e. does it mean that a kind person always has good character?. No, it does not. This is as a dominant and, at the same time, restriction: in most essential, valuable and important for itself situations, in those ones, in which it consciously controls, and, in general, “to a large extent”, this human will not allow that its action would make any harm to the others. This is what it means. But at the same time this

human may be very passionate, principal, self-assured, etc. – and all this will not allow telling that its character is good in the whole.

As we see, there are many unclear things, and the number of questions at reader grows – we strived namely for it. The point is that a static model is limited, and it does not allow understanding the real character in real life. It is necessary, let's again return to Vygotsky, “to understand the character dynamically – i.e. to translate it into language of purposeful instructions in social environment, to understand it in the struggle to overcome obstacles, in necessity for its appearance and deployment, in internal logics of its development” [Vygotsky, 1991a, p. 156].

The character does not just appear – it is created by human itself, and within this sense the character is that phenomenon, which is mostly linked with the action of the need, and, on the other hand, with higher psychical functions.

Z. Freud paid the great attention in his theory to character, considering it to be the system of inherited dispositions. In fact, the character for Freud was completely defined by the biological – it was a hard affection to the past: character of human, as a convict to chains is bound to its past.

No one, in fact, can reject the influence, which the biosocial inborn dispositions of human have on character – it would be careless and just wrong. But the essence for appearance of character is in fact linked with attempt of human to get rid of these “tortures” of the past, to possess them!

The need cause to motion of personality – motion to the world, so that to become someone in this world, i.e. – to occupation of a certain position. In time this motion and its direction will be realized by human but before it the character will already be formed mainly. How to explain this? The need is not the undirected force, on the contrary, it always (at the first stages beyond the consciousness of human itself) directs it in a very clearly definite direction – to meeting and interaction. The meeting generates the demand and a bit later – conscious goal-setting and interaction is the means. Hereby, we mean the interaction in a wide sense – not only with human but with

any being, subject of phenomenon. The interaction allows retaining and achieving the demand but not only that.

It (interaction) acts as a “magic” mechanisms, so to say, “back action” – allows acquiring (sometimes – overcoming) own directly-natural properties, drives, dispositions. B.M. Teplov in his time told that the appearance of character – this is the acquisition of own temperamental properties and dispositions by human. The interaction is the process, in which the whole personality as integrity, no matter how partial and discrete this operation would seem to us, takes part. Hence – character as integrity.

So, the ways of actions are formed in interaction, caused by need, i.e. the character is formed. Why do we tell that a human itself creates the character? Because the interaction anticipates the action of this human as an obligatory component and the action is such activity, which is incited by own purpose. Goal-setting turns out to be the process that appears much earlier in ontogenesis than it is accepted to think. Let’s remember the indicating gesture as unsuccessful grabbing.

The latter one is nothing else but action, and, thus – it was caused by purpose: if grabbing was successful – it would be one interaction and the corresponding means would be formed in it.

If it was unsuccessful – we have the incomplete action and appearance of a new “figurant” – social adult, who satisfies the demand and ruins the purpose; however, it forms new ways of interaction and, at the same time, making them self-assessed, incites the setting of a new purpose by a child, already – for interaction with itself. And this interaction in fact is the creation of a new nature of child. L.S. Vygotsky originally told on this occasion: “The interaction with adult leads us from inherited nature to the new, “acquired” nature of human, or, using the old expression – from old Adam leads a human to new Adam, new friend of human nature” [Vygotsky, 1982, p. 164].

It should be mentioned that the described phenomena are inherent only to early stages of ontogenesis – only here a certain disarrangement of features is felt. However, the central and the only main line of personality – “Key line of life” (L.S. Vygotsky) appears

very quickly, which is directed to the social personal growth and formation of social position. Features, ways of actions are arranged and grouped around this line and, purely, character is not any behavioral manifestations in general but only – stable and such ones that are closely interlaced with this line. Namely within this sense we tell that character is defined not by the past but by the future in life of personality. Thus, the character acquires orderliness and structured statefulness. L.S. Vygotsky and S.L. Rubinstein, independently of each other, agreed with this thought.

L.S. Vygotsky wrote: “Character is the social stamp of personality. It is the crystallized typical behavior of personality in struggle for social position. It is the plotting of the main line, key line of life, life plan, single life direction of all psychical acts and functions” [Vygotsky, 1991, p. 156]. S.L. Rubinstein mentioned: “Features of character – these are such essential properties of human, from which one line of behavior, the same actions appear in a certain definite logic and internal succession... The definiteness, which constitutes the essence of character, may be created at human in relation to what is not indifferent to it” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 220].

But it means that the availability of character alone means that this human has something in the world, which is not indifferent to it, what it treats passionately. And thus we start understanding the connection of character with orientation. The orientation structures the character, and the strong intergrowth, which defines integrity, appears. A life journey of each personality is in fact the realization of its orientation to the future thanks to individual specific ways of actions and interrelations (character).

Such vision enables assessing the meaning of obstacles on life journey of human: overcoming an obstacle means the consolidation of character composition and orientation and, on the other hand, creation of variety for ways of actions, i.e. appearance of new features but within this complex “orientation – character”.

Now we can understand the joy of martyr, who goes to execution, defending his ideals and values. His character was formed in unity with orientation, overcoming a great number of obstacles, and each

time overcoming brought with joy of victory and joy of feeling of his rightness. This is the dynamics of life. And the situation of execution is assessed by this human as overcoming one more obstacle. And he already knows that he will overcome it – hence the joy is. This character has been formed by this way.

We understood the psychological mechanism but at the same time it leads us out to other, higher ethical spheres: namely here we see the cardinal difference of character and personality. Jesus Christ and terrorist- self-murderer at final stage of his life act absolutely due to the same psychological mechanism – preservation of his integrity, his values and ideals at the cost of loss of own life. We will not be able to understand the principal difference of their behavior, if we are based exclusively on this final moment and exclusively on character. We should not forget that this deed is the final chain of their lives and we can understand it only analyzing the whole motion.

There are a number of acute questions, both personal and purely characterological. We can answer these questions, using an interesting concept “key experience” (E. Krechmer, L.S. Vygotsky, L.I. Bozhovych), which, according to the words by Vygotsky, suits to the character of personality as a key to lock. The gradual creation of complex “orientation – character” in ontogenesis, leads, on top of everything else, to differentiation of inward world at personality.

The special experiences that appear in connection with the events, which are most closely and most directly linked with senses and values (orientation), are distinguished in it.

At the same time they are relevant to character (if, let’s say, the fate of my children is the actual sense and real but not only declarative, value of my life, my character will obligatorily be structured around this value. And then everything that to any extent relates to their fate will be experienced by be deeply and sharply, literally influencing on characterological structure. On the other hand, my own purposes and deeds will compulsorily be considered, analyzed and experienced by me within the context of this value. The activation of key experience (strictly speaking, its evocation) is the event in life of personality, which enforces to act integrally, according to its real essence.

Thus, the formation of key experience is the original reflection of genesis of human character and orientation in its inward world. From this point of view, Jesus is the symbol of openness to problems of all people and worry about their fate, their spiritual state. The one that concerns these spheres excites the key experience in it – deep, notional, “real”. It turns out to be so important that He considers his death as the last means to return people to the good and spirituality. Let’s pay our attention: in fact He takes the death not for the sake of defense of own ideals but for the sake of other people. This is principal.

We observe quite another genesis at terrorist-self-murderer: originally he divides all people into good “we” and bad “they”. His ideals are that “they” (enemies) prevent from ideal (in his understanding) existence. So, “they” shall disappear, although together with my life – for the sake of further existence of the ideal. This is the closeness and deprivation that became the character, related with the narrow orientation.

The abovementioned examples are essential from one more point of view – they explain the real connection of character with the will of human. The closeness of these phenomena is fixed in language – expressions “strong-willed person” and “person with character” are synonymic.

But we cannot identify the will with character as S.L. Rubinstein clearly emphasized [Rubinstein, 1940]. The will acts as the factor that stipulates important but only one quality of character – its strength (stability, resolution, persistence). But as Rubinstein correctly mentions, the character is not emptied by these qualities – it “has own content that directs this stability” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 231].

In other words, the relation of will and character are complex and reverse: the will acts a degree of strength, stability of character and the latter one, in its turn, defines, how, where and why the will be manifested. And, thus – the will is not included into composition of character.

The character of human as a separate and original psychical quality has the following main properties – stability, strength,

content, complexity, and harmony. All these properties are polar, i.e. they anticipate the availability of own opposition (stability – weakness, strength – amenity, etc.). The strength of character is defined as energy quality – energy in achievement of purpose, capability of human to develop significant tensions at this, as well as at overcoming obstacles. The important feature of this quality is that it is the indicator for capability of human to defend, to preserve itself as personality.

The strength of character among all its properties is mostly linked with orientation of personality. It is usually considered as purely positive quality but we would like to mention the following: in some cases the character acquires such strength that suppresses the personality, a human becomes dependent on its character and ... inadequate: they are accentuation, and, especially, psychopathies – affections, which in fact are the evidence that the character “conquers” personality, it becomes self-valuable and super valuable for human, a human keeps aloof from the world, becomes inadequate.

Paranoia may be considered as a vivid example for super strong character: super valuable idea, generated by human “gets” over the super strong character, it finally closes the whole world and possibility efficiently to exist in it for human. The fact that this disease is linked namely with character is seen from the following: an affected idea turns out to be so related with the ways of human interaction that any attempt to prove, to show that it is mistaken, makes the opposite – a human is waiting for confirmation (and not for disproof of idea) from interaction, so, it seeks more actively and... finds the arguments, necessary for it.

The stability of character is mostly linked with the volition of personality and means the strict succession and persistence in achievement of purpose, accented defense of own opinions. We are inclined to consider two modifications of this property – “stability-fragility” and “stability-flexibility”. The difference between them is principal and stipulated by efficiency in connection of character with personality in the whole (but not only with volition). The first modification differs with rigidity: while meeting an obstacle, which

cannot be overcome at once, a human may continue trying until full exhaustion and crisis of character (“break”).

Hard maladjusted experiences of such human are reinforced by high self-assessment as it got used to its “stability”, which, by the way, is a socially positive quality. The second modification (“flexibility”) anticipates the close interrelation with intellectual processes and valuable notional sphere. A human turns out to be capable for worthy compromise and considers the situation of frustration not as purely characterological but as personal (vivid historical examples- antipodes – J. Bruno and Galileo).

As it is seen, the strength and stability of character, is, strictly speaking, its dynamic indices, and they alone do not reflect all its peculiarities. So, the character is marked by essential wealth of diverse features, including rather nuanced, thin shades of their interrelations. The complexity reflects the degree in development of connections of these features between themselves and personality in the whole. The real characterological profile of personality can be understood only in dynamics of development of abovementioned properties.

In order it would be more understandable, let’s return to the kindness: why do people, who have the inborn readiness to be kind, as Joshua thought (and not only He alone), so rare have the corresponding feature of character? A human may have the weak character, and then it makes malicious mischief under influence of circumstances and gets used to this, “a habit” appears. Undoubtedly, hereby it experiences a violent discomfort but cannot do anything – the circumstances are stronger.

On the other hand, a human may have the super strong character, and then the kindness is transformed into compulsive idea, in fact regenerating into its opposite.

The good may be not found through the absence of stability in character or “be broken” if this stability is fragile, to enter to the state of affect or depression and to create much harm. Finally, the low degree in stability of character may lead that a kind human will not feel and will not react to the thin circumstances of difficult situation,

and its kindness may turn out to be evil. All abovementioned relates, strictly speaking, the problem of harmony – disharmony of character.

Finishing the analysis, we would like to fix upon one essential moment, which is usually not taken into consideration by researchers of character. “The general place” in psychology is taken by the statement that the character is that quality, which defines the behavior, it, strictly speaking, is the ways of behavior, typical for a certain human. But it seems to us that there is another aspect: the character should be considered as a way for experience of ... itself, its Ego by human.

The character, within this sense, is not identified with self-consciousness, Ego-concept or self-assessment. It is namely the experience – integral sensual reflection of itself by human. This image of character in psychological practice is noticeable very vividly: a human, who has problems in interrelations, first of all, thinks that these problems come from its partners in communication. Further there may appear the notion that it alone makes something wrong (but this notion is exclusively situational and has purely rationalistic content).

It is mostly difficult accepted the position, according to which the reason for proneness to conflict is in the integral inadequacy of behavior and world outlook of this human as here the integral experience of itself by human is infringed. The character as a way for experience of itself by human is close to the phenomenon of identity due to the meaning (E. Erickson). This aspect of problem is formed in ontogenesis together with its “external” manifestations, providing with uniqueness of integral structure of personality. And here we have a very complex and important problem of definiteness.

This term is a key one in S.L. Rubinstein: “Definiteness that constitutes the essence of character, may be formed at human in relation to what is important for it” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 221]. In general, concept “definiteness” is mostly often used by Serhii Leonidovych in works, devoted to character.

The latter means, strictly speaking, the definiteness of human in life – clearness in understanding own position, differentiated attitude to public values and other people.

However, it seems to us that there is a certain problem that within this sense concerns again the correlation of character and personality. Absolute definiteness, definiteness in the whole and in relation to the whole (character according to Rubinstein) is in fact freezing. Namely here it is very vividly seen that, firstly, the character and personality is not far the same, and, secondly, that development of human is defined not by its character but the harmony in correlation of personality and character. Flexibility and changes that are so necessary in real life, can infringe “definiteness” but the limits of these infringements are defined namely by human alone as integral personality.

The character, with all its importance, is still only a substructure of personality, and the fact for existence of human in extreme situations or under conditions of violent disadaptation confirm the priority namely of personal onset (in some cases we can observe the actual loss of features of character and existence by human during a certain period of time exclusively in personal mode. Though it cannot last long, a human turns out as if naked psychologically and is traumatized ... so, tries “to return” to its usual features).

In general, it seems to us, that the psychology of extreme situations could determine very much interesting about human character, if it would consider it in dynamics, i.e. genetically. So, definiteness, availability of strong character and just its availability (as I. Cant mentioned this) is in fact the problem, which roots are in personality and its establishment.

Genetic psychology allows seeing one more problem, “transformed into postulate” (if we use the terminology by L.S. Vygotsky). Let’s pay our attention – all definitions of character somehow or other hang over to old Greek “stamp”, calking (precision and ... freezing, almost as fingerprints, – let we be apologized for analogy). And on the other hand, the psychology is overfilled with theses and arguments about phenomenon of intravital changes, plasticity of character, its “openness” to education. We, thus, find out the complete contradiction (if “a seal” is plastic, is it in fact a seal?).

Undoubtedly, in old Greek definition there is the metaphorization of phenomenon, as freezing, calking of character is the most precise

parameter for psychological deviation (Krechmer and especially Gannushkin showed this well in relation to psychopathy). The character in norm is not changed; it is developed, remaining hereby a feature of namely this, concrete human. And, thus, everything that is relatively steady and stable in character has the personality as its background. The psychological health of human within the context of problems on character is defined by the fact that the character at healthy human is developed.

This is not just changes in connection with circumstances of life, age or health status, this is the progressive motion, realization of potency and establishment of psychical new formation of character. And if the latter terms causes to surprise (concept “new formation” in fact is not used in psychology in relation to the character) it is necessary to understand that such properties as flexibility, sound sense or wisdom just suit to definition of new formation, which was given by Vygotsky (such changes of psychics that cardinally influence on the whole personality and change its life).

By the way, about wisdom – L.I. Antsyferova in her last work vividly showed that this is not only the high level of intellect but namely the character [Antsyferova, 2002]. Popular vital notions, according to which the character is worsened with age, cannot be made absolute. It can be developed and namely the wisdom acts as the final and most developed, realized image of human character. It should be mentioned “in brackets” that psychology of old age is, in our opinion, in absolute “embryonic” stage (sorry for word-play).

The initial implicit position of researchers about “extinction”, “involution”, “disintegration” of higher psychical function in this age does not correspond to reality in any event. Following to this position distorts the old age in our eyes! The actualization of existential experiences leads to absolutely new and quite unknown forms for development of personality for us but this is namely the development and namely the progress. We cannot understand those people because we are sure that they “extinct”, and our language, our words and approaches are quite inadequate – so there is the barrier (as we see the mechanism here is the same as in early ontogenesis – we

are sure that it is not a personality before us yet and because of this our full lack of knowledge about this being).

Meanwhile, understanding the old age shall not be based on the thesis that the biological in human is emptied but that the personality is at the highest level of development ... preserves hereby the infinite potencies of further establishment. As it concerns the character in this age we will make only one hypothetical assumption: its correlation with personality is cardinally changed; the character stops being a substructure and acquires the status of attributive feature for personality.

Changeability, non-freezing of human character is vividly shown in emotional sphere. M.D. Levitov in his time noticed the interesting regularity – emotional state, if they are experienced by human often and long, may transform into properties of its character. The state defines the peculiarities for experiences and behavior. It is a long feeling that colors vital relations. It may become usual and thus – comfortable for personality, no matter how paradoxical it would sound, when, for example, we speak about depression, aggressiveness, affection or frustration.

But it seems to us that here there is the inverse dependence: namely the character as stable and usual emotional reactions and behavioral manifestations of human make it open and ready for experience of certain states. The mechanism for appearance of psychologically depended behavior may be here very interesting and instructive. Modern psychology does not know much about dependence. But this knowledge is sufficient in order to make the conclusion – the inclination to dependence is a property of character, and here it is not so important what, strictly speaking, is the factor of dependence (alcohol, drugs, other human or own personal likings). We can assume that this property at the level of mechanism is excited by original “displacement” in goal-setting from external objects and vital motives to experience of state.

We think that the main reason for “launch” of this mechanism is namely the initial peculiarities of character: insufficient stability, break of character with volitional qualities and orientation and at the same time the vulnerability and openness – namely this, as old

characterologists would say, creates the complex of symptoms for inclination to depended behavior. Let's demonstrate this on such very modern example as dependence on computer.

Even usual practice testifies that among great number of people, who use this device often and much, not many become dependent on it. And the problem here is not only in hierarchy of motives as in peculiarities for goal-setting and properties of character.

Usually a computer is used as a means to achieve the purpose that exceeds the limits for interaction of human with this device. For this purpose, strictly speaking, it exists and the absolute majority of users consider it namely by this way. And this device is specially made so attractive, it has a great number of emotional effects, and, thus, its use is accompanied as if by adverse effect – the one that hereby occurs is vivid, interesting, capturing.

So, “communication” with computer may excite not only experience for achievement of external purpose but the positive experience for the process of interaction itself. And this second experience, in its turn, may acts as the additional motivator – interactions acts as the means for achievement of “external” purpose and self-valuable purpose. In some cases this purpose may take the place of the main (external) one. But here we are interested in what namely cases does it happen?

It seems to us that the main content of positive and psychologically comfortable experience that appears in interaction with computer is the feeling of freedom – a human may receive information without conflict interaction and special efforts, manipulate images, have a rest... People, who due to their character cannot do it easy and simple in the real world, who are tired and strained too much from this world, at last, receive what they need. And they receive it easy, without efforts.

This experience, which they sought very much, achieved so difficultly (and it was unknown in general for some of them), motivates, attracts to itself and forces gradually to change the behavior. Thus, the dependence appears and we see well that the role of character here is very large and double – its peculiarities may “provoke” the dependence, and it alone is changed as a result from

frequent experience of a certain state of freedom, abandon, which in fact means namely the absolute non-freedom.

Finally, we need to tell about structure of character. Genetic position allows making somewhat unexpected assumption on this occasion: human character, from the point of psychological content, is the unity, which is not further decomposed.

We may tell about properties or sides of character but we cannot – about features and some components (volitional, emotional, motivational, etc.).

Character – is a unit, unity of human existence on the part of experiences and relations, and the conversation about features concerns not the psychology but philology and sociology. It appears as unity – at once and all as unique value; it exists and is developed in such form. We imagine separate features, projecting our knowledge on language and nuances of human relations to the integrity. In fact each character is a unique combination of properties (not features), which form the individual configuration of personality and its existence.

Thus, undoubtedly, volitional qualities, emotions and orientation grow into the character but they are not its components: the character within this sense does not differ from other synthetic formations of personality, which also have emotional, motivational and other components. The specificity of this new formation is defined not by these elements but by the fact that it appears and exists in direct contact with other people, other characters.

Namely within this sense we can tell about mediating function of character in human life. And when we already speak about complexes of symptoms, it should be mention that we speak not about some abstract features – words but about unique form (patterns) of properties and sides. This is the reason for interest in character on the part of genetic psychology.

Mental states

We defined the personality as a form for existence of human psychics. There is the necessity to pay attention to the fact that this

existence runs in different states, which are constantly changed, flow from one into another and, in general, define the meaningful peculiarities of human life.

Mental state – is the phenomenon, for which understanding and description science like semantics: formal logical constructions lacks

If we only approach these “tools” to the state, it immediately loses the most important thing – coloration, flow, vividness, changeability. We should here remember (once again) very wise O.F. Losev and his criticism of pseudoscience: “blue, deep wonderful sky, – he wrote, – that is really perceived and experienced by us, for some reason or other does not satisfy the science; it needs to translate it into terms: “atoms”, “flows”, “layers” and lines of numerous formula. Then there will be the scientism but ... there will be no sky. So, what is a larger myth? – asks philosopher.

The state of psychics is stipulated by activation of separate functional systems. It seems to us that exclusion, change, flow of states is very similar with the one that I.P. Pavlov described as the induction of nervous processes. The state appears on the border of activated psychical structures, defines and “fills in” a certain space, and then initiates the activity of other systems and... passes into the new existence, new state. And here already the state activates the systems and this means that the state is such one that will occur, happen.

The states are the important component of human psychics, hereby somewhat mysterious component. On the one hand, we cannot but acknowledge their availability, principal meaning in vital activity of human. On the other hand, the scientific study of those phenomena is linked with some methodological and methodic difficulties, which are based on psychological nature of state themselves. It is the constant dynamics, motion, which, if it is stopped artificially, at once passes into another flow.

A researcher of mental states has not many possibilities for study. Speaking precisely, there are in total two these possibilities: observation and self-report of testee. It is undoubtedly very few. In particular, if we mean serious restrictions of abovementioned methods.

The peculiarities of behavior are fixed in observation. Some or other its changes may tell about availability of certain states. And, thus, the state alone acts as hypothetical constructor of researcher. Its meaningful and dynamic characteristics are also not more than hypotheses. The inclusion of physiological and psychophysiological indices into the sphere of research does not change the essence of the point as the real indices are still the facts of behavior or indices of devices and further again the hypothetical constructs work.

Even if we artificially excite some or other state, this gives surprisingly few to us to understand the psychology of its origin and existence.

If we speak about self-observation and self-report, there are much more problems here. Namely the certainty in that a human can always define and describe its state means that we put the sign of equality between the state and experience. And it is, in our opinion, not justified. However a human will always describe the experiences of state but not the state alone and thus we will have the substitution of subject of research.

On the other hand, it is well known that it is possible to describe the experience only when it acts as the object of self-observation and this will occur if a human “goes out” from it, stops feeling it. Hence, from this point of view of “beyond” or “over” experience, it will be seen quite different than it is in fact when it covers the whole personality, including system “Ego”. It is necessary also to take into consideration that the states always accompany the life of personality (in other words – a human is always in some state), thus it will describe the “preset” state quite not objectively and impartially.

Thus, we will here have only hypotheses. The abovementioned stipulated that the fact that modern stage in researches of mental states is the accumulation of empirical data and construction of primary research hypotheses for psychological nature of these mysterious phenomena. The problem of reliable psychological correlates remains very urgent and below we will try to suggest our point of view about it.

The serious, subjective and systematic research of mental states at personality in national psychology started after publication of the

great work by M.D. Levitov "About mental states of human" in 1964 [Levitov, 1964]. This, obviously was the first (and the only until now) fundamental work in this sphere, and namely after its publication there appears the opinion, according to which the psychical exists not in two modifications (processes and properties), as it was imagined earlier, but in three ones – processes, states and properties.

The state is a certain internal characteristics of human psychics, which is relatively unchanged component of psychical process in time.

This notion is rather empty and in any case shows that the time parameter gives few to understand the psychology of state (it is seen well that here the logic for description of states in physical systems is used mechanically). M.D. Levitov defines the mental states by the following way: "...this is the integral characteristics of mental activity for a certain period of time, which shows the originality in flow of psychical processes depending on subjects and phenomena of reality that are reflected, previous state and psychical properties of personality" [Levitov, 1964, p. 18].

We see here the systemacity of position. Levitov tries to emphasize three principally important things – state is the all-encompassing psychical phenomenon, such one that colors the whole psychical activity, and, on the other hand, pretends to the role of original "carrier" of the psychical (search for such "carrier" is a separate very interesting section in national psychology: fear of substantialism generated the contraction, and such competent scientists as L.I. Bozhovych, V.K. Viliunas seriously discussed this problem, thinking that a "carrier" was experience. On the other hand, Levitov, in fact tell that the state is the central chain in interfunctional system. It is actively analyzed in modern literature and, in our opinion, has the fundamental meaning.

Finally, the thought by Levitov that the state is determined not only by reflection but the previous state (we would add – future!) is essential. Here we have very ambitious "encroachments" on research of problems in dynamics, and, mostly important, development of states. The fact that it actualizes the problem of

interaction in the system “state-property” is also important in definition of Levitov. In general, it is necessary to bestow honors to soundness of M.D. Levitov, his professionalism, depth of analysis and penetration into the nature of phenomenon that is reflected in vivid, deep and interesting text itself, and, let’s say, in the moments of discussion with S.L. Rubinstein (for example, at discussion about mood), in which “victory” is not by the latter one. It is unclear why so talented and vivid start has not become the efficient push for active and deep researches of mental states.

The analysis of literature testifies that these researches were usually held and there were very much of them but they usually had the narrow-applied and empirically-descriptive character, hereby, their majority was not inclined to conception and generalization.

Namely such situation explains the artificiality and indefiniteness in classification of mental states (top-priority problem, if we mean the establishment of direction), the authors themselves tell frankly in numerous attempts for this classification [Mental state, 2000].

Let’s return again to M.D. Levitov. Pushing off from attempts for construction of individual typology (and he makes it not in vain, as the state does not just “cements” the interfunctional system, it closes it on individuality and it may happen that here we should seek for its sources and essence), the author fairly tells that, let’s say, no universal classification can be for such feature as character. Levitov tells: “In relation to mental states the problem of classification or typology is as complicated as in relation to the character. Mental states are too much diverse, and, hereby, in different relations.

There are many such complex and contradictory mental states, which are even difficult to call; it is necessary to describe them more-less thoroughly” [Levitov, 1964, p. 25]. And he rather reasonably at that time refuses from “universal classification” of mental states, making “only” some generalizations. The analysis leads the author to possibility to distinguish “some subsections” of mental states, namely:

- Personal and situational states. The individual properties of human are first of all expressed in the first ones, peculiarities of situations, which often excite non-

characteristic reaction at human – in the second ones” [Levitov, 1964, p. 26]. Let’s mention here one essential thing – the state expresses: the whole world of personality as in drop is really expressed in it, it is necessary only to learn to see it;

- Deeper and more surface states, depending on the force of their influence on experience and behavior of human. Passion as a mental state is significantly deeper than mood;
- States that positively or negatively act on human... Apathy may serve as an example of negative state, inspiration – state, which positively influences on activity of human;
- Long and short states. Thus, moods may have different duration: from some minutes to a day and some days;
- More or less realized states. For example, absent-mindedness is often unconscious mental state, resolution is always conscious; tiredness may have different level of realization. M.D. Levitov also mentions that there are pathological and borderline states, which he does not consider and thinks that this is the task for special disciplines. However, if we add this group of states to the ones, distinguished by author, we must agree with him, it is obviously not the classification; these are in fact separate subsections.

Most modern classification of mental states looks otherwise. L.V. Kulikov mentions: “the common thing for all states is that they have time, emotional, activation, tonic, tension parameters, include the situational and trans-situational component.

Different parameters come to the fore at different states”. [Mental state, 2000, p. 15]. In opinion of author, this allows dividing the states into long and short (due to time parameter), as well as into emotional, activation, tonic and other according to the fact, which namely parameter is leading.

We will set the modality of corresponding emotions as the basis for further division of emotional states, activation states are divided due to the level of motivation, completeness of inclusion into

situation, tonic states are divided according to the level of general tonus of organism that, as L.V. Kulikov fairly thinks, in its turn, is linked with human health, at last tension states are defined by degree in general tension of organism (psychical and psychophysical). This classification seems rather logical but as artificial as all others. Thus, Kulikov reliably puts the joy on the positive pole of emotional states, although it has the larger right to be put on positive poles of activation, tonic and tension states.

On the other hand, here they did not take into consideration the one that happens at pathological and borderline states. To which group, let's say, should we refer the states that accompany the reactive psychosis, abulia or schizophrenic delirium? In general, it seems that P.D. Levitov was right, when he wrote about impossibility for creation of classification for mental states. In any case, at present moment, this aspect of problem seems somewhat untimely and hopeless as the classification without establishment of essential characteristics will always be artificial (it is necessary to remind of the problem of classification in biology in XIX century, everything there also started from artificial and unsuccessful attempts and the real classification as the reflection of objective state of affairs became possible only after theoretical generalizations by C. Darwin).

However, on the other hand, this problem cannot be ignored, if we wish to remain within the psychology and to study mental states as reality and not to operate with abstractions – hypotheses.

The real understanding the nature of mental states, in our opinion, is not in the plane of states as they are and systematization but in analysis of their dynamics, development and relations with other psychical phenomena. It has already been mentioned that the mental state is the concentrated and synthetic reflection of all psychological peculiarities for personality. Other specialists share this opinion. Thus, L.V. Kulikov mentions: “The spiritual, soulful (psychical) and bodily being of human is somehow or other reflected in each state” [Mental state, 2000, p. 10].

In order to extend this thesis it is necessary to add that the states reflect not just the abovementioned phenomena but their, so to say, individual variant. And namely the state is the real indicator of

individuality. On the other hand, the mental state not only reflects – at the same time it forms the psychological phenomena. It should be understood in two senses: firstly it means that the states influence on other psychological phenomena, change, build up, and rebuild them.

Thus, thought, fantasy or image of memory can excite a certain state of personality (in this case the state reflects) but at the same time it can change this thought or fantasy, give another coloration to it, generate another sense, finally, stipulate the appearance of new thought. Secondly, the term “formation” may have another sense – as rendering the form. What does the expression “state forms thought” mean in this sense? It means that the mental state, forming the interfunctional system on the basis of this thought, integrates it with expertise, properties, aspirations of human, and only then a thought becomes mine, i.e. a thought namely of this human – it acquires the unrepeated form. It is clear that it concerns not only a thought as it is.

The analysis on interrelations of psychological states and properties of personality seems to be productive. Still K.-G. Jung mentioned: “If the state somehow becomes chronic, so, its result is the appearance of type, i.e. usual unit, in which one mechanism dominates, although hereby it cannot completely suppress another one as it with necessity belongs to psychological activity of life” [Jung, 1994, p. 123].

Other researchers pay attention to the fact that a feature of character can be considered as embodied long state of personality.

It seems that any feature (no matter what sphere of the psychological it would relate) is to some or other extent the embodiment of usual and long state of human. Of course, here there is also the feedback: features of character and properties of personality in many respects define which states and how a human will experience. There is the sense to speak about inclination of human to certain states, about individual internal pictures for progress of states, etc. When the statement of this fact for interaction of state and properties looks rather obvious, even banal, however it is necessary to pay the special attention that we do not absolutely know the psychological mechanisms for this interaction.

Hypothetically we can tell that the acknowledgement of such place and role of mental states may in a certain way extend and specify our notions about mechanisms for acceleration of new personal structures: it becomes clear that this process is mediated by states that are experienced. Dynamic phenomena of inward world at personality, and first of all different kinds of intentions, as it is known, have the tendency to be embodied (objectivated) into the purposes, actions of personality, and then into its properties. Now the picture has somewhat been specified – they, these tendencies, are embodied, first of all, into the state, generate it (although the states alone are generated by the states, previous states).

The generated state, as embodiment of personal intentions, creates the interfunctional system, and only after that the “embodiment” is continued by abovementioned way. Hereby, the state controls the whole process, and mostly important – the control is relevant to this individuality, this hypothesis requires verification and it enables building the generalization about nature of state and its real place in psychics of human (so, the remark by K.K. Platonov that the states take the intermediate position between the processes and properties is useful only “geographically”).

There is a serious problem in specification of spheres in psychical reality, which are described by categories “mental states” and “experiences”. Many variants for joint use of these concepts, and thus – different interpretations – can be met in literature.

Sometimes these concepts are used as synonyms; sometimes they are enlarged in logic “experience of some or other state” and sometimes in logic “state of experience”. In terms of understanding the representation of these phenomena in the inward world of personality, the specification of the sphere, which is covered by one and another concept, seems important. It seems that the interactions between these phenomena are rather complex and ambiguous.

The expression “experience of state” turns out to be very simple as it means that the experience is the state for personality, i.e. it represents the subjective parameters of state. But the experience, in fact, this is not only the state, the whole pictures of inward world at

personality is specifically reflected and united in it. We see that experiences and states are very similar in this. Their real meaningful difference can be understood if we separate ourselves from usual logic for division of the psychical into processes and properties. It is necessary to realize that “process” and “property” is only the artificial constructs, created for convenience in research of integral psychics. The analysis of states tells that we do not just have one more construct.

We dare here to make the central hypothetical assumption. It is based only on two methodologemes, which are well known. Firstly, the psychics are indissoluble and individually-specific in each human (human is the carrier of the psychics, as well as organism is the carrier of life) unity, which exists and functions exclusively as such unity and in fact its functioning never and nowhere resembles the mechanism that consists of different elements, harmonically united each with other. It is necessary to realize that in fact it does not happen by this way. It is though and imagined with purely cognitive purpose – modern scientific cognition with necessity anticipates the previous division of existing (phenomenon) in order “to reach” the essential. There is some logic, absolutely irrelevant in relation to the object of cognition, and we try to understand the object according to the laws of this external logic.

This is the typical, clear and absolutely wrong way as in fact we should not put our logic on the object and allow existing its own logic and try to understand it. It does not happen in such a way in psychology until now (as, strictly speaking, in many other sciences).

Hence we have the second initial provision: scientific cognition in fact due to its essence requires dividing the object but it should be made according to own logic of this object itself.

The psychics have never been and will not be the static formation. So, its division within cognition pursuant to “static” logic is artificial, and, thus, it does not correspond to its nature (permanent crisis of psychology, about which they started telling almost since the start of its existence as a separate science is the interesting evidence for correctness of this idea). It seems to us that the primary division of psychics as the object of scientific research, which would

correspond to the logic of this object itself, is the division into form of its existence and way of existence. The form of existence fixes the “appearance” of object and its dynamic, motion.

On the other hand, the form represents (expresses) the way of existence. We can assume now, being within the outlined logic, the form of existence of human psychics is the mental state and the way for its existence is the experience. Thus, the mental state can be defined very briefly – this is the form of existence for individually-unrepeated psychics of human. We can try previously to argue. Firstly, the state is total, not discrete but flowing. A human is always in some state. Here it is always necessary to understand literally – since birth until death and without any breaks.

Of course, these are different states, and they change each other but they are always present, and they really execute the psychics, each time forming somewhat different configuration but namely this personality is always guessed behind it, this regularity even at deep psychoses is not infringed. The totality of states is not only a time a surface-embracing indicator. It is, so to say, a totality “into the death”: and the fact that thinking is the process, which is only abstraction, and the fact that it means the state, hereby sharp nuanced, depending on the fact, whether a human solves a learning task or a life problem, creates the scientific theory or work of art ... so, the fact that here the state is undoubtedly presented – is seen well without any abstractions.

One cannot confuse it with other states and at the same time it is somehow “interlaced” into the system of states at this personality and is hereby transformed into unrepeated individual pattern.

The depth in penetration of states is not limited only by psychical sphere. The interfunctional system, which integrates some or other state obligatorily “goes out” into the sphere of biology, and thus the state as if “closes” the space for existence of human being. When, let’s say, a human start being ill with the flu, so-called pre-sick state is developed in it.

It covers literally the whole spheres of personality: deceleration and some deformation of action in cognitive processes, attenuation of interests and other intentions, astenisation of emotions, and

besides – inertness, tiredness – all this is well known to everyone, and we, as a rule, are not mistaken that we really fell ill. However, it is very interesting that this state starts from ... cellular level of organism as namely this level is affected by virus. It seems that each mental state is so all-embracing.

The mental state does not only execute the “appearance” of psychical life of personality, in our opinion, it forms its dynamics. The hypothesis by O.O. Prokhorov about dynamics in correlation of mental states and psychical new formations at personality is interesting within this aspect. Considering “energetic plane” of mental states, according to criterion of general activity of personality, the author distinguishes two kinds of states – state of balance and imbalance (“ravnovesnye” and “neravnovesnye” – in Russian transcription), “The starting point, – write O.O. Prokhorov, – may be the states of relative balance (states of average or optimal psychical activity), which may include the state of rest, concentration, psychical adaptation, interest, etc.).

The states, connected with higher psychical activity (joy, delight, anxiety, etc.), as well as the states of lower psychical activity (dreaming, depression, tiredness, sorrow, etc.), which are characterized by higher or lower level of activity, correspondingly, will be referred to the states of imbalance” [Prokhorov, 1994, p. 84]. The states of imbalance appear at infringement of symmetry in the following triad:

- Personality
- Organism
- Environment

The new functional system (state), which is characterized by a certain tension and discomfortable experiences, is formed. Having a certain excess of energy, the new (asymmetric?!) interfunctional system generates the intentions of personality, excites original actions and deeds, and, at last, leads to appearance of new formations of personality. The important peculiarity for this kind of states is to be a chain in the process for origin of psychical new formations. O.O. Prokhorov mentions: “The important function (possibly, the main one) for states of imbalance is their stipulation of

process for appearance of new formations in the structure of personal properties” [Prokhorov, 1994, p. 86].

The specific mechanism “for origin of new order through fluctuation” acts. The deeper and sharper the state of imbalance is, the more active the process for origin of new formations is run and the deeper and more essential structures the personality displays. The progressive solution of strained situation anticipates the integrative processes of personality and self-development. The activity that leads to appearance of new formations is formed namely in this case (in fact, as it can be seen, the point is about development of personality).

Thus, thanks to special activity and behavior, the new structures are formed from the state. Speaking about determinants for states of imbalance, Prokhorov pays attention to the sense – “passion, significance of situation, separation of the most essential circumstance in it, factor, which introduces the most disorganizing onset” [Prokhorov, 1994, p. 89].

It seems to us that the idea by O.O. Prokhorov about solution-embodiment of special group of states into psychical new formations is rather interesting and perspective. It seems that here one from central psychical mechanisms that does not only unite the most important components of psychics into single meta-functional system but opens the dynamics of development “is caught”. The real essential role of some mental states becomes clear.

Of course, all this requires the serious study and specification: which namely states and why are the initiators and “implementators” in establishment of new formations, whether the regularities of their appearance exist (not the regularity but randomness rather appears in statement of author), what feedback of new formations for mental states exists – there are many such questions.

It is necessary separately to mention the following. Even the previous involvement of processes of ontogenesis and pathogenesis into the context of this idea allow telling that “resolution” of states of imbalance in new formation (development) is not determined only by personal sense.

Undoubtedly, there are purely objective determinants; the natural changes in stages of age development, age crises, appearance and development of disease, etc. On the other hand, it is important to mention that the regressive way for solution-embodiment of states of imbalance shall exist along with the progressive way. Of course, it is also linked with new formations but of destructive character. The address to the idea by L.S. Vygotsky that the new formations, which appear at the stage of age crisis, have rather mysterious destiny, may be interesting within this perspective. Vygotsky assumed that these new formations become not actual after crisis passes but do not disappear at all.

Perhaps, they play the special role in development of further states, and, accordingly, dynamic processes in the whole. In general the age aspect seems more interesting as here we can deal with the complex of states of imbalance. Let's say that a teenager may experience the state of imbalance, caused by age crisis, besides it can be somatically ill child (this is one more state of imbalance) and the state, caused by purely individually-personal problems (relations in the family, interrelations with coevals, etc.) may also be added here.

What symptomatology will we have in fact? Will it be some states, or – a complex, new synthesis? Perhaps, will the mechanisms for compensation act? And finally which new formations will “solve” these states and what will be the way?

Somehow or other, the idea that is discussed here allows productively approaching to the problem of dynamics in psychical states.

Let's try to discuss the primary scheme for transition of state of imbalance into psychical new formation, using absolutely elementary example for convenience.

Let's imagine a pupil, who cannot do important learning tasks (the term is used in traditional sense) through overloading the volume of mechanical memory. The situation, sufficient for development of state of imbalance, according to Prokhorov, appears but in fact only it can be sufficient

There is the necessity in additional conditions – importance of tasks, tension, duration, social significance, etc. Let's assume that

all conditions are performed, and the state of imbalance has appeared on this occasion.

We do not know how it occurs but it is clear that the state originally appears within the old interfunctional system, and, having appeared, ruins this system. So, obviously, it is necessary to specify that the state of imbalance is not namely the interfunctional system but means the aspiration for creation of the new one. Hence we have the tension. It may be called the appearance of energetic dynamic potential. This moment is very responsible. The higher energetic in state of imbalance requires actions from personality.

But what these actions will be depends not only on this subject. The progressive way that leads to appearance of new formation in this case is linked with the fact, whether the social environment will give the means for acquisition of its memory to a child (its transformation into higher psychical function). Let's imagine that such means will be given (unfortunately, in practice learning is rather the exception than a rule). A child starts using the means, and, finally, solves its problems. The state of imbalance, however, does not appear yet (it is only softened) and the new formation does not appear yet.

The new functional system is absent yet but there only its "premonition". This is the second stage. Further there is the necessity in repetition and revision of the way for new memorizing, for this purpose the state of imbalance should artificially be activated, otherwise the motivation may disappear. This third stage is the key one. And only after its completion, after successful attempts for transference in use of the new way for mnemonic activity to a great number of different tasks and situations, we can speak about appearance of new formation, new interfunctional system and change of dominating state.

Here the scheme is anticipated but still this is only the scheme and we should not forget although about the fact that we consider only one plane in existence of human. At the same time many other events and tensions occur in its life, other mental states appear and are changed, and this complex picture for real life of personality may correct the stated notion very much.

In the whole, the consideration of problem on mental states within the context of dynamic processes at personality seems very urgent and heuristic.

So, the states belong to the most essential and fundamental phenomena of psychical life at personality, although, hereby, they are the least studied. In any case, the analysis of the main theoretical concepts in psychology of personality allows determining rather a primitive fact – the theories especially those ones, which are based on psychological practice, pay the special attention to psychical states but hereby they are not *especially* studied as a subject of research (state of empathy and acceptance in K. Rogers, “peak experiences” in A. Maslou, “insight” in Gestalt-theory, “individuation” in K. Jung, etc.).

Always other, “more essential” phenomena in the center of researchers’ attention and the mental states are some background, on which everything takes place. This “background” notion about states prevails in modern psychology that stipulated the specificity of works, devoted to study of this phenomenon – on the one hand, they are purely descriptive, sketchy drawings that are usually interesting and important, however they tell nothing about psychological nature of states, on the other hand, many researches are devoted to classification problems, although artificiality, conditionality and randomness of these classifications is obvious: sometimes there is the feeling that not psychological but purely philological problem is solved: search for words that mostly correspond to some or other nuances of states, tested by subject.

Within this plane the analysis of question, for example, about correlation of such phenomena as the mood, emotional tone, stress, etc. – reminds rather the known “the glass bead game” than psychological research.

However, there are the theories of personality, which try to consider the mental states in their real role, which they play in human life. So, F. Lersh as a meaningful “unit” for analysis of personality considers “its dialog with surrounding world” and experience as reflection of this dialog by subject [Lersh, 2001].

According to Lersh the “functional circle of experience” contains four chains in dynamic interdependent “soulful processes” – “perception of world and orientation in it”, “demands, aspirations and desires as the second chain in dialog of human with the world”, “emotions become the third group of processes, integrated into general process of spiritual life”, and the last chain is activity “as human response in its dialog with the world” [Lersh, 2001, p. 95].

It is important for us that Lersh does not limit the world of personality by this. He writes: “... this four-chain cyclic process of psychical life is built into the one, which is not the process itself and namely – into the *state* of mood, which coloration runs through all experiences. This is – as *stationary moods* [Lersh, 2001, p. 96]. This aspect becomes a subject of attention, when we ask how that one, which occurs in the form of experience and behavior between human and world, becomes *intrapersonal*, i.e. it is divided in human itself, in unity of its personality.

Thus, the central, integrating role in existence of personality (“dialog with the world”) is paid to this component. It is confirmed at analysis of “model for soulful layers”, built and discussed by F. Lersh: “stationary moods” in it are considered as a key phenomenon [Lersh, 2001]. These states exist “in the form of *feeling of vitality* and *feeling of selfhood*, forming that background and that basis, in which the soulful processes are constantly deep-rooted” [Lersh, 2001, p. 97].

The stability in stationary states does not object the availability of their different modalities: thus, the state of vitality is stable and is always but it can acquire different character: anxiety, fear, cheerfulness, enthusiasm, inspiration, etc. In principle, the idea by F. Lersh is clear and, in our opinion, is very close to the truth. Usually, he does not consider a number of essential issues of psychology and states (what the interesting term “inbuilt” means, whether the interaction (and namely which) exists between “stationary moods” and “circles of experiences”, how these states appear, etc.).

However the important steps were made – the states were introduced into the structure of personality, hereby, to the key position, they are acknowledged not as only the background but the *ground* for vital processes that take place in human psychics. The

psychological nature of states itself cannot be understood without study of their origin and development. This is the initial, main idea in genetic psychology and namely within its limits we try to research the mental states of human (it is interesting that this idea almost literally coincides with the main thesis in existential psychology: as personality in fact is the being (establishment) of human in the world, it is possible to understand it only studying this process of existence as establishment).

It seems to us that the definition of state as “functional system” by A.O. Prokhorov is not very good. In fact, as a rule, such system is the personality itself and the integral totality of its psychological characteristics at definite time is its state. The existence of personality is in fact its constant “dialog with the world” and we assume that the state appears namely in this interaction. The totality of mental states (they are available *always*, until a human is alive, and they “*fill in*” the whole personality) and, at the same time, their mobility and changeability are defined by general specificity in connection of human with the world.

It seems to us that this specificity is mostly adequate reflected by concept “combinability” (this term for the first time was introduced into psychology by G.S. Kostiuik for characteristics of correlation between learning and development). The combinability is the *strained* unity of independent, self-sufficient units, each being capable to self-development (“human” and “world”) that can exist only together but are never *merged*, do not become *the whole*. This coexistence, if to use the terminology of Gestalt-therapy, is the complex, mobile but indissolubly strong *contact* but never – not the *merger*.

The contradiction and proneness to conflict in combinability is stipulated by its nature itself – each from united units is developed and exists due to *own* internal laws but hereby, on the other hand, it with necessity shall reflect, ... take into consideration the laws of another one. Besides, namely these internal laws appear and are changed under action of other unit as well. In our opinion, the existence of human in the world is namely like that (S.L. Rubinstein in his time noticed this, having told that a human does not only *stands against* the world but is *inside* it [Rubinstein, 2003]).

We would be incorrect if we told that the mental state appears at human in response to interaction with its united world, so if to understand the interaction as a discrete act (and it is in fact so), the state not only *appears* but *precedes* the interaction as personality is always in some state. The search for answer to the sacramental question “what was earlier?” has already long ago discredited itself, thus we will consider the situation by such way that the act of human interaction with its united world excites the *appearance* of state (at least, *changes* in available state). This is the central thesis and further we will try to disclose it.

First of all about that content that is put here into term “world”. The point of view of existential psychology according to which a human exists in three worlds that are mutually intersected (three forms of world) is reasonable. The first of them, Umwelt, natural world – this is the world of surrounding living and non-living nature, as well as the world of its demands, drives, and instincts. R. May correctly assumes that this is the world, in which a human would continue existing if I did not realized itself. “This world of natural laws and natural cycles of sleep and wake, birth and death, desire and rest, world of biological determinism, “world of the thrown”, to which everyone of us should adopt” [May, 2001, p. 167].

The second world of human – Mitwelt – world of interrelations with people. The third one – Eigenwelt – inward world of human as personality that in fact is as real as the first two. The life of human turns out to be united with these three forms of world. The state appears during meeting of human with one of them. We mean that for appearance of the state it is necessary to break the usual duration of vital activity by some discrete act, main personality of which is in its special *penetrating* character for personality.

Really, what unites such different events as disease of internal organ, infection, vivid disturbing sleep, important event in life, appearance of a new brilliant idea (image), meeting with important human, completion (start) of activity, etc. It seems to us that the uniting factor here is namely the character of influence that penetrates into inward world (hereby, activity may originate both from subject itself and from “one of the worlds”). Such discrete

penetrating act (that has the expressed nature of *event*) marks the temporary change in human position in the world, sharpens the contradictory tension of combination. The physical system as a result of such *event* is rarely changed structurally up to destruction. A human has the possibility to preserve the structural integrity and valuable unity of Ego, however it is achieved through the change in reflection of the world.

The state acts here as the all-embracing dynamic new formation, that: a) influences on cognitive structures and provides with balance of their activity, when the world for some time is really reflected a little by different way but, on the other hand, the expertise that allows a human being adequate in general is preserved.

Of course, up to defined limits (different between borderline and psychotic states); b) allows really changing the activity, while preserving the personality in the balance with all three “worlds” and itself. We think that the main thing is as it allows: the state, which has appeared as a result from “penetrating” action, allows *transferring* the situation of *influence* (it is not important, whether of human on world or world on human) into situation of *interaction* (dialog) with the world. The most important thing – a human continues its existence as an integral personality – is achieved by this way.

On the other hand, we can speak about specifically *signalizing* function, when the appeared states as “tell” to the personality and environment that further interaction is impossible and it means that there is the real threat to integrity or personality, even to human life.

In general, the situation for appearance of mental state may be presented by the following way.

At some period of time the lytic duration of vital activity is broken by discrete “penetrating” act of influence. The reflection of this act generates the experience of personality, being realized. The latter one is important because namely the realization of experience shall obviously define – whether “to launch” the mechanism for appearance of new state. If the intensity of experience is such that a human is not able to continue the interaction with the world in present state, the new state that will a little change the situation of

inward world, not ruining it and will allow building the new interaction, appears. It seems to us that the most essential and complex thing is the interaction between experience and state.

As it has already mentioned, the experimental study on mental states of human is rather complex research problem. Some competent researchers, in particular M.D. Levitov, mentioned that the receipt of reliable empirical data about content and dynamics in progress of mental state is very complicated by impossibility to determine the clear psychical correlates of this phenomenon.

Levitov fairly mentions that the changes in behavior of individual, which can be noticed in observation, deviation of objective indices for some psychophysiological parameters are the indicators for availability off a certain expertise but they in fact tell few about psychology of this phenomenon.

The use of self-reports by testees is problematic. The point is that a self-report ruins the experience as subjective derivate of state. The desire to express, to verbalize the experience of a certain state rationalizes namely the experience, destroying its emotional component. In fact a human declares its understanding that it, as it seems, experienced. This phenomenon, by the way, is very successful described in fiction literature. In particular, Kostiantyn Levin (character from "Anna Karenina" by L. Tolstoy) very deeply experiences the beauty of nature but it is intolerable for him to speak about it, and he does not like when other speak about it. Verbalization (rationalization) ruins his experience, making them unpleasant, rough, "deformed".

The methodological obstacles seems to be unconquerable, if to take into consideration the provision by M.M. Bakhtin that the statement not so much expresses the experience of a certain state as forms it. Precisely speaking, it reforms it, modifies, so, the subject, being self-reported, occurs in the state for formation of absolutely new experience, and, it is clear that we cannot rely on its explanations as on serious data. Within this terms there is no sense to rely on introspection, when a task for self-observation over own state is set until its appearance.

In fact we alienate a human from its own state by this task that is in itself the artifact as the essential psychological characteristics of state is just that it is the state of personality, i.e. it itself at that moment, so we cannot speak about any separation, even theoretically.

The abovementioned difficulties lead to the fact that everything that we today know about mental states is purely descriptive information at vital level (of course, it cannot be considered as phenomenology in any case). Although, it is necessary to pay tribute to the talent of great clinicians, whose descriptions are not just literally perfect but very precise and heuristic. However, they cannot solve the disclosure of psychological essence (structure and dynamics) of mental states.

M.D. Levitov in his central work mentioned that it is reasonable to use the analytical method of products from activity in order to study certain states of personality. It seems to us that the state of creativity – namely that one, in relation to which this method may be adequate. However, its application requires establishing the conceptual paradigm, which cannot be absolutely similar with traditional one. Let's explain this thought. We should assume that we know exactly: the act of creativity is undoubtedly linked with the special mental state of personality. It is called “enthusiasm”, “inspiration”, etc. but it seems to us that there is no necessity in such names, as creativity and manifestation of essence is absolutely original, dissimilar with any others, state. The specificity of creative act is such that free and purely built-in manifestation of personality, and, this, undoubtedly means that the inward world of human is somehow reflected in it (principle of objectivation, established by us).

The result from such expression-embodiment is always the symbol, “given using some image, – mentions O.F. Losev, – or without it, it is always something executed and ordered. It always contains some idea, which turns out to be the law of its whole construction”. According to recent data, a symbol, which is formed as a result from act of creativity, is the complex integrity of image and experience. Thus, the principal possibility for “decoding” of products from creative acts should exist, in that sense that we can receive the

information about inward world of subject of activity, and, in particular, its mental state at the moment of creativity.

But this possibility, let's emphasize this, exists in fact only in principle as it can be made within traditional approach to study of psychology of personality.

Speaking about traditional approach, we mean that methodological scheme, according to which a researcher may as if receive the real scientific reliable knowledge about psychology of personality, having separated from living real human and working in the space of abstractions. It is clear that the result from such cognition will be only the logical scheme, in which there will be no individual nuance, complexity, life.

If such approach may be justified for certain tasks, so, it is absolutely unsuitable for study of peculiarities for mental state as the state is always purely individual and vivid pattern and its schematization means the destruction of subject of research itself.

Is, let's say, the work of creator the reflection-embodiment of its inward world? Yes, without doubts. But can we "decode" this world if we absolutely abstract from the life of creator as human? This sounds as nonsense. We really can try to reconstruct very strong, vivid affections, for example, Van Gogh, due to his pictures but only in the case if we know his life and his personality.

So, the task to study the peculiarities for mental state of creativity due to products from activity may be performed only within the context of life of testee personality. But this is only one side of problem. The other one, not less important, is in the special position of researcher itself. A human, who scientifically studies the world, "is in special important relations with objects under research, and it shall make itself as a part of its problem. It means that a subject can never be separated from the object, which it observes" [May, 2001]. Rollo May further mentions that such statement of question opens the errancy of thought that the truth as if can be understand only in the logic and terms of external objects. The wide possibilities of internal subjective reality are opened, and it turns out that such reality may be the truth, even if it contradicts to objective facts [May, 2001].

The question whether something occurs with it objectively or not is solved here quite at another level – so-called objective truth is included into complex and contradictory relation to objective truth, truth of personality inward world. This, as we see, have the direct relation to psychology of creative act: thus, as a rule, the one that was absent objectively is experienced in it but namely the experience and the state, which “covers” it, is the truth for personality of creator. And we cannot treat it as reality, reality of inward world. Such change of position is principal.

It forces “to forget” about abstract objectivation, and, on the contrary, generates the dialogical intention of researcher – there is the desire to ask, to speak with this concrete personality, who experiences this objectively-impossible state.

From the position, which is here realized, we shall definitely accept that a work of art – embodiment of truth – i.e. mental state, which is experienced by author during creation. Why then would we like to believe very much that we experienced that moment namely by this way? How is this effect achieved? We cannot answer for this only from the point of view of literary criticism; although we shall know a bit about author – personality. Existential problem in establishment, separation of Ego-instance in inward world is where there are those things, which the author experiences very painfully. Namely they embody into image-experience.

One from central concepts in existential psychology is the concept “Ego is the experience”. This is very complex personal formation, which means that the quintessence of existence is the “force to be”: “being is referred to the future and is inseparable from establishment”. This is the experience of existence, realized in self-consciousness. R. May specially mentions that “Ego is the experience”, is not formed automatically – a human shall pass through serious tests of life and really to decide to be: “My sense of being – this is not my capability to see the surrounding world, to measure it, to assess reality. This is my capability to see itself as a being in this world, to know itself as being, who can make it all” [May, 2001]. And further, more precisely and vividly: “Being means not

“Ego subject” but “Ego is a being, who can recognize itself as a subject of what occurs in it among other beings” [May, 2001].

We can state that “Ego is the experience” is such one that constitutes the state of creativity. Not the inspiration (prepossession) of the topic, not aspiration to realize the intention is the main here: creativity in reality enables a human feeling the reality of own Ego, its existence and establishment. It is so exciting and strong experience (A. Maslou called it “top” or “borderline”), that a human time after time wants to feel it more and more: here is the real activeness of creative state, and here is its difficulty for personality. So, “Ego is the experience” means the Meeting with its real Ego, own essence (“Meeting” is here understood in interpretation of M. Buber).

However, Buber himself mentioned that Meeting cannot last for long, it ... passes by. And namely then it seems that appear something that may be called a post-state of creativity – exhaustiveness of human.

And again it is necessary to live, to go to the new Meeting, to the new “Ego is the experience”. Considering the author’s creations under this point of view, we can make the assumption that – image, created by author, is not the actualization of some unrealized expertise; this is in fact not the image of real event: the author embodies his own experience for state of its birth as Ego-existing, Ego-subject. In general, let’s mention, that this reflection of motion to Ego-real, existing, is very inherent to modern authors.

The original mechanism, thanks to which effect the state of creativity allows a subject feeling “Ego is the experience”, is the exit beyond situation, triviality, beyond own current desires and impressions. This mechanism is called “transcendence”, instead of splitting the being into subject (human, personality) and object (thing, surrounding environment), – mentions L. Binswanger, – now we have the unity of existence and “world”, which is provided by transcendence [Binswanger, 2001], which is considered as essential characteristics of human existence. “This capability, – mentions R. May, – has already been established in the term “existence”, i.e. “to separate from”. The existence anticipates the continuous

appearance, transcendence from the past into the present and future [May, 2001a].

Transcendence means not only the “exit beyond: some limits but the experiences, which are linked with it, and that’s why “any precise description of human beings requires considering the experience” [May, 2001a].

Self-transcendence anticipates that a human shall challenge the existence in general and purely existence, in particular. This challenge may acquire unusual sharpness, poignancy and proneness to conflict in some states. In particular, we mean the state of creativity as “pure” transcendence. The motion of personality in the state “Ego is the experience” may be rather complex, even illusory but it is always the motion of being of own Ego-existing.

In many works we see the hard, if not catastrophic, painful solution of problem of existence (being-non-being) by human. We feel the dynamic change in state of creativity itself, feel how author very delicately but clearly touches the values, passes between them and dark unformed desires. And at last it comes to the light of existence and being.

At last we shall mention that the state of creativity, as self-transcendence, as “staying” in the state “Ego is the experience” anticipates not only Meeting with Ego-existing but its constant reinforcement, maintenance as it is and suspension from the one where Ego is not. So, this state is such one, in which self-consciousness acutely functions. “Self-realization anticipates self-transcendence ... Realization of itself as existing in the world anticipates the capability to step aside, to look at itself and situation, to assess them and then to stimulate itself with infinite variety of possibilities” [May, 2001a]. The creator experiences it very painfully, sometimes tragically as the situation is perceived by it as disassociation of “Ego”.

We can see that the collisions of interrelations with “Ego-really existing” are very acute. The form for reflection is very different, from frank and clear, to complex imagery, re-embodiment, as if dilution and absolutely new synthesis but the essence is always the same –

Ego-existing “fights” as active and independent substance, wishes the preservation, integrity, being.

And this is undoubtedly one more central moment in state of creativity. A creator using its state creates such internal, true, real situation, when in diversity it can “choose among many kinds of relations between the world and “Ego”. “Ego – this is the capability to see itself in variety of those possibilities” [May, 2001a].

And this is the real freedom in relation to the world. Freedom, openness of the world, creation of a great number of possibilities for existence and free choice, solution of existential problems in existence – these are the characteristics for creative state of personality. We see that our notion about personality and its existence, position of researcher in analysis – in fact allows recreating the dynamic of soulful state at human pursuant to products from its creative activity.

At the end – there is one more important thesis, the thorough disclosure of which requires the special work. The point is that in psychology there is the opinion that the states of creativity are very close due to their nature to borderline and unhealthy mental states.

The principal difference is well seen from what is set here, and the state of creativity – this is the self-transcendence through creation of different worlds, openness to them and their free choice.

The feature for mental disorder – this is the restriction by one single world, fixation upon it. At pathological state, mentions L. Binswanger: “freedom that allows the world” being is substituted by non-freedom of depression using some or other “world project” [Binswanger, 2001, p. 312].

Expertise

The substructure of expertise is considered by us separately from cognitive sphere that is not traditional. We don't think that it is only a certain amount of information, which is kept somewhere in the inward world of human and which then is somehow used. The expertise for us – this is principally another. Expertise – this is a certain state of system, which has not only the energetic, not only

structural but informational nature. Everything that occurs with human, regardless of its desire, is accepted by the system of human expertise.

The information that comes from the surrounding and internal biological is dynamic. It does not form, in our opinion, any reservoirs. This thought is vividly shown in metaphorical expression by Rogers: “Memory – this is not a bucket with water, from which we can take some or other with mug”. In our opinion it is clear only one thing – we deal with continuous flow of information (flow of need), which is informational energetic due to nature and passes through human as being and passed through very many beings before, and will pass through many others yet.

This flow can nowhere be slowed down cannot be accumulated. It is not necessary to imagine that on the way of this flow there are some “capacitors”, which accumulate this information, and then we can use it. This is not the case.

There is the only dynamic energetically-informative system, thanks to the fact that the expertise from the past existence is accumulated in it. If we take that expertise – no matter in what form it would be – and we will not have this system, it will disappear as living and existing. Here we have another question: how the information, which moves in this flow, is used.

When the world is doubled, thanks to the appearance of symbols, then there appears the transcendence as a possibility for system to be engaged into itself, a possibility to take that I need from this flow. The mechanisms for regulation, which “take out” what a human need at this moment from the flow of information, are formed.

This is in fact the whole mechanism. A human does not accumulate but takes this information. Exhaustion – a very good term by Spinoza. Information is analyzed through the one, which is exhausted at this concrete moment. It is a common opinion.

There is another moment. In addition to expertise, which exists during generations, during a long life of mankind, each human can replenish with informative world with those data that come to it during its individual life. This mechanism is linked with the property of “carrier” itself. When textbooks tell that the phenomenon of

memory is linked with the fact that psychics are plastic, and we can imagine that we may leave a trace on it, as, let's say, by bare feet on the sand, everyone likes this image. In fact, this is the correct example.

The only that can be told – it is necessary to imagine the motion of the sand that occurs with the light velocity, to imagine that the one, on which it is reflected, – is absolutely non-material, and this is and always is the system itself but it changes every time. Something like a curl (if to compare with physics) appears at the expense of system contact with surrounding world, or at the expenses of its attention to itself at this concrete moment. As if a certain knot appears, and this is the actualized memory thanks to this duplication a human may address to this knot and actualize and use it.

Thus, the actualization of individual expertise occurs due to the same mechanism. And the expertise – this is not only the knowledge. It is necessary to pay attention that knowledge as it is, the information as it is are never kept in the form, so to say, pure form. Who can tell that he remembered something without context of situation, in which it happened, without purpose, which was set at that time that one will tell the absolute lie. It never happens like that. The information is never kept in “pure” form because it is caught up, enters this flow in that form, in which the life exists.

Since that it becomes clear that not only the information as discourse may in fact be kept.

The material, which is kept, is skills, abilities of human, its systems of behavior, ways for its reactions to a certain events, as well the ways for reactions of others to it, ways for behavior in separate situations, separate systems, succession in this behavior. What do we mean when we tell, for example, that here we have an experienced specialist? Ask any specialist, *what* is his expertise? He will never deploy it to you because it is a quantum; it is the union of all information. It is absolutely open and “clear” for the system “personality” and is not absolutely perceived in verbalized, deployed form.

And it is openly verbalized, so, it will be already different information. Try to ask a master how he processes the crystal that it

is produced so unique only by him? He will tell you, what sizes he uses, which tools he applies. But this will not help you. The most important thing – unity of integrity that is in motion during the whole time disappears.

The carrier of expertise is the personality in the flow of information. This information is complex, integral and is kept in this flow in the form of the mobile, exclusively mobile. It can be there in the state of rest in general, it cannot stop even for a minute. Again there appears the same question – what is the memory? Is it the reservoir, from which we take something or is it the flow? It is the one and the other. And again we need our complementarity principle because we again cannot understand what is in front of us.

Everything depends on the aspect view and point of view by researcher. If he needs to explain to student what such preservation as process of memory is, it is more reasonable to imagine expertise as a stable system. Then the explanation due to the type “this is a bucket with water” comes. If he needs to explain what the memorizing process means, and why Adler pays attention to early childish memories, it is necessary to pass to so-called “wavy” theory, and to explain this as a constant infinite motion.

I repeat, we need our complementarity principle because in expertise we see the same what physicians saw in electron. It is a flow and structure at the same time. And this process is seen here as nowhere else.

It is not in vain that A. Einstein in his time addressed to psychology: he had a very serious correspondence with Jean Piaget (as mostly meaningful as with physicians), most interesting psychologist at that time because here there are many mysterious things. And really, the psychics due to many parameters have the same problems, which are researched at the level of micro world.

It is necessary to tell about relation of expertise with other structures. The initial carrier of information includes the flow of the conscious and unconscious. It should be understood not by this way as Freud described Id, as something violent, unclear, and dark. The flow is grouped and structured, undoubtedly oriented, the need moves it as initial carrier. The flow undoubtedly is such that runs

through the whole life of personality and comes out of it. And we speak that personality after physical death remains in our memory – what namely is left in it? The informational traces, which appeared in the expertise of this human, remain. Not only its image. Everything that is linked with it remains, all – integrally.

Why do they tell that it is good when we do not see a dead relative? Because we memorize it as living. Because it does not ruin the image of integral personality, who is before us. And this is more vividly, closer to the essence of that human, who was near you. And if there is no informative part in the flow of need as a carrier of life, so, there will be no system, in which there will be no ground, in general.

A short remark from the sphere of purely practical psychology about expertise: it is known that the expertise in practical life of human plays the double role. On the one hand, this role is positive that does not require any analysis. This is the one, without which it is just impossible to exist. On the other hand, at the level of purely vital, concrete problems, the expertise or partial quantum of any expertise, which was for some reason or other experienced by human very sharply and left the largest trace, and a human most quickly finds it in the infinite flow of information, may in fact make a problem, close the possibilities to exist by a different way.

It may acquire the nature of motives, orientation, and, closing the one that it is interesting for us now, may in fact “stop” the personality. Thus, we cannot refuse from our habit, pass to the new level of communication with another human and use all usual.

The expertise may hinder the creativity, creation. What does, in opinion of most scientists, hinder to flexibility and creativity of thinking? The fact that we, considering each task and each problem, which appears before us, are inclined to act usually, i.e. pursuant to expertise.

If the expertise does not give the answer for this question, we – and there are empirical facts for this – try to restructure the expertise using the imagination, “for” this situation, and to find any ways out inside the old expertise. The psychics of human are organized by this way. And it occurs instead of to go to the new level of solution. This

mechanism hinders to creativity. In psychology there is such concept as inertia of action, which consists in that this human is inclined to usual action. I started moving, for example, in this direction, and it is very difficult for me to stop the hand and to make another motion.

So to say this is a habit. It is reflectory, and it is comfortably psychological. And this inertia very often hinders to approach strictly to establishment of purely new ways for behavior both at the level of practical action and mental action.

Thus, the expertise constitutes the genetic whole, appears due to all laws for development of integral personality, and exists in certain forms, and this form for existence of personality is changed by the same way as all other its structures. The expertise is included into the context of existence of this personality and is linked with the lines for its development.

Cognitive sphere of personality

At the beginning of brief analysis for cognitive component in structure of personality, let's mention the interesting fact: cognitive psychological processes are not considered by absolute majority of theoreticians as components of personality?!

Namely the expression "extra-personal psychology" is linked namely with this: the psychology of cognitions "is not intersected" in modern science with psychology of personality, i.e. – paradox – with the psychology of the one, who cognizes. It has many rather logical and objective explanations but the problem does not disappear from them.

And this fact is especially sad as psychology namely in the sphere of cognitive processes accumulated the largest empirical material and most interesting theoretical generalizations.

So, the synthesis would be more reasonable and efficient. We cannot here stop on the analysis of reasons and consequences from this "break" but it seems that such analysis could open many essential things in relation to the sources for crisis in psychology, – so, this is strictly the style of scientific thinking: cognition of the world, which is the necessary attributive feature for system "personality",

for some reason is fiercely taken out “of the brackets” and is studied beyond this system...

The attributive character of cognition is stipulated by informational component of the need, and, thus, there is the objective necessity in availability of certain psychical structures, which action allows the need to exist, i.e. – provides with orientation of subject and its interaction with surrounding world. Cognition is the function for existence of personality, and it is necessary to seek for the understanding its unity namely in it. In neurophysiology and cognitive psychology there are data that after birth of human the volume of its brain is increased twice for two times: during birth it is 350 cm³, during the first year of life it reaches 700 cm³ and in 12-13 years – 1,400 cm³. Further the area of its surface is increased (especially it concerns the cerebral cortex).

What do these dynamics mean? It is very few to tell that it is stipulated inherently but this is not the answer. We can put forward the hypothesis about sources and mechanisms namely for such way of development of human brain – organ, which has the direct relation to cognition. Since impregnation and until the birth of human being the need (mainly, its informational component) is as if accumulated in cerebral cells, forming the informative background for existence, and, at the same time, a powerful energetic potential of readiness (aspiration!) to self-renewal of information as the condition for further existence and development.

The personality turns out to be in state of readiness for real energetically-informational explosion, which occurs during the first year of its postembryonic existence. This is really the explosion – a human cannot imagine something like that what occurs with it, with its brains, with its psychics in such critically short period of existence!

We have already mentioned and we will tell once more that we are not inclined to sharpen the degree of negativity in so-called “crisis of birth”, at least from the informational point of view. Rather it looks like insight, sudden discovery of the world. But a child turns out to be ready for this, and such cardinal increase in volume of the brain during very short period of time may tell only that this is completely determined, predicted, expected action towards the world of

information. This “motion towards” is the manifestation of activity of the subject under need to life, to existence.

It seems to us that quantitative index (increase by 100%) is the “surplus” in relation to strictly adaptive tasks. It is more appropriate to tell about tendency in acquisition and experience – transformation of surrounding into “own – other” – into consciousness and self-consciousness. No other living being has the changes in the brain of such sizes as a human. It speaks about potential powerfulness of intellect, and, in particular, about readiness to perceive, speaking precisely – “to absorb” something much larger and more diverse than the world of nature: this is the second nature, world of human. Since the first days of life a human perceives not only the objects – it perceives the language, super difficult informational structure with a great number of contexts and branches – a child turns out to be ready for it!. A newborn child can acquire the unique universal method for human coexistence, being coded and branched. And, let’s emphasize – only and exclusively a human child.

“The means in response” – own language is adequately and synchronously in time formed within this term. The entry into the world of social existence, “social impregnation” turns out to be synchronized with “explosion” in development of cognitive sphere. This can tell only that the cognitive sphere at the beginning of ontogenesis is dominant in existence and development of personality. (We do not absolutely reject hereby the importance of processes that occur in other spheres of personality: we speak about the one that received the name of heterogeneity and heterochronism of psychical development).

The first year of life, “large explosion” in development of cognitive sphere generates the cardinal direction in its further establishment – differentiation of cognitive processes. The cognitive sphere as a function of cognition is originally integral, i.e. – whole.

Its development is the motion from less developed, undifferentiated integrity, through differentiation – to integrated unity. We, strictly speaking, mean that the function of cognition and orientation in the world cannot be provided by one, separate cognitive process.

When O.M. Leontyev, researching the phylogenesis of psychics, comes to the conclusion that the development of cognition starts as purely sensory process, he is undoubtedly wrong. Only the feeling can never be sufficient for orientation of living, integral being in the world, even at the level of the simplest organism (amoeba or infusorium): the organism is oriented, and it means that he reflects, keeps the information, somehow actualizes and transforms it, – by itself, already as a subject. And, thus, we cannot speak about sensorics as it is, sensorics in our modern understanding of it, i.e. – only as feeling.

The cognitive sphere at low levels of life evolution acts in its undeveloped and undifferentiated but unity. Although this unity cannot be called as integrity: cognition is the functioning of the single, simplified elementary process, in which there are only the elements and parts of those phenomena, which we know as feeling, perception, memory, etc. And further, if we already speak about phylogenesis and about O.M. Leontyev, who, let's mention, researched the development namely of cognitive sphere in this work – Oleksii Mykolayovych considered that the determinant for development of this sphere was the transition from the world to heterogeneity. But from where does the heterogeneity of the world generate? The question remains open and this is not surprising taking into consideration the time when this work was created.

It seems to us that heterogeneity, complication of the world is first of all the result from existence of subjects of life – beings. They “catch” the space of life, master it, change, accumulate, realize and again accumulate the information. And, thus, we really have one world of living beings. Here there is no determination in its vulgar materialistic understanding, and here we cannot divide the processes of interiorization and exteriorization in time: this is namely one world, and it is self-determined through subjects that live and act in it ... The result from reflection of the world at this stage is not the image, this, rather is the amorphous complex unity of information and its experience (emotions).

This level in development of cognitive sphere to some extent is repeated in ontogenesis. This occurs, in our opinion, in embryonic period when the phenomenon of reflection appears on the 5th-6th

month of existence (and this is confirmed experimentally). It is the complex, undifferentiated and simplified: this (if we use modern terms) simultaneous action: of attention, feeling, perception, memory, and thinking. The image at such cognition is not formed, as we have told, and some formation of general character is created that has rather emotionally-signaling, very indefinite and unstructured content. The differentiation occurs very quickly after birth, and experiments (numerous, especially in foreign psychology) fix the action of separate process and availability of images.

So, genetically originally the cognitive sphere of human is the simplified unstructured (amorphous) unity, and its further development occurs in the direction of differentiation because such is the necessity in existence of human in biological and social surrounding. At the same time it is necessary to mention that differentiation does not mean the separation of processes from one another and from personality in the whole: expression by S.L. Rubinstein that human psychics are personal in this case means the close interrelation and determinative role of personality in functioning and development of psychical cognitive processes.

It is well seen in further ontogenesis: already at the end of the first year of child life the cognitive processes that exist as separate ones, at the same time start uniting into the new, higher, integrated whole. This process is finished in juvenile age (is it sudden that it coincides with one more 100% increase in the volume of the brain?)

What does it mean? The images, which are formed as a result from reflection of human by the world, in its sum create the one that is generally accepted to call “inward world” of personality. They motivate the activity and perform the function of self-regulation but at the same time are developed themselves. This moment is to a certain extent a key one and is interpreted in the psychology by a different way. When the modern cognitive psychology, represented by Naisser or other researchers, tells that so-called perceptive schemes, the point is in fact about availability of a certain expertise, which exists at human before start of reflection of outward world, with which this reflection is compared, and, at last, a certain image is formed.

Rather natural question for genetic psychology appears: from where does a scheme originate? The cognitive psychology has never answered this question because here again there is the idea about “homunculus”, which exists originally, or idea about “stupid” infinity, so, we can tell that this scheme appears from the previous scheme and the previous scheme appears yet from the previous scheme, and thus we will go to infinity and will never find any sources.

We think that in this case we should rely on actual understanding the sources for formation and existence of personality. Scheme is a part, component of that socially biological experience, which is transferred and excites the development and existence of personality in the whole. In principle, it includes cognitive moments, as well as other ones, and it is transferred at the expense of so-called “social heredity” as P.P. Blonsky called it, from social beings – parents of child.

How this material is preserved – the science does not know but it does not mean that it is not necessary to study this. So, the availability of the one that cognitive psychology calls cognitive schemes (it may be called by a different way – availability of previous, primary, basal expertise in order to build the image), is excited not by some extra natural phenomena. It is stipulated by the fact that a being is never born from non-living and non-personal: it is the carrier of expertise. And “cognitive sphere” is a part of this expertise.

Analyzing the cognitive sphere in the whole, we see that there are very complex interrelations of cognitive and emotional at different stages of personality ontogenesis. And the fact that primary images and primary expertise of human is formed mainly on the basis of emotional experiences is absolutely right but it does not also mean that cognitive sphere interacts with emotional sphere as no impressions are possible without cognition.

On the other hand, any signals about surrounding world, let they be the simplest ones, are emotional and sensual at the same time. It is especially vivid seen at previous, primary stages of ontogenesis.

Not only the full unity of separate elements for cognition but the whole cognitive sphere with the sphere of emotions appears here vividly.

The question about formation of image is problematic at present moment. Despite the fact that numerous researches in psychology are devoted to problem of perception (O.M. Leontyev wrote about it in one of his last articles), the problem is that we do not know yet how the image is formed. And different interpretations of this process do not completely open its actual content. The elementary, as it seems, question about how a human sees the image cannot be solved at present level of science because we cannot imagine this “sees” by anything except a metaphor, so it is quite clear for us that vision is linked with certain perceptive systems. In this case there are no such systems.

On the other hand – where is a human oriented: in the system of images, which are formed in it about outward world, or in this outward world itself? In other words, what is really reflected in my psychics: a human that sits in front of me, or do I deal with its reflection in my psychics, with my image of this human? It is known that in philosophy very many spears were broken on this occasion, and many different hypotheses were created up to absolute non-cognition of the world, as if that a human is actually oriented in own images and in fact there is no objective world.

We do not know the answer, for example, to the following question: how a visual image is formed thanks to auditory sense or other receptors, how do these transitions occur? There are very many mysteries. It seems to us that the use of phenomenon of experience here, about which we already told, may partially help to answer some questions. Besides, it seems to us that the position, declared in philosophy of Spinoza, and his term “exhaustion of outward by human” to be very heuristic.

The point is the active interaction of human with a thing, as a result of which the image is formed, arises. Again we see that the explanation of any fact, in this case object, is possible only if we “catch” the process of its appearance in experiment or the process of transition of one image into other one, or process of image change. In fact, we speak about study on genesis of image.

Let’s return to the problem on development of image. National researches (first of all – O.V. Zaporozhets and his colleagues) proved

that the image is developed, transforming into the sign. This occurs starting since the earliest stages of ontogenesis, thanks to the fact that perception of child is accompanied by comments of adult. What is in fact the sensory standard? This is a certain object, phenomenon, property (color, for example, or pitch of sound), which turns out to be indissolubly united with the word in social reality for a child.

Thus, the image exists in the inward world as if since the very beginning at the same time and along with the corresponding term. Gradually it “is reduced”, its sensitive-sensory saturation is hidden, and a sign appears. We cannot “dispute” with Vygotsky, who proved that namely sign “is grown into” as we have no empirical facts.

But genetic logic is self-explanatory” a sign is not grown into (it is just too complex and “foreign”) and is established by human itself using the union of image and word. Why does it become possible? Cultural historical theory answers absolutely correctly to this question – because human cognition is the personally-active process (this is not the mirror reflection). Activity and operation create the inward world.

Vygotsky, analyzing the psychology of a blind child, completes the work by a phrase: “The blindness is overcome by a word!” [Vygotsky, 1982a]. What does it mean? The adequacy in reflection of the world by human is defined not by the world and not psychophysical state of sensory processes. It is defined by existence of integral personality in social environment. Higher psychical functions (mediation, arbitrariness) form the new interfunctional relations, making a personality to be surprisingly flexible and vital.

This is the compensation but not thanks to other nature – cultural environment, which provides with possibility to exist literally for “anything” if only a human itself wants it. The creation and use of sign allows changing the correlation of processes and the level of cognition is defined already not by development of any one process (thinking or perception) but by complexity and flexibility in system of relations.

The consideration of psychological problems in cognitive sphere of personality shall not relate only to the aspect for provision with adequacy of psychical reflection within vital activity.

The moment of cognition within strictly scientific comprehension of reality is essential. We can state that the serious stage in modern science, which, is indeed stipulated by development not of psychology but other first of all natural sciences.

The direct reflection of reality in perception does not open its essential features and secret mechanisms for existence of phenomenon or thing to us. It is achieved using thinking, which allows opening, retaining, abstracting and generalizing the essential as it is. The abstract knowledge appears and the image of perception is added and enriched. However it remains to be the image, having all corresponding properties (constancy, subjectiveness, etc.).

A human “passes” this image to reality and studies, strictly speaking, not it as it is but its relation with abstract world. New knowledge appears and the illusion in cognizability of the world arises. This illusion is very unpleasant and dangerous. The world seems such one that corresponds to our notion about it. And this is necessary as human feels then confidently, reliably and comfortably. But is the world such one that exists in our imagination? Modern science (first of all, physics) comes to paradoxical conclusion: we do not know the world, we cannot cognize it, instead of it we cognize the abstractions, which we studied at school. It is enough “for life” but not for all and not always.

The mechanism, thanks to which a human became a human, created the culture, this mechanism seems to use up itself and is transformed into brakes for further development. It is necessary to change the strategy for study of cognitive sphere. There are some facts, which testify the potential possibility of human for further cognition of the world.

Let’s show two of them. Well-known process of mediation that became “a common place” in psychology. But there is one aspect: when a human creates the means, it already knows why it needs it, i.e. it knows some “piece” of the future” (when a wild man makes a hack on the tree, he makes it not in vain: he knows that he will lack the memory (!?), when he will look at it). And this is the real and great mystery of human personality: the world, perhaps, is given to us not only in perception and sensorics.

Another moment. We tell – a talented, genius human opens hidden mysteries of the world.

And perhaps – this is not the case, perhaps, a talented human just sees the world such one as it is but not such one that corresponds to previously acquired schemes? S.L. Rubinstein sometimes wrote that the perception of human was organized rather pragmatically – are so-called “strong” sides of things and phenomena, which correspond to the nearest vital demands and to which a human orients. As if the starting point appears. But any thing, phenomenon is infinite in its properties and qualities.

Why do not we see them? And why did a genius see them? The problem of contemplation arises by this way: the world is not against me, as a warehouse for useful, harmful, pleasant or dangerous things; it is also around me (and I am in it), and if to look without interest (from pragmatic point of view), perhaps, we will be able to see...

Orientation

Traditionally the orientation of personality is considered as hierarchic motive-demand sphere that is constantly complicated. We consider orientation very narrowly as a real union of the most important values, most important sense-forming motives, which make a human life to be structured, ordered, purposeful.

Orientation in such understanding is that substructure of personality, thanks to which there is the sense to speak about vital phenomenon, which we call a life journey of personality.

The difference of the latter one from development is principal. The vital journey is ordered through the sphere of inward world, through self-consciousness and through values and senses. Similar approaches to orientation were declared by G. Allport and L.I. Bozhovych. Bozhovych, uniting orientation with concept “position of personality”, tells that juvenile age differs in terms of development by the fact that the vital position, which is the dominating during the whole further life, is formed at human namely in this age.

It is strictly the system of senses, system of values. This is the core of human life, which makes it to be ordered and socially susceptible.

But at the same time it does not mean that orientation is such structures, which has purely and exclusively social nature. It is formed thanks to the system of key experiences by personality and the key experiences, as we have already shown above, is the synthetics, integrator of the whole inward world that embodies the biological experiences and own biological states and social surrounding and its perception by human. It underlies the appearance and development of consciousness and self-consciousness.

Thus, as all substructures of personality, orientation is a substructure, linked with all others; it is the embodiment and a certain integrated union of the whole personality. At the same time, as all other substructures, orientation is a specific substructure. The most essential components are values and senses. If each personality is oriented, there appears the question: to what is oriented? This question is not so easy for understanding within the limits of psychology of personality.

On the one hand, it can be understood as the question about typology. Thus, Shpranger divided people into six types due to values (esthetic human, intellectual, ethical, etc.). Separating such types, we have not only the motives of esthetical human but, mostly important, mostly essential, this human sees the principles of beauty, harmony in preservation. Esthetical human may work as artist, as well as it can work as a driver, teacher, military man. Orientation is directly not linked with occupation. Orientation means a certain order for establishment and structurization of its own life world by personality.

Regardless of the fact what this human is due to occupation, or what its educational level is, it strives to build its surrounding world so that it would correspond to its internal tendencies, its internal desires. Orientation – this is the creation, grouping and structurization of the world by human near itself due to certain laws. When we speak about esthetical orientation, so, it means due to laws of beauty, when we speak about ethical orientation, so, it means due

to laws of good and justice, when we speak about pragmatic orientation, so, it means due to laws of sale, laws of commodity.

We think that this approach to typology from the point of orientation is the most interesting. So, if to consider other typologies (extroverts – introverts by K.G. Jung, etc.), so, at attentive analysis it becomes clear that they are derived theoretically-abstractly by Jung or by anyone else and do not exist in reality. We can put the question: why do we need the typology?

Unlike these approaches, the division into types due to orientation is more reasonable. It originates from top spheres of personality, from orientation of personality as structurization of the world around itself due to own laws. And the approach to typology from the point of view of orientation is justified because the orientation is really exclusively personal index. Orientation defines achievement. Orientation defines the style of human life. Orientation defines the style of communication and what is the most important thing in this life for human. Speaking about orientation we tell about existential values, existential senses. Orientation goes through the whole personality, all spheres of life and all activity of personality.

Thus, it seems to us that this structure is the least studied. The problematic moment is the absence of methods for research of orientation. We do not consider seriously Basset test. Orientation, which is studied using this test, is not the subject of research, which we described above.

As it concerns the development, genesis, it is necessary to mention that the need as energetically-informative carries is oriented. Our conversations about orthogenesis are not the fantasies. The evolution, development is oriented. We know: this orientation from the simplest to the most complex. We see the evolutionary transition, spiral from orientation of biosocial need to orientation of upper, spiritual level in personal orientation. This is the orientation of personality. Again we return to the question: why do we need the orientation?

We have already given one variant of the answer: orientation to structurization of own world due to own laws. On the other hand, we can tell about orientation to growth, orientation to become the most

complex, to become the most flexible and expedient, it means the drive to development. And here the orientation starts coinciding with self-actualization in the sense that each human strives to be such one, which it can be, due to belief by K. Rogers.

At the first sight such understanding may seem rather abstract. And further this abstraction starts filling in. We can tell who we can become thanks to understanding the orientation.

All can be the most complex. All can be the most developed. All can be more nuanced. All can be more humanitarian. All. And further the details appear, regardless of what you do, where you live, what you read, what you like – these are already nuances. But here answer absolutely clearly: we can all be the ones, we can be – we can be the most developed. And we can pass to the level when a human may overcome this confrontation of plus and minus, confrontation of black and white.

It means that that something may be not positive or negative and may be higher, more complex, better. In this sense better, more humane, more integral. The confrontation of the good and bad is finished, when we speak that there is the third one. This third is more complex, more expedient and more integral. So, we remove the eternal confrontation. The personality goes to it; this is its orientation of higher quality.

Abilities

The substructure of abilities of human is very important functional chain in structure of personality. We will fix on some essential moments, in our opinion. Firstly, the abilities act as purely social acquisitions for human, which appear and are developed namely thanks to that a human lives in *socium*.

The social surrounding requires from human a certain functioning, achievements of certain successes in solution of some affairs, and all this is possible thanks to abilities. We define abilities as a degree in acquisition of means for actions by human. It means that any activity, no matter we would take – learning, work, physical,

intellectual activity, obligatorily includes the system of actions and system of ways for their performance.

A human, who acquired well the ways for actions, is called able, and the one, who acquired them in less degree, is called unable.

Within this context it should be mentioned that as all other substructures genetic psychology considers the appearance of abilities as absolutely necessary, natural process, determined by social conditions of human life. The realization of certain demands means the meeting of human since yearly age not only with things that surround it, which a human wants to acquire by some or other way but with necessity to do something with these things, to manipulate them somehow.

In all kinds of activity, starting from subjective-manipulative, which is developed since one year at child, and in further activities, we meet the necessity in clever uses of actions as means for achievement of some or other purpose. The social grants human with the possibility to realize its purposes, its demands in different spheres, different direction, and everything depends on how quickly and qualitatively a human will acquire the means for these actions.

Based on such interpretation, on such understanding, we shall principally disallow the question about origin of abilities in that form, in which it arises in traditional psychology that considers the origin of abilities as the question what is more important – biological, morphological, physiological dispositions as the prerequisite for development of abilities or strictly social surrounding, in which these abilities are formed. There is no this problem in such forms because a human will acquire the actions and obligatorily achieves different purposes, if it is a normally functioning human in society.

Thus, the dispositions as prerequisites, social requirements, social practice and system of study as compulsory one is equally necessary and the origin of abilities is the integral phenomenon. We cannot in any way divide into what is the most important. At the same time the question about origin of abilities is central in paradigmatic plane of genetic psychology. Its solution seems here far incomplete and much more interesting and deeper than just the “competition”

for the first place between representative of natural scientific and social approaches.

The real solution of problem requires applying the principle of non-disjunctivity, established by famous Russian psychologist O.V. Brushlinsky [Brushlinsky, 1998]

The means for actions (degree for acquisition of which, let's remind, is understood by us as the psychological content of phenomenon that is called "abilities") are strictly the forms for purposeful conscious behavior of human. They are formed in activity and engraved, accumulated in expertise of individual and mankind. Objectivating in subjective and other social products, these means for actions are kept in cultural historical semiotic space. The desobjectivation ("decoding") and appropriation of these means for actions through interiorization by new generations realizes the continuity (non-disjunctivity) of existence and development of abilities in this plane. But we mean not only this.

The accumulation of acquired means for actions occurs strictly in individual expertise of each human. Reproduced and developed in hundreds thousands of generations, this experience shall obligatorily influence on the whole integrity of personality, in particular, on that one in it, which we usually call bodily (biological). "The social becomes the biological" – this thesis in this case is literal and, in fact, absolute, the ways for actions change the morpho-physiological structure and dynamics of integral system and hereby open one more way of continuity, at purely genetic level. This is the way for creation of potential abilities at originally human being by love energy, which part may become the abilities, being actually in those points of space and time, where these two ways will be able to intersect.

By the way, in our opinion, namely the second way of continuity may open the foundations for understanding individual peculiarities in abilities, so the changes in morpho-physiological thesaurus will occur both under effect of acquired forms of behavior and in conformity with natural (biological) indices of a certain individual. The set understanding opens the actual role of informative component of the need. In its eternal flow there is already what we call potential abilities of human.

And at the intersection of the need with social surround, its requirements, possibilities and restrictions, this potentiality is actualized and developed. Thus, in fact, the line of genetic psychology testifies to uselessness and artificiality of term “disposition” in consideration of problematic abilities.

If not to refuse now from this word, according to our opinions, the dispositions are never purely physiological, biological as we implement the point of view that any biological structure of human is strictly the union of social influences and purely natural structures just because this is a human.

We can speak that a human due to its genetic heredity, maturity or non-maturity of certain organs or their systems, certain physiological or biochemical processes may originally be more able or less able to acquisition of some or other ways for actions. And this means, for example, that in order to become an artist, it is necessary that a human would have a quick eye, sensory processes to distinguish certain nuances of color, certain tints of color scale would be well-developed; on the other hand, this human shall have a well-developed and differentiated musculoskeletal apparatus that provides with precision in motion of fingers, hand in the whole.

And it is clear that the inclusion of such human into a certain context of socium, which anticipates the production of a certain way for actions, will be much more efficient that when we take other human, who will not have these prerequisites.

But this question is not so simple. As researches show, the phenomenon of compensatorics acts very energetically in this aspect, Yu.B. Gippenreiter [Gippenreiter, 1993] absolutely correctly gives the example in relation to morphological data. For example, when after death of famous tenor Caruso, they researches the structure of his vocal chords, they turned out to be so rough, primitive long-napped and knotty that if we did not know, whom they belong, we would never tell that these chords of that human, whose clearness of voice the whole world was captivated. It means that within this aspect we come to a very interesting thing: organ shall physically, physiologically, morphologically be developed in healthy mode up to certain limits, no deformation shall be.

Then the social context prevails and dominates. And if the social context, i.e. environment, in which a child stays, is favorable for development of some or other ways of actions – artistic, musical, scientific, sport and some others, – and, on the other hand, if this favorableness, comfort is united with what motivates a child very much as integral personality and it wants to do it on its own but not under constraint of other human; if these two things are added by the third one, i.e. by a human or some people, who personally perceive this child and wish to teach it, to develop these ways of actions at it, so, this system will prevail over biological, physiological dispositions, and some or other ability as a system of ways may be developed very highly and very strongly.

But do not forget about the limit, which is the norm for development of anatomic physiological structures. That is, we speak about healthy brain, healthy muscles, and healthy organs in general. Only in this case the psychical, the social sphere turns out to the strongest than the morphological, biological.

More simply, if the situation assists to what a child wants to learn something, it strives so much to have achievements in this sphere that builds up the corresponding “organs” in its activity (and then – in its interfunctional psychological system), and such peculiarities may incite the development of abilities. And there, where there are inborn dispositions at human but the abovementioned social conditions are absent, the formation of abilities may not occur.

When we speak about the level in development of ability, we shall not step aside the definition: this is only the level in acquisition of ways for actions by human. Analyzing the talent, genius, it is necessary to mention one very important thing: “personal imprint”, personal seal of human, whom we call talented, genius or just a real master. On everything that it made there is as if a mark that this was made namely by this human and no one could do so much. It appears because the system of abilities, ways for actions is united with personal structures, is reflected, objectivated in that product, which is created as a result from activity of this personality.

The uniqueness of design for interfunctional systems of this personality is embodied into things: it can be a material thing and

ideal construction. It is reflected by such a way that no one else will create it as the whole individuality was embodied into this work of art. It is clear that not all people achieve this. Here shall be the unique unity of the whole inward world and the whole personality in general.

The consideration of abilities anticipates the analysis for phenomenon of sensitivity. Its nature has not completely been studied in psychology but we know that each age has periods when personality is mostly opened for certain social influences; on the other hand, it acquires them most easily. Besides, if a human “passed” this sensitive period and a certain ability has not formed at it, in principle, it can be formed later but for this it is necessary to take much more efforts and it relates to serious expenses both energetic and psychical ones.

So, the knowledge of sensitive periods means the possibility to model the development of abilities. Knowing, in which period and in which time it is necessary to act, studying a human, we hereby can forecast the overall or concrete development of abilities at this human. Then we stimulate this component of personality structure. Within this context it seems to me that it is important to consider the phenomenon of talent.

The problem on research of psychological peculiarities for child talent is rather urgent in modern science, which is confirmed by general volume and variety of scientific publications, devoted to its consideration. The appearance of generalized theoretical applied works tells about seriousness of researchers’ intentions. However, on the other hand, we should state somewhat surface and descriptive character of researches and namely the psychological nature of talent as phenomenon remains unclear.

The characteristic feature for such state of affairs is the polysemy of the term itself. Thus, there are 5 (!) definitions of the term “talent” in psychological dictionary of 1990. Here it should be mentioned that already L.S. Vygotsky wrote that such state of affairs in psychology, when the same term is interpreted too much meaningfully and arbitrarily, is the index for insufficiency in theoretical analysis and general crisis.

In fact, “talent” in modern psychology is not the theoretical concept and these “definitions that accompany this word in literature are only the statement of separate external manifestations for this phenomenon. We can really now, relying on numerous scientific data, outline rather saturated picture of external manifestations of child talent. It is indicated that the most frequent manifestation of talent is the early speech and large vocabulary.

At the same time the extraordinary attentiveness, unsaturated curiosity and excellent memory is marked. Further the following parameters for talent are provided: prominent abilities, potential possibilities in achievement of high results and already demonstrated achievements in one or more spheres (intellectual abilities, specific abilities to study, creative or productive thinking, and abilities to descriptive and executive activity, psychomotor abilities). They pay attention to specificity in personal qualities of talented children; in particular, they observe higher sensitivity, emotionality, feeling of justice, width of personal values, etc.

Undoubtedly, the noticed facts are very important but it is necessary to pay attention to the fact they do not approach us to understanding the essence of phenomenon of talent. These facts are a set of symptoms – manifestations of that psychological phenomenon, which is called “child talent”. But it is impossible to tell what its psychological nature pursuant to the simple consideration of these symptoms is.

The transition from simple fixation of separate manifestations (symptoms) for talent to its meaningful analysis as integral psychological phenomenon seems possible in conceptual space of genetic psychology. Strictly speaking, the one that genetic study of the psychological (approach to psychics, as such one which is developed” – according to G.S. Kostyuk [Kostyuk, 1989] is the most reasonable and efficient in terms of its real understanding, is known already since the times of L.S. Vygotsky and G.S. Kostyuk.

However, this approach in real researches is applied very rarely and in our opinion it sets a very interesting and heuristic space of analysis for psychological phenomenon and may really solve the main scientific cognitive task, which G.S. Kostyuk formulated it in his time:

“The main task in study of genesis of human psychics is to cognize its qualitative peculiarity, conditions that generate it, laws for its establishment” [Kostiuk, 1989, p. 123].

The key provision is that talent as a psychical phenomenon – *appears* (this expression fixes, as it is seen, the fact that is the integrity as namely the integrity appears and not a set of separate elements).

The one, we observe at child, its significant success, curiosity, rapid progress in study, etc., – all this is the manifestation of what has appeared.

What namely, how and why has arise – these are the fundamental questions, they are the main points in theoretical analysis of problem. Further we will make the assumption, although hypothetical, but such one, which is based on clear methodology of cultural historical theory. L.S. Vygotsky showed that peculiarities for development are stipulated not by the level of some separate psychical functions but specificity of interrelations between functions (theory of interfunctional systems).

We can assume that in case of talent at child we have the original interfunctional unity, which provides with that level of development, which is called “talent”. The fact that unity, which has arisen, covers the whole psychics and not only the intellectual but mnemonic spheres is principal. Thus, there is the sense to speak about level of child development in the whole, subject and not its certain elements.

Talent as integral (all-personal) interfunctional system has certain psychological characteristics. It is very mobile, the processes that support it are marked by high dynamism, new relations between separate functions are established very quickly that provides with effects of interchange, compensation and super compensation. In the whole, it is necessary to speak about high mobility and liveliness of this system (talent).

It is necessary also to mention other, its very essential properties. Firstly, here we have the unique correlation of triad: affect, intellect, action (term “affect” is used here in understanding by L.S. Vygotsky, i.e. rather not as an attribute of emotions but as motivational incentive phenomenon). L.S. Vygotsky convincingly

showed that the key problem of children with mental delays is the specific lagging of action by thought, motive, is very slowly realized in activity, namely hence – delay.

It seems to us that in case of talent the situation specifically “converts”: namely the action and transition of motivation and thought into activity is here very quick and mobile. The relation in triad (affect, intellect, action) is the dynamic and reverse, thus, the results from action, which very often are not anticipated by a child (especially in early ontogenesis), stimulate the activity of affective and intellectual spheres.

As the transition from them to action is simplified and becomes rapid, the stimuli for further desires and thoughts appear at once. This regularity in behavior of talented children is manifested in their curiosity, “non-saturation”, mobility and easy switching over, which, however, may paradoxically be united with surprising stability of attention (this “paradoxically” usually concerns the norm but not the talent).

Speed, plasticity and instability of processes at talented child stipulate the second important characteristic – quick and easy development of higher psychical functions. Early speech development, aspiration to embody own inward world into reflection, whether at performance, disposition to operate figures – all this testifies to rightfulness of noticed fact. This tendency is so brilliant that even original “displacement” in sensitive periods of development occurs at talented child. We do not have sufficient data to analyze the reasons for such phenomenon but it seems that there is the sense specially to research this psychological phenomenon.

One more characteristic concerns the fact that talent as a psychical phenomenon not only *appears* but *is developed*. It seems that the psychics in this unity, which is talent, very vividly and strongly realizes (hyper function) one from its essential functions, and namely – designing (modeling). In order to understand this characteristic it is necessary to pass to the answer for the following question: *how* does this all-personal integrity appears – interfunctional system, which is usually called as a talent?

Analyzing the interrelations of the natural and cultural in development of psychics, L.S. Vygotsky notes that in the norm there is the original balance: the specificity in social situation of development, in which the appropriation of cultural historical experience occurs, corresponds to each stage in maturation of some or other structures.

Namely this balance stipulates the succession in development of higher psychical functions. A human detects and realizes own demands and inclinations, selecting among numerous objects of social reality the ones that correspond to its internal manifestations. The appropriation occurs in the form of means for action. Appropriated means acquires psychological nature, is included into structure of consciousness and through “interference” into existing interfunctional systems influences of further process of development – appropriation.

This process received the name “double mediation”. At the same time there is another aspect: a human does not appropriate the means as it is but makes something (someone) by the means and only then appropriates it. We think this provision to be principal as only a subject – carrier of complex inward world, in which the vital expertise is represented and to which the expectation (means – for what?) is inherent, can *make* something by means. Thus, when we observe the process for transformation of something (someone) into psychological means – we have the manifestation of model for the future, created by psychics.

As the result from this there are changes in psychics itself, we can speak about its *self-modeling*. Let’s remind that there is the correlation between maturity of psychical structures (and thus – their readiness for appropriation of certain means – signs) and social systems of learning and education, “passing” through which a child acquires the corresponding expertise, thus – self-models own psychics.

What will be if the balance is infringed?

Vygotsky considers the problem of defective child and tells that it gets into situation, for which the structures of psychics are not ready (did not ripen). Thus a defect appears – the process of maturity

is delayed due to natural reasons, the psychics turn out to be not ready for acquisition of normative expertise. Can we tell that the situation is here transformed and a talented child due to natural reasons has the effect of quicker maturation in separate function? It seems to us that we cannot tell so.

The whole expertise in study of talented children testifies to the fact that their successes are defined by not quicker maturation of separate structures of psychics and by already mentioned properties of integral personality as a single interfunctional system: flexibility, plasticity of processes, speed of dynamic phenomena and easy formation of higher (mediated) psychical functions. This observation seems to be important in terms of practical problems: it is necessary to know about easy exhaustion of children.

Besides, here there is the solution why one from German philosophers-classics told about these children that a wunderkind – this is a child, at whom everything is in the past.... So, how do adults usually act when they meet with child talent? Using pedagogical methods, they start meagerly loading some separate function (thinking, imagination, memory, etc.) that leads to the fact that a immature child, so to say, “overstrains itself” and is exhausted, not realizing those potencies in life, which as if “promised”. Imbalanced child under such pedagogical conditions is easily deformed as personality.

At last, it is necessary to pay attention to one more aspect of analysis, which modern genetic psychology specially emphasizes. In fact, almost during the whole time we speak about it: we mean the necessity in integral approach to analysis for appearance and development of a certain psychical phenomenon, which shall be considered exclusively within the context of the whole personality. Not the development of separate functions defines the talent but, on the contrary, the talent as integral and all-personal characteristic stipulates the specificity in development of separate parts of psychics.

The main spiritual foundations of human personality are universality, infinity and self-consciousness of human. Talent as psychological index just means that a child, thanks to

abovementioned peculiarities, quicker and more active realizes these foundations by the ways, which it has. It as if hurries up to become a human; it is very early – subjective and personal. We would risk assuming that early development of the one, which may be called *moral personhood* – this is the main and key parameter of talent.

Really, what does it mean the quick and easy possession of language (and our observations tell that talented children not just easily and quickly grow into linguistic culture, they are characterized by modeling, game with speech means)? In our opinion, this means nothing else but the aspiration to develop subjectness in itself through mechanism for establishment of means as speech is the universal means of interaction in culture. What are the achievements of these children? Psychologically, they are the result from manifestation – embodiment of general personal nature of human (to leave own imprint).

At last, it is necessary to mention the absolute originality of relation, in which talented people (and not only children) stand to such specific activity as the game. We notice during the whole time: a talented child achieves the highest results very easily and without visible efforts – as if playing; talented adults like humor very much, they usually recklessly play different games, are delighted, etc. This speaks about very essential thing. So, the most essential feature of the game is that it anticipates absolutely free manifestation of human by itself. We again come to the fact that this is the main feature of talent.

The personal aspect in problem of talent is important not only in the terms of its scientific understanding. It forces to be very careful in relation to a child, not to forget that first of all – this is a human and it needs just to live in addition to demonstration of its achievements.

At last, let's mention that the term “abilities” is used in psychology rather widely. The axiomatic division into general and special abilities does not stand any professional criticism because we can tell, for example, wider. There are abilities to study; no psychological textbook considers it. In our opinion, this is the most important ability for human.

So, it defines how a human is learnt, open to formation of ways for actions in itself, open not only to acquisition of knowledge and to their transformation into the means and how much it can perform the activity, related to learning.

The classical, most objective interpretation of abilities is in B.M. Teplov [Teplov, 1985]. He outlines three key characteristics for abilities: “Firstly, abilities mean the individual psychological peculiarities that differ one human from another”.

Further analysis of this thesis leads to solution of one from cardinal contradictions – correlation of general and individual unique in personality: abilities are the structural element, which shall compulsorily be any personality, in other words, a personality cannot be without abilities. But at the same time there cannot be personalities with absolute similar abilities. So, in fact the first thesis by Teplov has much more general, integral personal character, and we can formulate the opinion by the following way: integral structure and key elements are inherent to any personality, personality in general.

And at the same time this structure and its elements, as well as their correlation in each concrete personality are qualitatively unique.

There appears something that may be called as a unique and unrepeated design of personality.

B.M. Teplov in the second thesis specifies the subject: “Abilities are not any individual peculiarities in general but only such ones that relate to successfulness in performance of any activity or some activities” [Teplov, 1985, p. 16]. Hereby, the structural chain (side) acquires own limits and orientation.

At last, the third thesis of scientist, which is distinguished by complexity, in fact it concerns the psychological content of abilities and their dynamics. Abilities “are not reduced to available skills, practices or knowledge and ... may explain the easiness and quickness in acquisition of this knowledge and skills”. What may this “easiness” mean, which do abilities “explain”? Here, in fact, different levels are concentrated (“vertical” dimension): from anatomic physiological dispositions and elementary psychical functions – to conscious regulation of own life. S.L. Rubinstein meant namely this

when he told: "... human abilities – this is the one that is brought up without its participation" [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 137].

On the other hand, the degree in possession of knowledge and skills (in fact, psychological means) is defined by motivation, leading features of character, etc. (and this is "horizontal" dimension for interaction of separate sides). At last, the degree in possession of psychological means defines the quality of vital activity and social interaction, content of human spiritual experiences (unity of biological, social and soulful constitutes the real background for existence and vital establishment of personality as integrity).

The conceptually important genetic fact arises from the provisions, being analyzed – abilities exist only in development. They appear, function, and are developed due to own laws that act within the context of general personal laws for establishment of individual. It is better to trace the origin of abilities in early ontogenesis and on example of so-called "general" abilities.

Here we have exciting facts, which discover that abilities, different due to nature, appear according to uniform mechanism. We, in particular, mean such abilities as, for example, upright posture – on the one hand, (it would seem, purely physiological ability) and speech – on the other hand (ability is undoubtedly socially-psychological). The biological background (construction, functioning, state of anatomic physiological, first of all, nervous organization) is absolutely important in both cases. We shall tell here that the significance of biological bodily background remains important always, during the whole life of human. So, the "body" shall acquire a certain degree of maturity for appearance of abilities (initial stage of development).

Next condition – a human as integral personality shall experience the strained and contradictory meeting with social surrounding. The initiator for this meeting shall be namely a human and the demand shall be such one, which is unable to be realized under conditions of present possibilities of human. In the first case (upright posture) we have two demands, which incite "meeting" – demand on psychological separation from mother and demand on cognition, in the second case also two demands interact – demand

to control the behavior of adult and demand to express own experiences.

In both cases a child shall possess the means for realization of abovementioned demands. The social surrounding and this is the necessary condition for further motion, shall provide a child itself with possibility to form such means, and for this it shall have them in special signed symbolic form. The acquisition and appropriation of means denotes not only the satisfaction of demand and appearance of new ability as a structural element of personality. Further, abilities are not only developed but interact each with other, as well as with other structures (sides), forming the steady complex interfunctional systems. B.M. Teplov showed on example of musical activity that its successfulness is stipulated by integrated ability, which he called “musicality”. It includes three abilities as components. “Musicality” itself means the ability to experience the content of musical work.

So, integrity, uniqueness of personality is formed, exists and is established in its living motion. It includes socially-cultural values, on the one hand, and the biological, genetic background for personality – on the other hand.

Completing the conversation about structure of personality, it is necessary to mention some very important things.

Firstly, we described the structure of personality as we see it not just because it seems to us by such a way but tried to enter to the sphere for determination of development, its laws and mechanisms; process of personality existence in the world. It seemed to us that at this moment we can speak about availability of such structure at personality. It does not absolutely mean that we insist on the fact that the personality structure can be only of such form.

It seems to us that this question is open as we in fact still know very little about personality, we see a human being in very few things. We see a human in situation of that life, which is at present moment. If we take a human from the beginning of epoch of mankind – it had no such structure of personality: it was undeveloped.

Here it will be reasonable to make one more remark about infinity of personality. F.M. Dostoyevsky once very brilliantly wrote in “The Brothers Karamazov” about what is a real personality of human.

And a real personality of human – this is the one, which is shown in special conditions of life. And no one knows which it is, and which can be. It is really an eternal mystery of human. We cannot understand how it happened that a personality of each human contained the whole Universe. How it happened that when I hear that a new galaxy was discovered, which was seen by no one and will not be able to see, I can imagine it.

This “vision” was born inside a human, in its inward world. These things remain unclear, and we tell that the personality remains open both to the world and depths of its existence, possibilities for reflection of this world, its experience. And likewise indeed it remains for ever to be open for scientific research. And this should be perceived normally and not to strive to build the single and consummate theory of personality for the whole life, and be very nervous when someone does not like it. We will always find something in human that is not included into any theory. And we would like to finish the consideration of personality structure namely by this moment because it is not the end but the start. This is the eternal start for research of human, which in general is its eternal life.

PERSONALITY: FORECAST OF DEVELOPMENT AND LIFE JOURNEY

Human being (existence)

The existence of nature is reasonable – it is unquestioningly. A human makes this existence such one. It does not “imagine”, does not “invent” the expediency, does not “grant” nature with it – it really establishes it (expediency).

Firstly, a human, remaining a part of nature, performs the goal-setting in conscious activity, and in infinitely great totality of representatives from human race, in infinitude of time for existence of generations, is the real expedient moment, in which the natural phenomena and natural essence are changed. A human changes the nature and not only in activity. It changes it by its essence and existence.

Hence, secondly, the essence of human alone is natural. A human – this is a form for existence of nature, natural, in which it is closely interlaced with social cultural and is absolutely special, unrepeated clot of biosocial unity that self-reflects. A human life, existence of personality by some rather incredible, **brilliant** way includes everything – not only the nature as being – the whole world.

It is not just natural – it is nature itself, the whole world in infinity of potencies and directions, depths and peaks of existence. Thus, the special tissue for expediency of world, into which a human life is interwoven, is formed. Thus, the ontology of its existence – drama – appears. In order to try to understand it, it is necessary to overcome the reductionism, to realize that a set of any, in principle – even infinite number of separate empirical facts will give nothing to us to understand this drama. It is necessary to study the existence of integral human, individual life, fate ...

One from actually deep and real experts in the problem, S.L. Rubinstein wrote that “existence – this is the participation in the process of life. To live – means to be changed and to happen, to act and to suffer, to be preserved and to be changed. The existing – the

one that lives and moves, becomes and passes into the other” [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 304].

A human is captured by the flow of this all-general existence of the world, and, within this sense, it exists, as any other component of the world. Any existing object has the **essence**, which, referring again to S.L. Rubinstein, is not some abstraction, imagined by analysts and granted with some ability “to generate” the existing. The essence is as obvious and perceptible as its whole “carrier”, it is as if “dissolved”, presented in its each element, in each dynamism.

The strained, contradictory (binding) unity of essence and existence appears. It seems that S.L. Rubinstein does not have time to finish the thought, to bring it to the logical end. How is this contradiction solved? In what? It seems to us that the binding conflict contradictory unity of essence and existence is solved in absolutely unique act of **performance**.

If to be thoughtful, the whole content of our book is full of this idea: development, dynamics, establishment of personality (existence) is, strictly speaking; the way for existence of own all-general essence – **need** as a contradictory energetically-active informational formation. And this contradiction is solved by performance: embodiment of real nature of human into creation, product, at last into the largest miracle – new human, child.

Let’s repeat: the whole living exists by this way (or almost by this way). But a human has one more way of existence, unique and uniform: it is allowed to reflect own existence. To choose, to control, to experience, to change and ... at last, to meet with its final character – as Ego is a natural being. This is the main drama of human life.

Ontologically a human is interwoven into this being and as the day comes after morning, as the maturity comes after childhood and youth, as the night changes the day, as the maturity is changed by old age, and somewhere there, at the border of deep night and early-early morning I will go ... so that a new childhood, new life would come and this eternal existence of people would never finish...

But even if I go with the full realization of this (V. Vysotsky told – “... what is my end is not the end yet, the end – this is someone’s start... I manage to smile, I **saw**, who will come after me...”), if I

understood and “saw” – all the same this is the drama... How to leave this world, so familiar, native world that became mine?

Rubinstein tells that two things make the experience of expectation for own farewell by human to be a tragedy: firstly, fear of impracticability (life in the whole, intentions, affairs) and secondly – care for relatives – “How will they be without me?” But, perhaps, it is not all. It seems to us that a human nevertheless completely, seriously and adultly does not believe that its existence will be broken. And thus, this “How will they be without me?” is obligatorily added with “how will I be without them” – there, somewhere? And in general – what is there?

Namely this period (we called it “extreme old age”, although of course, here there is not only the chronological aspect – unfortunately, someone may have it long before physical old age) turns out to be the core for reinterpretation of being, when all this is expressed in thoughts, feelings, aspirations, desires by special manner, immediately-integrally. Why so? Because it exists in order “not to suffer and to sleep calmly”. Unconcernedly, i.e. – having withdrawn from current trouble and fuss.

But this is – “daily logic”. And everything is absolutely by a different way at the level of considerations about eternity (and finitude) of being. I analyze what I have done after I “entered the morning”, as in that juvenile age, which explained some idea to me, or essence of sound mind, or my future activity, dramatic situation, etc. This is the original creativity. But creativity never starts, it exists constantly. But how is it realized? And how is our life realized? The content of this realization is individual for each human, and its form for all is drama.

But the life is final, no matter how vexing it is to experience (I would like to have estates, cars, farmsteads, I would like that the whole world would be mine!) but ... I, my dear mister, must go... I go with obduracy for relatives, those ones, who helped me to live, decorate my activity... and I am outraged of them.

I excrete the colored gall of rags for some unfair (wrong and offensive) truth, and there is the evil good and good evil.

This truth can be unfair for the one, to whom it is addressed. But it is the truth because it is *my* truth. I see our relations just as they are and thus it is the truth for me. But from the point of view of the other – it is unfair as it sees and builds up the situation principally by a different way: this human *really* treat me well, frankly, being based on experience of conscience. In fact it confesses the real morality and love to human in life with me. That's why this truth is so *unfair*.

“Good evil” – expressed with good intentions, it touches the initial, root and very thin strings of human, and ... always offends it. It, on the part of tutor – as kindness but acts as the evil in another human because it disturbs, turns over everything in it. But “evil good” – expressed with bitterness, let kind, “good”, necessary word, will return to me ... by bitterness.

In front of the abyss of spiritual physical disappearance of me as “Ego”, my existence is that drama, in which I analyze first of all my bad deeds. The existence is turned “inside” me, and, at the same time, into the future and it turns out, I just *must* express myself on occasion of the future at this last border.

The address to “inside” means that I shall tell *something* about myself. But such clear rational differentiation never happens. It turns out that everything occurs by a different way: the complex, integral, emotionally-saturated analysis of the whole my being, analysis of my dramatic life, shone by future genic concept – address to the future always – since *the very* beginning and until *the very* completion.

And I create and express only kind, mild impulses, destroying everything nasty, perfidious, bad in myself. I, staying at the border of own being existence, act as a ser of own future. I either completely destroy myself, or find the “points” of dignity” in myself, which I send to the future. In general I *repent*. My repentance is my force to the future.

And when I stand in front of abyss of non-being, I have that eternal, which I now put off from myself as the horse-cloth is taken off from horse... And I look into the future without optimism but with my abilities that they will be realized by my descendants.

And if I speak about tragedy of existence, it does not concern how I will be buried (pompously or not very much), which words will hereby be told and how much tears will be spilt.

The drama in fact is not in me but in those people, who will stand near my grave – rises and drops of *my* drama. Namely they bring and recreate the drama as my force, greatness or my uselessness (when bandits are buried – there are many beautiful burial mounds, wreaths, other luxuries... and no great and really beautiful words because they (*bandits*) – “*are not born*” because they had no drama of the whole life. This banditry generated and actualized only exclusively protective property for enrichment of their somatic state or their relatives and it is not the case if they wanted it).

This is something that generates another substance of my Ego at the border and rejects the first one. This is something that exists in me as a poniard that pierced a human body and continues living in it by its own life. So the sleep: perceives me as human. I see the nuances of colors in it; I see my being in it that released from light, from the whole natural.

Falling asleep, I see exclusively my own world. I see myself and some other human in it and the global natural sense of our being covers.

In this state (and it looks like the state that accompanies the completion of human being) I discover one more capturing fact – I discover that I have the purpose of life. A subject itself sets the purpose of life. It exhausts it and this is tragic.

When S.L. Rubinstein writes that human life can be realized by two ways – as simple functioning, deprived of reflection and ideal (1), and as conscious extracting of existence (20, – he, of course, is right. But at the same time he is not right... This thesis of Master stipulated the appearance of many adherents for so-called “psychology of daily life”. It is even stated that this not reflected and not illuminated by self-consciousness daily life in general prevails in existence of human due to time parameters. But this is already the great lie. Only psychologically inferior human may live by this way and this is already not a human existence. They forget about the Other. It is the mirror; it is the one, who constantly and always requires the reflection and rise over itself.

Transcendence is the fate of outstanding and especially talented people (A. Maslou was based on something like that when he

developed the concept of self-actualization). But transcendence is not the departure from the world. It is the arrival to it.

The problem is rather not in absorption by commonness as some very enthusiastic researchers imagine it but in our fear to be reflexive. It seems that I will look comically and stupidly if I seriously think about the great and finite... Odd fellow, unlucky wretch, strange... But is it the case in fact? Really at each step, at each moment I meet these eternal existential problems – death, loneliness, isolation, nonsense, love, faithfulness, honesty. I do not avoid them but solve at my level. But I always solve and never avoid them. I cannot just do otherwise.

We studied the life stories about criminals, homeless persons, drug addicts, i.e. not born, not realized, those ones, who have not happened. However they are in fact catching dramas. They experience by this way. It is necessary only to feel them as people... In fact they are other dramas, another level. And who will define it? Indeed A. Maslow is right when he speaks that personality, who has self-actualized mostly, may be a usual (average) housewife, who in the seclusion, cleanness and health of her relatives saw the sense of her existence. It happened.

We would like to warn young researchers about fast judgments and hopes of favorite classics thoughts, grabbed from the context not only of their works, their life, their existence.

Even S.L. Rubinstein had lived very simple and ambiguous life. He happened, but... not in the way he would like it. He happened not in his works, but in his pupils, which were so more talented that accomplished his plan. But what kind of drama it was for the Rubinstein himself! Here is what he wrote in last, most important and favorite book: “My obligation is understandable. Hesitations are impossible. Malfunction would be a crime. In order to complete the life, before finishing it and live, I still have to create three more books. My first work is almost finished.

Today I solemnly pledge: all heart blood, all life flame, all spirit force of mine will be given to complete third book – final, favorite, about truth and goods, about ethics, about human. There is sense and justifying of my life in it [Rubinstein, 2003, p.487]... and we are

holding this book. But S.L. Rubinstein hadn't finished it; it had been done by pupils. What a life drama!

So, the level of dramatics is one of the important marks of personality development level. We are speaking about destiny dramatics, life drama, and personality dramatics itself..., because we think about end of existence and about accomplishing. Drama is always spiritual, whatever happens in “everyday life” – betrayal, offence, quarrel, envy – drama is about spirit seized.

And another important thing is that drama connected not only with acknowledging the end of existence, but with acknowledging the own limits: drama is about that I cannot rise over myself and became higher than myself. We cannot rise at all and then the dramatics of unrealized will rise in front of us. But we can... try: realize own inefficiency, restriction, weakness and addiction, we address to inner world and... work with it. We become stronger, higher, better. And it is not so important in what form we do it: reading books, watching films, listening to the music and ...thinking, bringing up a child and see in it light and eternal, making good to own folks and ...forgiving them, reaching the tops...

The main thing is that this work should be difficult, discomforted, lasting. We are forcing our brain and our feelings to work for, having connected in contradictory unbreakable couple, creating human – life subjects born by myself.

Human existence is dramatic, the listed reasons confirm that. And everybody has own drama as own inimitable life. But, it seems to us, there are some landmarks, key moments of human existence ontogenesis, which are **objectively** contradictory-dramatically.

1. The origin of existence of human individual and preparation of him for leaving in this world. It is real drama of spirit. There are many acting persons and interests, many contextual “layers”. Was this new creature conceived in love, what kind of biosocial need impulse did it receive?

What kind of relations were between parents and multiplan - multilayer interaction of this unborn human creature and mother. This all are very important. At this time, the child has been taking a lot from world – as material, so nonmaterial. And this is the response

to the world, of course, as it can. Last researches, received by using of modern equipment, showed that on 6-7 week – it had been already existence. There is already an answer.

It is very important how it is waited, what is spoken about, what is thought, to what are being prepared. We don't think about what and how this creature thinks and feels, but it already active: chooses the more comfortable place, shows oneself and expresses its conditions. She is preparing. It is also the drama of woman, the whole life of which will be other, besides she felt and understood something about what she had not even guessed...

It is existence in couple. It, this unborn human's child, has been structuring relation, environment, aspirations, if... it is waited. Otherwise, all of these are not done, if they don't wait, and then it withers in womb – unexpected, unnecessary, needless... It will come like this in the world, having already passed first drama of its existence – in light and jolly shades or, vice versa, in sad and scary.

2. I step into life, inhale it. It is not fear and discomfort, but drama, because I come for creating our own life. I have seen these native people, whom I have already known, but only now I saw, “inhaled” this cluster of social existence – wonderful and such colored, but at the same time hard, unfair. Born child it is expressed eternity. “Preeternal baby” – Jung calls it like this.

I am the beginning and endless ending, I am potential, energy and at the same time memory, experience. I am burdened by the mission to *become*, happen and ... not loose myself. I am open not only for influences. “Spiritual origin – it is a kind of jump into the world and it is very bad for that who wants to assert oneself, when it doesn't find the similarities for oneself in any of the possible world aspects and cannot connect with any of them! [C.G. Jung, 1998, p.35]

Here is the real child's drama – it is necessary to connect with this world, but and with what exactly?

Child is a creation of whole universe, moreover – every child. Here is what mythology says:

Sky suffered of birth, earth suffered of birth,
And purple sea gave a birth.
Bloody-red water plant is in birth suffering.

Empty stem of water plant ejected smoke.

Empty stem of water plant ejected flame.

And boy appeared from flame:

Fire instead of hair, fire instead of beard.

And his eyes were suns [C.G. Jung, 1998, p.50].

... And child initially is lonely in this world. It is not the loneliness, about which existentialists speak; it is not “thrown” in the world, if the whole world took part in its creation and birth. Child is lonely as contextual unity, unlike, unsimilar, atypical. It is alone. Only it is like this. “It pre-eternal baby in pre-eternal [eternal] loneliness of pre-eternal environment; pre-eternal baby appears to be deployment of pre-eternal egg similar to how the whole world appears to be deployment of *itself*” [Jung, 1998, p.58].

Child shall enter this world, make it its, and it forms inside internal world by converting external. It is very hard, because it contradicts to its entity and internal nature. And child creates game – the world of fantasies, special actions, experiences. It preserves and develops in the game. It stops to be lonely because of it. Child creates myth: playing myths, metaphors; fairytales become real condition and source and also driving force for development, because they are the reality, in which the child is free and freely develops. Personal creating reflection is birthing.

Child’s drama is about it is socially mature creature but... it is not accepted like that by surroundings. Its maturity, however, doesn’t raise the doubts about understanding that it exists in endless converting of experience. It is open and... protected.

Childhood drama contains aspect and reflects of other. Exactly here the other becomes a mirror in which I see him and myself. This is how my “I”, my intra world, appears and develops.

This drama, this tension (pure and open) of human’s existence will be useful for me for many times, when I become older...

3. Dramatically moment of life is connected with appearance possibility to continue the life through reproducing of self similar. Whatever is written or said about it (a lot is written), actually it is really the drama of my existence.

Biological asserts itself very powerful and calling, the need is restructuring and internal and external worlds are changing... for me. Those undiscovered corners of human's relations and passions are opening, which are not just closed, but simply... uninteresting as themselves.

Now they are the main. I feel this force in me – possibility, this worldwide attraction and ... step into very responsible moment of life drama: “Do I, the last bastard, have a right?”. Of course, this is not what F.M. Dostoyevsky meant, placing this phrase into the lips of his favorite hero, but ...what a phrase! What was happening with us there, at this touch stone of one of the most important periods of maturing? What is happening with our children? Indeed, we cannot seriously schematize “by Freud”, like it is a fight between “Id” and “Super-Ego”.

But it is not everything like this. Dramatic canvas is unrolled: I need, I need necessary to know what is happening behind this attraction? What does it look like, what does it provide? And it is scary, moreover – it is not humanly according to what I have understood and acquired. How it should be? And you should be liked and you should like (and again this dizzily difficult contradictory unity of animal and humanly).

Dramatics is escalating by, and there is sense in it, appearance of new life; but actually I don't see this sense, don't experience, I am far from it. And also there are girlfriends and friends, their experience – real and imagined, and my reputation in collective, my maturity that is very important...

There is one more very important aspect of this drama, unrealized and unseen. These are style peculiarities of further sexual behavior. They are being formed here, preserving very often for the whole life. Will the sexual relation be always joint, if not with love, though at least with human feelings – kindness, warmth, beauty, openness, frankness, clearness, respectfulness. Or... nothing of this, nothing from existence, and relations, sex – these are just a mean, spiritless and penny wise, the method for self-asserting, receiving of satisfaction, going off, testing, risking, at last just harboring for while

clamorous impulses of body organs. Everything is complicated and ... with existential consequences not only for me.

The other – it is the human in general, whom I give myself or receive from it, what it is, how it is – the same will be with me. And also – what about children: how humanly will they be, how much will they exist – happen? It depends very much on how and with whom they were conceived...

This drama only emerges here, in period of sexual maturation. It is the most critical (because it is real, because – outside of me, but in us, between me and others) and lasts during the whole life, developing and enriching, converting into drama of my children and grandsons...

4. Maturity drama. It can be asked, is the existence of adults is dramatic at all? And the answer can be given – yes, and very much! Here what is important: adult is a person that does, chooses, responses. There is some despair and at the same time pathos in this. “I decide! I know that life of my close and lovely people, my growing, my effectiveness, my health depend on this. And after all, strange to say, the main acting person here is not Me. People, that judge me, are related with me. I am required more: will I be able to manage intricacies of surrounding reality and relations of other people; will I be able to understand, to feel own world? What (who) is more important? In fact, every my step is a decision: move to something *from* something; self-determining, self-effectiveness.

I am *always* at the crossroads; it excites and depresses, inspires and scares – because I am not alone... There is something good and sweet, and you shall refuse from it. You look for compromises, find, and they destroy, you look for again. But the moment comes, when it is necessary to *decide*. And you know that refuse..., and already know that, after all, you have an end. Everything will end any way – prompt, whisper. And can you stay as a human that has happened. What exactly will you accomplish?

...It is not truth that we, adults, don't see the life like this at all and don't solve these problems living the “everyday life”. As famous psychotherapist-existentialist I. Yalom wrote about this – for considering such things it is necessary to abstract from routine and

vanity, concentrate on eternal, and delve deeply into experiences. It is a beautiful myth and good protecting mechanism for neurotics. Let's not forget Rubinstein – “the entity is dissolved in existence, in existing”, and this is the process of establishment.

Actually, we always, in every small thing of this moment, solve these “eternal” questions, check with them our deeds. Otherwise... it is not work. Only over hurt neurotic runs from them, but because of this he is notably inadequate. We likely can sometime, very rarely, do something, “having slipped” these problems (“Beside personality” – great expression of L.S. Vygotsky), but then we are repaid a thousandfold”. I can in exciting (destructive, bright, fair, hurt – it doesn't matter) make steps, “having forgotten” for a while about own adulthood and responsibility, but I *actually* remember about it, somehow I persuade myself, somehow explain myself...

But then necessarily the time will come, when I answer myself, own entity, own existence, and it means, to some extent – to the whole world. And you don't have to think, it will happen, as Yalom writes, in comfortable chair, in quietness and calmness “watching TV in slippers”. It will touch Me, when it is necessary for it, and will force to reflect results, response, solve. The question is only about how close I will come to establishment like “unborn” and “undone”...

Yes, sometimes we are not in time unfortunately. My patient, which wasn't understood and “beaten” at home, suppressed by household, unevaluated and unrealized, was actually a personality in full understanding of this word – creative, original and, of course, ambitiously-offensive. Special condition – offence through incomprehension, unacknowledging, pragmatism, and ... suddenly human, who understands, appreciates, condoles, and “grabs” real importance.

Generally, it is like nothing happened in life-household understanding, but there was some internal “step-back”. And entity “called”, and then it was revealed, it was necessary to think and evaluate and make a choice, but it had appeared that it was nothing to choose... Everything is like that... in this moment. But what could be a drama! You cannot wait for “chair and comfort”, the soul, actually, shall work always, – here the poet has a point.

5. Drama of end [ending]. I analyze own life way, and there are my colleagues, my friends, folks in this analyze, which have been with me and now continue this way without me... And this last stage becomes very strongly social: biological has already passed (or is passing).

Drama acquires social meaning: pass away of exceptionally-inimitable personality and... how it is painful to live this world: “What a lantern of mind has gone out! What heart stopped beating...” You shall admit that it must be said about *each* of us... I create the last splash by own decease [death], which becomes a drama for the other people. Why? Because by beautiful words, beautiful deeds, my original thoughts (they are *necessarily* inimitable, because they are only and exceptionally mine), results of my activity, my unique inimitable attitude to people and their attitude to me – are the unique and ... they vanish. L.S. Vygotsky actually understood very well what the drama was about, had been speaking that personality establishment had been dramatic. The drama is in me, but ...*beyond*.

This social, essential existence, colored by human emotions of people, which bend at cold human body, creates real portrait of individual, which has passed away. And its life turns into drama for us, because we lost this human. I direct to the poet’s words again: it exactly, this lantern, ... went out. But our mind has not gone out and our heart has not stopped beating. And we return in predictive reflection of that what has happened: other human died; tide, glowing of life finished, the beginning of which was at the same time the beginning of other...

And I want to underline one more time the greatness of social entity for understanding that dramatically situation can occur only when this personality has passed away, become cold, dead – it becomes the beginning of other’s reflection – individual, personal, historical. It absorbs all peculiarities of life existence, which are outlined by personality activity sense of those who passed away. This is its attitude to own close people, friends and, the most important, – to own children and parents. Just right now I have thought that there were two people in my life, with whom, and with memories about which, I would, perhaps, somehow... say goodbye at deathbed – these are mother and grandfather.

These are the people, who made a human of me; my establishment turned out to be connected with these people's efforts. Their attitude was with greatness and dignity to me; they saw attentive, sensitive, kind human in me, which is originating. And I have understood that sometimes the other makes for me something what cannot be seen, – it sees me in future, and by its life, its communication it brings me to me like this... and it will bring. And I do the same not because of pragmatic thoughts (so to say – something good will be recalled about me), but of self-expression.

As a human, I cannot do in other way: I follow (not identically, but adequately) the examples of fair, sensitive, gentle, kind attitude to other person, which create adequate (not identically) opposite intention. But it is not only this. Perhaps, I don't want to say anything to anyone, I don't want to teach and foster anyone, I just live, I don't set any actual goals to follow the examples of behavior reactions (moral, intellectual, physical and labor). And I ask questions about why I acquire these examples? Actually I don't acquire them, but on the grounds of them I create own examples.

It is possible that examples of people close to me serve as not etalon, but some mean, acquiring of which stimulates in me those humanly, that deserves for attention even of myself. I appreciate in me those, what is really unique and general for me. And the main point here is attitude to other. From where do I know this? There are moments in life, when the whole my entity is being opened to me in its unwearied and generality. It's a moment of falling asleep, which provokes special and deep thoughts, feelings, and contents. Why it is falling asleep? Because, I am sure, the wisest human is that, who is falling asleep. At this moment it is pure, cleared of its attributive biological entity's social layers.

It stays in its pure substance, which looks like baby. I am sure that nature gives us a chance – it is a “return” of child with its purity, potential, endless, social maturity and quite special loneliness – it may give very much to this, which is very attentive to itself. The time before sleep makes us closer to the child, which has freed... It has freed, because it is like in the flight, it is in the world, and this is reality for it.

Perhaps here we meet with real own spirituality – pure, without social layers. In my opinion, this condition deserves the attention that has not been paid yet by our psychologists, physiologists, philosophers... It is something that became free for a moment, just astral, moral, spiritual, freed, I repeat, from social layers and biological potentials.

The same is with dreams – it is not the fact of unrealized desires, but a fact of free spiritual-sensitive human's intentions.

... The problem of existence has another angle and acquires unexpectedly new color if genetic understanding of fundamental fact is considered as correlation of biological and social in functioning of psychological core of personality. I want to explain maximum definitely and clear the nature of this question.

It is about we reached the conclusion, which was paradoxical and unexpected, but clear (Let “doubting Thomases” seem, it doesn't deserve for attention).

The question is about discovering of absolutely unique fact that present personality core is appear to be genetically source contradictory relation, which is called – need. And when we speak about it and compare this point with different statements, it seems necessary to me direct to Bible as to eternal knowledge which is of great value. Exactly genetically source relation, which constitutes personality, is called “need”. And when we consider Gospel of Matthew, we say – the essence is a piercing of our entity by kirpan and there is a need to free of it.

I consider as my obligation to say that among the huge availability of theoretical and empirical data we had to outline absolutely impressive unit of personality – it was the correlation of biological and social which appeared to be *need*. I would say not in this way: genetically source correlation, which constitutes personality, is need. The need, as some dichotomic pair of biological and social correlation, constitutes personality when it is originating, and when it is developing, and developed and, finally, dying personality. It is the first fundamental fact.

Second fact: when we say that personality – it is a clot, it is, in fact, like a product of social relations, so what do we mind? In this

case, I mind that society, environment, interlaced into organismic level, bring to individual in the development process constitutes for itself the fact of own biological entity availability.

What this constitution is about?

It turns out that social, which is fundamental, inimitable, absolutely stunning moment of human's life, grows in a process of individual becoming personality. Why?

Individual becomes personality due to that it really has fundamental morphological structures, which in combining create biological, morphological formed structure.

Influence of environment, surrounding and correlation of this (social) and present biological create quite different parameter, which, by appearing at human as individual, turns it into *personality*. Why "personality"? Because there is in us a moment of magnificent individual existence and that *absolutely unique*, what appears to be *social collective*.

Realization of love and need

Scientifically proved, deliberated forecast of further personality development of child – the question which arises any way at professionals in age practical psychology are. However within scientifically psychology this problem is almost not being considered. Professional expert has every time to create own concept of client's future development, which includes real conglomerate of separate points of different theories, own experience and empirical psychodiagnostically data, gathered during the work with individual.

L.S. Vygotsky, in his work "Development diagnostics and pedagogical clinic of hard childhood", wrote in 1931, recognized the forecast of further child development and main task of age psychological consulting. Since that this problem has not been studying as scientifically, but it cannot be said that it was irrelevant. We consider that the main reason for lack of attention to the problem of scientifically forecast of personality psychical development is caused by general crisis condition of theoretical knowledge in the

personality psychology and its development area. [Vygotsky, 1982a].

Theoretical schemes variety, each of them claims to be absolutely, multivalence of concepts, definitions, and, the most important, continuing prevail of preformation and epigenetically views, which grounds on development views as on the simple discovery of already available grounds – all of these, and also clear speculativity of separate structures, which reflect just own researcher's views without any relation to reality, – make the serious work in the area of forecasting – impossible.

Of course, all these questions cannot be solved immediately, but, in our opinion, there are already basis for, at least, setting the problem of scientifically forecasting in the area of psychology development.

These grounds are provided by genetic psychology. Having understood this area of knowledge as system of views, we define appearance of psychical phenomenon, their pass, establishment in life processes, functioning and restoring after losing of working functions as research subject. In other words, genetic psychology is intended to study objective processes of new psychical phenomena originating, formation of new psychical mechanisms and knowledge about them on the grounds of discovered prospects and (or) development projects.

Creation of prospects (projects) itself is appear to be organic component of research process. Thus, forecasting is interlacing into subject of genetic psychology. Theoretical understanding of genetic approach realization, particularly in the area of experimental studying, provided the possibility to create the principles' system of experimentally-psychologically research structuring, the most important among which is principle of historicism (the unity of experimental and genetic research lines) and principle of designing (active modeling of psychical forms in specially created conditions).

In due time, we had already noted that source prospective idea of genetic psychology development was the studying of psychological regularities of personality development management during the

whole life. Now the next step can be done and personality development forecasting can be approached as scientific problem.

What is research within the frames of genetic psychology? The logic of experimental-genetic method provides not only registering of some or other empirical forms of psychical expression peculiarities, but active modeling and its reproduction in special conditions. It helps to discover their entity, in other words – appearance and establishment regularities in ontogenesis of some psychological functions.

Theoretical level of psychical processes studying in experimental-genetic method is set through designing of subject activity's contently-operational sides. Specific peculiarity of such designing is that model, created by researcher with learning purpose, corresponds to real inside structure of psychical process itself. It means that at the beginning the researched psychical processes or functions are designed as a model of some activity, and then they are actualized through mediation of subject activity in organization of special methods.

The criteria for qualitative psychological research become correspondence degree of real accomplishment process to its model. Thus experimental-genetic method brings inside the structure methods of higher psychical functions, which are acquired by subject in the process of some content transformation. At this, transformation itself combines inside genetic structural-functional moments of objective reality and sets similar psychical structures (in the way of analyzing methods). Actually we are still very far from as forecasting, so managed development.

For the moment usage of experimental-genetic method has provided the possibility for receiving some scheme: if we have general empirical and contently-theoretical regularities of psychical development till the researcher “interruption”, know main regularity of this process after “interruption” (we take this knowledge from previous researches and literature), and also know main mechanism of higher psychical development (interiorization – exteriorization), we will be able to model further development.

However, all of these don't relate to forecasting: as regarding the past ("till interruption"), and so in modeling of future ("after interruption") genetic psychologist grounds on general theoretical knowledge, but not on the knowledge of specific personality, who is in front of him. This nomothetic, by its entity, approach is completely acceptable for only scientifically researches of general regularities. However, it doesn't provide almost anything for psychological practice, where analysis and forecast should be structured regarding specific child.

Genetic psychology will be able to provide real instrument for psychologist-practitioner, if it, without losing subject, principles and methods, grounds on unique child's individuality – bearer and subject of these regularities. Previous achievements of genetic psychology provide the possibility to set this problem as vexed and current. Moreover, theoretical ideas about alternative nomothetic, ideographic approach are being quite actively developed as in world (G. Allport), so in native psychology. (L.S. Vygotsky).

It should be recalled early pedagogical works by G.S. Kostyuk, in which the ideas about psychological subject were formulated: it is the unique integrity as specific personality feature. The same position had O. Lazursky developing so called "clinical approach" in personality psychology.

Thus, genetic psychology (and genetic-modeling method as its basis) is that area of psychological knowledge, which can provide the forecasting of personality development, but only under the condition of ideographic approach realizing (in native psychology, present definition corresponds to phrase "clinical approach"). Let's admit, deviate a little bit from theme, that redirection of genetic-psychological researches in present approach is caused not only the necessity of scientific forecasting problem solving in psychology.

Because, the only area, where genetic-psychological researches are realized, is studying, with growing of experimental data the more current becomes question about what is really happens with pupil, who has been the subject to experimental-genetic research? In scientific context everything is clear: such works provide the

possibility to set important regularities of higher psychical functions' genesis.

And pupil, who passed through this, – what did change in him, what did he experience and how did continue his life way? Till specific time this question hasn't been interesting for us, and pupils stayed beyond the attention. But this time passed. In only scientific context genetic-psychological researches provided a lot, but they could provide more if individuality hadn't been ignored.

These researches are very useful in practical-applicative aspect, because psychologist-practitioner will consider in age consulting the fact that development of higher psychical functions is going on as acquiring of cultural methods-signs in child personality activity. The conclusion can easily be made from here that you cannot understand past development and forecast future by ignoring social situation or considering it as only the one of factors. But actually genetic psychology is able to provide much more.

We shall ground on that psychical development forecasting problem is, from the one side, component of genetic psychology's subject, and, from the other side, – system creating factor of personality psychical existence. Of course, the last is abstraction, because human almost never forecasts own development. Actually it forecasts something other – achievements, life situations, existence conditions with other people, life specific of own children. It might be called “goal forecast”.

Any individual activity appears to be tightly connected with forecasting: from elementary sensory-perception reflection acts to difficult personality actions, when the consequence of some deed shall be forecasted. It turns out that future much more determines personality development than past (it was emphasized by different authors as A. Adler, L.S. Vygotsky, G. Allport).

Defining of the fact, that forecasting is necessary adherent and general factor of personality life, is very important for setting the problems and tasks of psychical development forecast of individual. From one side, the forecasting phenomenon should be researched itself as personality function. From other side, we shall take into the account that the structure of personality development forecasting

must be grounded on that personality, itself, forecast own life. Anyway, personality “goal forecasting” of own life way shall be one of the central diagnostics subjects during the forecast development tasks solving within genetic psychology.

Such thought changes a little bit central problem aspect – life way shall be forecasted, and only in its context – development.

But it will be like that only on the stages of personality forming, when it is able to define this way itself. Because of this, forecasting in child age should be quite different. Here it will be objectivity specific projection, explication of different possibilities, particularly individual’s anatomic-physiological backgrounds.

In present work we can define only some moments, which are being actualized in relation to psychical development forecasting.

Forecasting is about careful study of personality development and bringing up individual history. A. Adler made one of the first attempts to connect past and future of personality (attention to early children’s memories and, at the same time, – “fake finalism”, creative “I”, “social interest” – thus everything that determines life from the future side). The results, received by A. Adler, are very valuable.

According to L.S. Vygotsky [Vygotsky, 1991a], education – it is social acquiring of natural development process. Thus bringing up history will show us, what becomes natural and comfortable for the subject. In other words, this history will show us the initials and prospective of personality activity character and individual style. German educator O. Rule noted that child’s personality development and forming is a unique socially-directed process.

The amount of tactical methods, aspirations and abilities, which outline the life plan, are created, because with time passing all soul functions start to work in opposite direction. That is called character, – O. Rule noted. If all of this is determined by future, then we shall necessarily know the initials in order to forecast the personality in its own future. But it is possible only at genetic-psychological position: psychical new creation (abilities, character, etc.) is being produced by personality itself, when it aspirates its own future.

Forecast subject can be only integral personality, but not its separate elements. Any ability can never be forecasted as such.

Ability exists along with personality structures, the most important, among which, are those that don't have clear verification in scientific psychology.

We mind soulful features of human. Well-known compensation and over compensation processes are not possible to explain on the grounds only of abilities. We shall consider general aspiration of any personality for full social existence. Only within this context interaction of abilities might be understood and forecasted. Known in age psychology, restructuring abilities phenomenon of older school age is explained not only by aspiration for social fullness and that future becomes in this age a kind of personality "affective centre", as it was noted by L. Bozhovych.

The fact is that in this age soulful abilities of children itself and surrounding them people start to be dominating. It turns out that it is able to change drastically personality abilities.

On the other hand, integral approach to personality development forecast provides paying attention to anatomic-morphological and physiological abilities. We still have to study and realize real place and meaning of these abilities in personality life. It shall be noted that, perhaps, they were mostly not historically "lucky". In due time native paedology seemed to be solving this question, but it had not been liked by government. Here we see necessity in usage of historically-psychological, genetic and even cybernetic researches for solving forecast tasks. In due time, G. Kostiuk said that studying influenced even on anatomic-physiologic human's backgrounds [Kostiuk, 1989].

In our opinion the most important forecast problem is focused in "personality-social surrounding" dimension. We can only note on this that this forecast tasks' dimension provides for another look on the problem. We consider that bringing up and studying as processes which start psychical structure development, will have their explanation in the context of our problem solving.

Thus, the area of the closest development as forecasting real space of personality forming in childhood age is an interaction system of child with adult, which, actually, determines further movement. But this "determination" includes not only the etalon

development image, but also the knowledge of specific child's individually-genetic tendencies.

Therefore, each child's attention to these peculiarities shall be obligatory during its development forecast.

Another important problem in the context of forecasting is connected with rime parameters of development dynamic. There are many researches of personality psychological time today, but they have quite different look in the context of forecast problem. As it was mentioned, the last one was the individual process. Thus, individual should be the area of closest development. What does this statement change? Let us say, well-known "Piaget's phenomena" which were empirically studied by clinical method, thus – they were reliable and adherent to some age. But what will happen if we change clinically-diagnostic method for clinically-genetic, in other words – individually-forming?

It might be imagined theoretically that we will not only find these phenomena, we will be able to project their overcoming by each child. Particularly it will be possible if we know the development temp which, of course, is individually specific.

Generally, our preliminary analysis confirms that forecast problem can not just been simply solved within the genetic psychology, but also forms other views on development process in general.

We can outline general picture of our approach to personality development forecast. First of all the analysis shall be outlined: we speak about integral personality which is always in movement – forming.

Then we will overview integrity not only as personality attribute, but also as system of its integrity with social environment from one side, and with biology-genetic peculiarities – from other. The important component of this structure is dynamic indicator of life passing time.

It is important to separate forecasting as common activity of researcher and adult personality from forecasting in childhood age, when far life prospective are not developed at correspond level yet and forecasting function doesn't adherent to individual.

The researcher's (the one who forecasts) activity itself shall consist of such main components as diagnostics (psychological, socially-psychological, biological, genetically) designing-reconstruction, designing-prospectively, modeling. It shall be mentioned that these parts are consecutive in time; every next shall be the background for the previous. So, multi-component diagnostic system provides for designing-reconstruction.

Peculiar excursion of researcher in personality test is meant. The main purpose of this movement is about defining of basic genetically-dynamic development tendencies. Discovered tendencies shall be considered as background for designing-prospective. It is important to indicate that tendencies, discovered in reconstruction process, have very important, but restricted meaning. So in this point we leave A. Adler principally. [Adler, 1993]

Designing-prospective shall be based on the same indicators as reconstruction, but here the pivotal role belongs to social and age factors. It is extremely important to mind personality factor (human as such that forecasts and accomplishes its life way). Unlike reconstruction, designing-prospective can be several.

Model finishes and specifies project. In our opinion, people shall consider factors of personality external social influence as dominating. At this forecasting process doesn't end at least for psychologist-practitioner. It has to carry out forecast, use own activity (consulting-correctional influence), by organizing surrounding's activity (for example teachers, parents), permanent monitoring.

At least, there are some thoughts regarding applicative aspect of problem. The areas of first priority shall be considered: professional selection, medicine, jurisprudence, pedagogical activity, family relations. These areas has already had request for personality forecast development. At that two forecast forms are important and interesting. First of them can be defined as "forecast-ongoing" – probable forecast of long human development in some are of its activity. Second form can be relatively defined as "forecast-event" – probable forecast of human behavior in case when important, drastic event happens that change main parameters of this way. So, our employers worked at surgical clinics according to stuff request which

was about some patients after hard surgical operation develop not proper forms of behavior, in particular, unexpectedly aggressive.

We were set a task to forecast patient's behavior after, for example, amputation. We discovered that only knowledge of extreme conditions, psychological traumatic experience is not enough for this. Individual forecast for personality integrity is necessary, the procedure of which provides the results of high probability degree. It is clear that every indicated usage area of probable forecast has specific peculiarities.

The question, about what successes can be expected from child or young human (if it doesn't concern higher educational establishment studying) is very up to date first of all in terms of application. Because the important stage in the human life is when studying appears to be main type of activity and main measurement of personality activeness. At this time personality experiences forming changes, which define its further destiny.

Development tendencies of modern educational system in Ukraine escalate very much practical actuality of success forecast problem of studying. Earlier this question was of high importance for pupil and his parents at senior classes of general educational school and looked like clear question – was it possible for this child to study at higher educational establishment what exactly educational establishment was the most suitable. Nowadays educational system provides for the possibility to choose starting almost from the beginning of studying (special classes, schools, preparatory schools, lyceums, remote, home studying etc).

Such time “decreasing” of choice limit leads to that child, itself, almost doesn't participate in that due to objective reasons – absence of any life experience and undeveloped self-consciences. So, responsibility is on adults – parents and teachers.

The key point is a question of criteria, which are used for choosing of educational system for child. Usually theses criteria are very distant form future student's personality. First of all, they are defined by social factors, in particular by prestige. Somehow or other, the question about will the child be able to study at one or another

school and how successful will it be is always brought up at “interested persons”.

In the same way it arises during entering the higher-educational establishment. But how is it solved? Accomplishing practice of probable success forecast of as children, so future students doesn't have any relation to scientifically regulations of studying activity and personality development.

Let's show it in details. There are three focal points, which are “activated” at any selection system (by the way, not only at studying). Two of them are overlooked as obvious, “axiomatic” and in general are not being analyzed, and the third one can vary. What does belong to “axioms”? First, statement: if human (child) enters the present educational establishment, it means it really wants it. Does it have relation to success forecast? Yes, definitely, because we speak about motivation.

Secondly, belief that any educational system is objective in the relation to assessment of studying successes and flexible, and students are absolutely passive. However taking into account the forecast problems, the educational systems, actually, are neither objective, nor flexible.

In such manner, we can state that believes about two of three focal points, connected with success forecast of studying practice, are false. Paradoxical situation is created: we cannot forecast without taking into account important moments, but we cannot do it on the basis of the existing believes.

Exactly here the necessity of deeper theoretical problem analysis becomes understandable. It is realized during the review of third focal point: what is important in the personality of the child for its selection to one or another educational establishment? Logic here is very simple – selection means finding of the students, which have characteristics that provides studying success.

Which are these characteristics? Without special analysis we can speak that during the selection for some studying the characteristics are not discussed. The available knowledge level (very rarely – skills) of future students is studied.

In due time (we mean twenties of XX century) at our country the groundless of such forecast was realized and just psychological criterion was used – intellect development level. Children were started to select for studying on the grounds of IQ.

Exactly measurement of intellectual development, as was noted by L.S. Vygotsky in due time, is about “forecast of relation existing between intellectual development rate and child’s school success”. L.S. Vygotsky [Vygotsky, 1982a] carried out multidimensional researches, the results of which are remarkable. He discovered that great correlation existed between IQ and studying success, but it was quite difficult and contradictory. Longitude showed decreasing of intellectual development level during children studying, which have had it the highest at the beginning. It will become higher if children are with initially low IQ, and average indicators remain unchanged. L.S. Vygotsky has proved experimentally that studying success of phenomenon is simple and consistent. The absolute and relative success shall be distinguished. “Absolute” success is set according to two parameters – correspondence to pedagogical norms and comparison with other pupils of class. “Relative” success is an indicator of child’s towards itself, though this parameter registers present positive or negative changes that happen during studying process. It turned out that these two forms had differed very much one from other and in its dynamic they had complied with other regularities.

So, “absolute” success is an external indicator and it registers subject’s adaptation degree to educational system. It doesn’t speak about any present internal changes, about personality development at studying. In return “relative” success turns out to be psychological correlation of real changes during the process of studying and bringing up. We can state that school registers the “absolute” success and studying system in general is not useful for considering relatively success as major. The question arises regarding our topic – what kind of success do we mind when we speak about forecast?

Vygotsky, in his experiments, tried to forecast both success forms on the basis of IQ as a key point. It was discovered that during some time children with the highest intellect development rate have

the biggest “absolute” and the lowest “relative” success. Return logic was found at group of children with the lowest IQ.

It seems that success forecast in different forms can be built on the basis of IQ. But it turns out that clearly defined children groups as by IQ rates (high, medium, low), so by success rate, are very inhomogeneous, and, in particular, other “external” factors have great influence on success.

It turns out that success in both existence forms depends on what studying group the personality gets in. By using two parameters (IQ and studying success indicator), L.S. Vygotsky define regularities.

At last, experiment touches IQ, and L.S. Vygotsky proves empirically, and then generally, that this indicator provides almost nothing for success forecast, because it registers the present development level and doesn't say anything about further possibilities.

In such way the definition of the closest development area as socio-psychological space of personality appears, in which it reveals internal potentials in the form of cooperation with other people. Under the specific conditions they can turn into own individual (actual area) gains. And L.S. Vygotsky considers this as key moment of forecast. And it is not already IQ, but social environment and the closest development area take the first place as key factors of studying success forecast. L.S. Vygotsky's ideas about social development situation and the closest development area somehow were not developed in pedagogical psychology [Vygotsky, 1991a]

Success is undoubted and important indicator of internal changes which happen with pupil during the studying process. At this the dividing of success to “absolute” and “relative” is very hypothetical and useful in just pedagogical aspect – it turns teacher's attention to own pupil's movement is very important. Now we can only point that, unfortunately, this movement is not taken into account and is not forecasted. But only consideration of this will mean that success will become the expression and indicator of development. It is not enough to say that this unsolved question makes impossible the solving of practical tasks, in particular – forecasting.

It shall be noted that, actually, this question is always solved in practical pedagogy and the way, how it is solved, defines all present peculiarities of studying-educational process structure. At the beginning of chapter we described how pupils success forecast happened in modern pedagogy.

In our opinion G.S. Kostiuk was the most precise and careful, when he expresses the idea about relation in which were the processes of studying and development. This relation appears to be as their unity. At this, in great manner the study adjusts to development regularities and the development itself activates studying processes in natural way. [Kostiuk, 1989]

Definition “unitness”, which had been used by G.S. Kostiuk, was very successful. The difficult and contradictory unity is described by this definition. If studying and development are united processes, so it means they not just complete each other. These processes cannot exist alone, they foreseen the availability of each other. At this each of them remains individual and there is always tension between them. Thus, unity means contradiction and some conflicting, because of different “subjects” goals availability of this unity. So, very successful definition of Kostiuk requires further research and explanation.

What does such understanding of studying and development correlation provide for success forecast problem solving? First of all, let’s remind how G.S. Kostiuk understood studying: “Studying – it is pupils’ management that is managing of pupils’ activity, directed at knowledge, skills and other social values gaining, and, by the mean of it, managing of psychical development of pupils, forming of their intellectual, ideal, moral, working and other features”. [Kostiuk, 1989, p. 75]

From here we can understand why correlation of study and development is to be uniting: after all, pupil is a subject of own development and this development is managed externally through studying. It is understandable from where unitness as tensioned contradictory unity appears. It seems to us that G.S. Kostiuk considered unitness of studying and development relation to be

defining characteristic of pedagogical situation despite what does study appear to be.

The other thing is that unitness will become different depending on how the management will be carried out.

We will explain this in more details. That, what is used to be called traditional studying system (authoritarianism, declarativity, reproductibility, absence of enough attention to individuality), actually appears to be management. But this management here is directed to manipulation and “suppressing” of pupil’s subjectivity: it turns out to be excessive and inappropriate, because the major thing is to do clearly teacher’s tasks and correspond to etalons.

Such pressure creates unitness form, the main criteria of which are pupil’s aspirations to adopt to hard system, and from other side – resistance to this system as protection of subjectivity. G.O. Ball [Ball, 1990] notes right, that both pupil and teacher in their interaction are always both its subject and object, thus the strict dividing of studying process to its subject and object is inappropriate. We can say that traditional studying system is directed maximum to “object” pupil. It is kind of studying which promotes a little the development, and in case it causes – then it is only because of resistance (indeed adaptation and active self-development are almost uncombined).

In such studying system, success is an indicator of pupil’s correspondence to the set requirements. Thus, this has to become the present object of scientifically forecasting.

Now we can turn back to the beginning and understand that orientation during different preliminary examinations of available knowledge and skills level has some sense: their actual level means the degree of pupil’s adaptation – the degree of effective adaptation to existing pedagogical system management. This is the forecast of contradictory unity “adaptation-resistance”. Why is such forecast often mistaken? There three main reasons:

First of all, system itself, despite it is singular, but in its variants (different types of establishments, different studying techniques etc) it can differ much, thus, its acceptance even here as constant is inappropriate;\

Secondly, we have already noted, that the same achievements can be reached by different methods, and thus, attention to individuality shall be expressed in this “forecasting”. Finally,

Thirdly: the moment is not considered that pupil remains subject of own development and own activity anyway.

Moreover, this ability to change to “higher” age periods seems to be growing, becomes more intensive. So it can be said that misbalance of “adaptation-resistance” relation is happening: emphasize is shifting to resistance (aspiration to show subjectivity, individuality). The appearance of own values, aspirations, possibilities, and the most important – life plans and prospective just cannot be considered by hard system. “They go out of control” – pedagogues say about pupils and they are turned out to be quite right and quite powerless. Here, of course, any forecast destroys.

But studying, as pupils’ educational activity management, can be principally different. Studying of G.S. Kostiuk legacy confirms that he tried to show the opposite approach to studying management. In work of 1937 [Kostiuk, 1937], dedicated to research of individual approach psychological problems in studying, he sharpened the problem: individual approach should be about not considering of individual pupil’s peculiarities, but about development of these peculiarities. It shall be promotion to establishing of individuality as unique inimitable integrity.

The main here is not “suppressing” of each pupil’s subjectivity, but quite opposite – efforts for its support and development. As G.O. Ball notes: “Management notion... is deprived of authority sounding...” [Ball, 1990, p. 115].

It shall be added that skills management, according to G.S. Kostiuk, shall provide not only pupil’s functioning (management object) in some parameters, but also promote its multidimensional development as subject of this activity form. Then G.O. Ball actually comes to this point: “Management methods have to fully consider specific object features (if the last one is human then, in particularly, it will be its individual peculiarity, its subjective features, including ability for creation)”. [Ball, 2000, p. 114].

The last one, creativeness appears to be background for self-development. G.S. Kostiuk says also about such management method: “Teacher educates by its attitude to studying, its structure, relations with pupils, communication with them, its erudition, richness of spiritual interests, principality, and strictness” [Kostiuk, 1989, p. 29]. The described matter is nothing else but characteristic of dialogic interaction.

Of course, in this case also correlation between studying (management) and teaching (and by its mean – development) will be uniting, in other words tense and contradictory. Because, let's remind L.S. Vygotsky, “studying never completely corresponds to development, it is never identical”. But this unity here takes quite different meaning – it is not resistance and adaptation aspiration, it is coordination of different beliefs and aspirations of two personalities (adult and child) regarding life direction of own formation. From other side, it is also that, what L.S. Vygotsky wrote about, – studying influences were adopted in different manner by subjects and caused different changes in psychical development.

Unity remains, but stops to be antagonism, antinomy. Besides, the notion of “closest development area” finally gets present content and meaning in the aspect of G.S. Kostiuk studying. L.S. Vygotsky said, it was that what child could do with help of adult, but it remained incomprehensible, what had been hidden under the term of “help”. Now it is clear that it is about such relation system, when adult promotes subjectivity development, and thus – individuality.

If you imagine studying system, built on the basis of G.S. Kostiuk's paradigm, then what does pupil's success appear to be within it? It is not the adaptation to system degree, but subjectivity degree in own movement: individuality, originality, creativeness, flexibility degree etc. And it is understandable that exactly this shall be valid object of success scientifically forecast of studying.

Stages in life journey of personality

Sequence of stages of life's journey creates time structure of personality existence. Each phase appears to be qualitative new development level. It is complicated by great amount of life path dimensions, interlacing within it of different development lines, each of them has own history.

In order to understand valid content and meaning of some human's life period it is necessary: to know the initials, to compare it with whole integral structure and dynamic of life cycle, to consider it's as the closest, so the most far, the deepest affects regarding personality development in general.

The movement by life path connects with human's development as personality and activity subject, in other words, at the end, as inimitable unique integrity – individuality. These connected, but in the same time different, directions of human's movement in its development define the changes of life path and its structure.

Life path is studied very actively and differently in psychology. We outline here three main conceptual approaches, which, are seemed to us, fully reflect integrity process of human development:

Firstly, understanding of life path as human's self-accomplishment (C. Bühler).

Secondly, conceptual ideas of S.L. Rubinstein, who concentrated attention on motivation regulations of life path through analysis of the notion “personality orientation”.

Thirdly, ideas system about personality life path, which is grounded on life crisis and life periodization notions (L.I. Antsyferova, T.M. Titarenko).

Charlotte Bühler revealed the phases change regularities of human's life, dominating tendencies (motivations) in connection with amount of life activity change. Development's driving force, according to C. Bühler's ideas, is naturally born inclination to self-realization, in other words accomplishing of multidimensional self-realization. Self-realization within this concept is considered as some outcome, result of life path.

The notion of “self-accomplishing” is close by meaning to notions of “self-realization”, “self-actualization”, but in the same time C. Bühler is prone to consider, for example, self-realization as “moment” of human’s self-accomplishing process.

Considering the phenomena of self-accomplishing as “result”, researcher directs to personality ontogenesis and states that at its every stage personality is able to self-realize, having survived the global condition at this (at each age it’s own): good well-being is considered to be indicator of self-accomplishing at early age (till 1,5 years old); experience of childhood end is an indicator of self-accomplishing in the period of 12-18 years old; experience of self-realization – in period of 25-50 years old; self-ending – 65-85 years old.

The degree and fullness of self-accomplishing is defined by the level of human’s self-defining as ability to set a goal adequate to its internal entity. Therefore, the development of goal-setting mechanisms, connected with self-consciences level (quality, deepness), appears to be fundamental factor of C. Bühler’s concept. Very important notion of “life goal” for here, which is difficult to find empirical correlation, actually shall be acknowledged as existing and significant (we, of course, mind the phenomenon “hidden” behind this term).

C. Bühler reasonably considers availability and realizing of life goal, adequate to own possibilities and aspirations, as principle condition for personality psychical health. She polemizes with psychoanalysts (S. Freud, A. Adler), conclusively proving that personality neuroticism is defined not so much by sexual problems or insufficiency feeling, but as insufficient directness and self-defining.

It is very important that C. Bühler uses the L. Bertalanffy’s idea about tension rising tendency, adherent to all alive systems, necessary for active overcoming of “environment resistance”. Such spontaneous, initially adherent to alive, activity doesn’t adopt individual to environment, as it was explained by Freud, but enforces it, making expansive and, at the same time, complicating and developing. No doubt, this force is a need. Particularly, we would like

to pay attention to the next: it has been noted that Freud is very logical in defining of personality structure.

His source – libido as initially natural energetic component, literally “faces” social world, hostile to it, and, as consequence, creature bearer of this libido is forced to adopt, and, especially for this, all Freud’s three component personality structure is being created.

In other words – structure is an outcome of antagonism, the exit of which is adaptation. It will never be ideal and that is why there are worries, neurotics, psychological protections etc. And if we now return to C. Bühler we will see the absolutely opposite logic: there are initial force and resistance, but the main existence idea is not adaptation at all.

Vice-versa – the idea is about self-accomplishing and, of course, the personality structure “for this idea” shall be different. Another thing. This force, which is spoken by L. Bertalanffy (and is only he?), and which is used by C. Bühler, – it really is a need, which we understand it shall be. Exactly its passage and energy create personality structure and define its life path. How? C. Bühler explains this. First of all, she separates the phases of self-accomplishing starting from teen age.

Why from this age – is understandable, because key factor of self-accomplishing appears to be personality self-defining, and it (it is confirmed by modern data) exactly starts at the end of teen age and early juvenile age. Researcher, no doubt, is right when she brings earlier stages of ontogenesis beyond the limits of life path. However, we seem she is partly right in her explanations of this.

It is not about individual doesn’t carry out “professional activity”. It is half of the problem. The other its equal half is about it is really impossible to speak seriously about self-accomplishing of new human, which is not ready to realize itself in born of new human through the contact with creature that loves you. We, and it is most important, personify in new humans and if, conditionally speaking, C. Bühler conception can be added by need phenomenon analysis, it will be completed theory of personality life path.

More close these conceptions appear to be while considering the life path sources. C. Bühler postulates two sources – complimentary and mental. First of them is determined by inner body forces, so development type is defined, actually, by dominating of biological energy. Particularly, C. Bühler considers that due to this the peak of creative activity coincides in time with peak of biological prosperity.

In opinion of scientist, mental factor looks like psychological new creation: at the end of biological motivation (or even at the beginning of extinction) mental energy appears, which determines further self-accomplishing. It is psychological by its nature. We would say that in reality goes in such way with the exception of one “but”: biological, social and psychological (mental) determinants of personality self-movement are, in general, difficult synthesis of each other – personality doesn’t have anything just biological or just social.

These conjugations, which move from parents, are those, which are called by the word “spirit”. This is the form of existence and self-development need, which creates this what we get used to call self-realization, self-accomplishing, in general, personality’s life path.

The issue of personality self-realization (self-actualization) traditionally is connected with humanistic psychology, in which even present term is central. Let’s pay attention to presence of self-realization ideas in native psychological science. We will note at once that analysis provides for the possibility to open deep and substantial philosophic-psychological backgrounds of this phenomenon understanding. The only thing that shall be taken into account at this – quite rarely usage of term “self-realization”, but we are interested not in epistemology, but in the nature of things.

The human’s basis of aspirations for self-realization is not always acknowledged aspiration for immortality, which can be realized in different forms such as: wish to raise the knowledge level, improve humans’ life conditions, pass the knowledge and experience to others, open the sense for people etc. Thus, we deal with essential, initial component of personality life, which cannot exist within individual human’s existence. Successful aspirations can be realized only by going out of these limits, but “going out of the individual existence limits for separate individual – only by joining to something

bigger, which will not end its existence by physical death of individual”.

But what does such “joining” appear to be?

O.F. Losev noted in due time: “Personality in general, if it was, had being thought always as unchangeably influencing, so acting”. [Losev, 1991, p. 73] Thus, personality “is always revelation”.

At this expression is not just personality function, but it’s necessary and basic attribute. As we see, according to O.F. Losev, personality is, first of all, expression form. Expressed existence is always synthesis of two classes: one – external, obvious and another – internal, comprehending, the one which is presumed. Expression is always synthesis of something internal and something external.

V.A. Petrovskyy develops his theory of “personal contributions” in context of this idea. [Petrovskyy, 2003]. In general considering his views as adequate to understanding of self-realization in native philosophical-psychological tradition, we shall underline the next. While developing own theoretical scheme within the frames, as he notes, “personalization concept”, V.A. Petrovskyy grounds on ideas of O.M. Leontyev about personality as individual’s “system feature”. “We particularly characterize this special feature, – writes V.A. Petrovskyy, – first of all as human’s ability to determine changes of individuality considerable aspects of other people, be subjects of behavior transformation and surrenders conciseness through its reflecting (“personalization”) in them”. [Petrovskyy, 2003, p. 440]

Further author adds central for him notion of “reflected subjectivity”, which “includes ideas about personal aspect of human’s existence in the world as form of active “ideal” human presence in life of other people, “prolongation of human in human”. And then he clarifies: “Reflected subjectivity is, thus, the form of ideal presence exactly this human in my life situation, which is defined as transformation source of this situation in important direction for me”.

If we consider the thoughts of V.A. Petrovskyy in context of personality self-realization phenomenon, it shall be recognized that very important aspect was actualized by him. Really, human “subjecting” is not only external objects, but also other people, which

become to some extension its creation. And the problem here is about extension.

On the basis of V.A. Petrovskyy's explanations, we can come to the thought that personality is nothing but "reflected subjectivity" of great amount of subjects, which in due time were considerable for this person, in other words – they made their own contributions to it.

But is it really like that? In our opinion, here can be only dialectic solution, because we face the anatomy: personality, no doubt, is some sum of "reflected subjectivities", since it has been existing in situation of other personalities' influence from the beginning.

But, at the same time, it cannot be just sum of these contributions, because in the last case we would have the mechanism, but not the personality.

In our opinion, solving of this antinomy is about recognition that personality overcomes reflected subjectivity, and this is, actually, self-realization. Thus, really important is not the amount and nature of "contributions" to personality of other people, but its ability, accepting these contributions, to overcome them in own activity, in which these contributions "melt" and transforming. In other words, actually, the problem nature solves the process of self-realization itself.

However, we stop so carefully at analysis of V.A. Petrovskyy's views not only because they actualize essential aspect human life. The thing is also about practical outcomes.

Considering author's views in their "pure" form, the conclusion can be easily made that, for example, professional self-realization of teacher or educator is about aspiration to accomplish as much as possible influences on pupil's personality and leave "a lot" of reflected subjectivity. Unfortunately, in this way it is understood by the most of educators and adult people in general. Therefore, psychological subject can be clarified: drive of teacher's professional self-realization – it is desire to leave maximum of "personality contributions" in pupil's personalities.

However we consider such setting of question as absolutely incorrect and inhumane. Teacher, actually, self-realizes in self-realization of its pupils. In other words, pupil as my work – it is

human, which I helped to feel self-valued and inimitable-unique individuality, free, setting own goals and reach them by its efforts (in other words – overcome reflected subjectivity).

Of course, such things often press and annoy teachers, and especially parents, because self-realization of that, whom you educate, is understood existentially (in other words according to theoretical scheme of V.A. Petrovskyy, as behavior correspondence to that, what has contributed in human). It seems to us that K. Rogers is right.

Described theoretical statements provide the possibility to specify considerably the source problem: personality self-realization (and thus, its motivation) is natural and totally-general feature (grade) of any personality. The question cannot be about its additional forming. Moreover, the main mechanisms of this process become known. So, problem is about people do not always open (and thus – form) all its natural forces – features, remaining uneducated regarding own potential.

In other words, analysis of national philosophical-psychological tradition's main provisions provides the possibility to define: personality self-realization is, actually, organically adherent to any human (and thesis about that a lot of people (3% according to Maslou) self-realize, because everybody “do” that, is inappropriate).

But social conditions can be such that encourage more active and deeply reasonable personality formation (thus, self-realization). And exactly this is social-psychological problem. In this context we consider analysis of Ukrainian psychologist T.M. Titarenko's views as very important. “My “I” as synthesis of finite and infinite, – she writes, – at the beginning really exists, then, in order to grow, it projects itself on the screen of imagination, and my dreams, fantasies, bizarre delusions open for me endlessness and infiniteness of possibility. My “I” contents a lot of potentials; it is necessity and that, which I can become”. [Titarenko, 1999, p. 256] But this possibility is realized always very partially.

What is restriction? From one side “I” restricts myself: “There is a danger of possibility area excessive enlargement, when because of imagistic structures because no time lefts for their realizing. In this

way “I”, step by step, turns into entire mirage due to lack of reality feeling... Human should realize its internal limits, natural borders, in order not to cheer itself with kaleidoscope of possibilities”.

This remark, in our opinion, is very valuable: self-realization shall ground on internal basic human peculiarities.

A. Maslou’s thought is specified that self-realization is a process, during which human should become somebody, determination exists, and it appears to be nothing else but compilation of classical “internal conditions” (S.L. Rubinstein), from anatomic-physiological to psychological. However it is not all yet.

Self-realization is determined also by eternal peculiarities of life conditions. Self-realization is determined also by external peculiarities of life conditions. By analyzing “ordinary” and “existential” personality being, author actually follows personality self-realization mechanisms at different level of its existence. Ambiguity and difficultness of researcher’s position attracts. From one side, “human remains within the limits of immediate”, doesn’t develop, doesn’t grow. “Platitude of wimp”, its stickiness and “vegetableness” of such life are underlined.

It seems that to be appropriate and logic reasoning of necessity in this life of holidays, carnivals, ceremonies, games – all of that provides the possibility for human to self-realize by remaining personality. This is principally traditional and widespread point of view. But T.M. Titarenko goes far and then it turns out that “ordinary days are that base, which provides the possibility for exit from situational captivity, breakthrough real freedom”.

Besides, “immersion into existence, natural syncretism of world perception provides the feeling of stability, durability, rightness of what is going on”. All of this, actually, is very important in the life of each human. Ordinary days form quite particular personality type, for which to distinct, show own inimitable individuality, considering general context, is unwanted. It is easier and more reliable to be like everybody, to look like others.

Thus, it looks like we have complete conformism and de-individualization. Continuing brightly to characterize this personality type, researcher notes: “They (these personalities) can use their

ability, in time orientate in changing conditions, save money and beneficially invest them in bonds. These people have been successful already or, not unreasonably, are going to be successful. Their adaptation can be jealousy, their existence seems almost harmonically.” [Titarenko, 1999, 1 p. 57]

But are they really themselves? The last question is key question, and we obligatory will return to it after review of all author’s logic as integral structure.

It turns out that along with ordinary life quite different life exists – the life of “act”. Human does “act” – and in this time lives in different life dimension, and it is quite different itself. But making of “act” is always restricted in time, and after this act human... “returns to ordinary life”. It returns, as T.M. Titarenko notes fairly, quite different, internally enriched, as grown as personality.

Thus, we have particular discretisation of human’s life: ordinary (“actless”?) existence interrupts with “act” and then again returns to ordinary life, having changed qualitative personality at that.

There is a great seduction to consider “act” as act of personality self-realization, and it is like that according to logic of so called “act approach”, that is very actively developed by Ukrainian authors, which consider themselves as followers of V.A. Romenets. [249] “act of truth”, “dead of beauty”, “act of existence” etc. – discrete existence moments of personality, in which it really grows and self-realizes, look like that.

We will not analyze theoretical views of V.A. Romenets, however they deserve for attention. At least we do not meet listed forms of act at him, and we cannot meet, because his idea was quite different than what is explicated in this form.

V.A. Romenets pointed at such forms of act: “act of risk”, “act of faith”, “fatal act, in other place – “act of sacrifice”. Logic is quite different from above listed. But more important is other thing: V.A. Romenets considers analysis possibility of similar phenomena – act and self-realization. Providing psychological definition of act, he notes: “...It is also top form and main, conscious mechanism, way of mental development”.

Considering the idea of self-realization act as “quite abstract”, he expresses quite appropriate, in our opinion, remark: “Definitions

“self-accomplishing” and “self-realization” have performing shade and point to developing of already available content... [Romenets, 1999]

In work of L.I. Antsyferova we find the characteristic of self-realization as creativeness: “Special directness of human’s creativeness – it is her creating of itself, its internal world, own soulful life”. [Antsyferova, 2002, p. 30] At some stage of ontogenesis something like doubling of self-realization as system of personality actions happens. From one side, human continues to actively form external conditions of own development (subjecting – desubjecting), from the other side – own internal world now is an object of forming efforts. “Is the individual an author, creator of that psychical creations, which start to be realized at some stages of personality development, and thus, integrate? Doesn’t human participate in creating – and not only in finding – of own independence, truly self?” [Antsyferova, 2002, p. 36] – asks L.I. Antsyferova, polemising with C.G. Jung and A. Maslou.

Actually, it is necessary to note that initiative-creating beginning, which is in the basis of personality self-realization, has really existential meaning for human, being as its existence condition. The central turns out to be problem of that internal activity real content, which personality accomplish, developing and changing itself. Self-realization is an important form of such activity. It is shown in researches of Y.B. Gippenreiter, O.T. Sokolova and others that act of self-observing itself brings to remarkable changes of personality internal world. Taking this into account, in this case we consider self-knowledge and formation of adequate “I-conception” as important mean of self-realization process and its diagnostic correlation.

Recently the socially-psychological aspect of personality self-realization is actively being researched in native psychology. Particularly, it concerns to human interaction peculiarities with social environment and psychological aspect of professional activity. Y.I. Golovaha researches self-realization in context of personality life prospective. [Golovaha, 2003]

The last one is considered by author as “integral picture of future in difficult contradictory interaction of programmed and expected

events, with which human connects social value and individual sense of its life”.

Personality prospective, researcher remarks, is the most important factor of its development and self-realization. Life prospective is not preset for personality, but is created by it, changes and specifies during the whole life, passing in its existence tensional-crisis moments. In our opinion, the research of so called distinct alternative at personality life path is very interesting and productive in this notion.

G.M. Adrieyeva [Adrieyeva, 2003] pays attention to importance of environment in personality processes: “identification with some type of environment is the most important of “I” image. In her opinion, environment is organically included in personality life world and in some way influences on its existence and development. It is noted that interactions of personality and environments can happen as in the way of homeostasis, so heterostasis, in other words – acquiring and transformation – creating of social environment.

The last one relates more to self-realization process, than homeostasis, though this process is not studied enough and, in our opinion, foreseen grate internal work, that has relation to self-realization. N.V. Chepelieva, by analyzing L.S. Vygotsky’s conception, comes to conclusion: “Social development situation – it is important conjunction of internal development processes and external conditions... This correlation defines both dynamic of psychical development during some age period, and qualitative peculiar psychological new creations, which appear at the end of this period”. [Chepelieva, 2006, p. 120].

Each human forms typical behavior and emotional forms of reaction to specific life situations during the life, which N.V. Chepelieva calls “conceptions”. Psychological situation is important from the point of psychology view, which “appears, when real conditions impede goal reaching, meeting demands or they are explained as such, that contains specific obstacles, problems etc”.

Psychological situations can appear also because of availability of internal obstacles.

N.V. Chepelieva quite appropriately, in our opinion, considers psychological situation as “task for sense” [Chepelieva, 2006]: it is meant, that their overcoming foreseen the act of sense creation, and thus, if consider ideas of V. Frankle, – act of self-realization.

It seems to us, that aspect, which is revised by N.V. Chepelieva, has central meaning for solving of personality self-realization problem – the solving of numerous psychological situations brings to that world stops to be alienated perceived as such, that stands “in front”, in return position “personality inside own world” appears (S.L. Rubinstein). The research of human’s problem in new life situations deserves for attention.

On the basis of literature analysis we outlined such characteristics of self-realization need: self-realization need belonged to the higher needs group; it was qualitative characteristic of personality; present need actualized potential possibilities of personality; it promoted personality development; self-realization need existed in variant “for others”, in other words it had social character; self-realization need – it was value; it had permanent, continuous character, self-realization need possessed of goal-oriented formation ability during the gaining process of one or other activity.

Fundamental needs create behavior activity. Activity, according to phrase of K.O. Albuhanova-Slavska, “accomplishing as personality in life acting plan... acquires self-realization form” [Albuhanova-Slavska, 1991] In this case we concentrate attention on activity problem, which A.V. Petrovskyy defines as personality needs realization, as searching of need subjects. Activity defines acting, in other words it is driving force, source of “potentials” awakening in human. Activity is induced by performance need, it appears to be higher than performance level, but its character is defined and mediated by higher life needs. So, self-realization need is personality activity source, and activity defines those performance types, in which present need will be satisfied.

S.L. Rubinstein considered life path globally: “Human’s personality nature finds it’s completing expression in that it not only

develops as any organism, but also has its own history [Rubinstein, 2003, p. 245]

This thought is exceptionally principal and essential, because what does it mean “has its own history?” Firstly, it means “to live trail” in this world. But not only trail – something done, created as itself, its need embodiment. It means to change this world somehow; no matter it will be a little change within the scale of generations change, but even the birth of new human (embodiment – need subjecting) – it is already creation of a new world in general, new form of worlds reflection of itself. Secondly, has dream – mean embody itself, own life in memory, experience of other people, having changed themselves with that.

They are those “contributions”, which transfer us in own other (ideal) and make everybody eternal and endless, without considering biological terminality. Thirdly, the question should be about that my history – it is, actually, reflection. I experience own movement, acquire experience and – remember. We have quite interesting connection in “point of personality” experience, intentions, life plans and rejected alternatives. Exactly because of realizing this difficult unity, acknowledging of existential psychology big truth appears, which understands personality as “existence – human – in world”.

Every moment of its existence, human has “inside, this unity, which allow her to transcend, in other words – to be endless and effectively. So, the history differs from genesis by that it foreseen availability of internal in that substance, which is moving. And here it is very interesting to turn back to analysis of S.L. Rubinstein phrase, having done the logical emphasize on the word “own”.

This subjective experience, we would say, expresses – accompanies specific unique need embodiment, in which both movement experience of people, which created this personality, and social contributions of cultures (result of converted – interiorized artifacts), and unique assembly of natural characteristics (let’s not forgive – biological actually was social some time ago).

And only for such creature the PATH is possible – here we provide this notion with biblical meaning. Psychology of so understandable

PATH – the chapter of our science has not been started, which is waiting for attention of researchers.

At this the creating of new theory is not important. The problem is about, how strange it wouldn't look like, solving just practical tasks of human's psychological health. Let's remind, central question of therapist to client in existential psychology is question "Where are You?", it is about Dasein. "We can understand existence of another human, – notes R. May, – only have known in which direction it forms... Thus the future time is important for human" [May, 2001a].

Dasein means that human is a creature, which has own as in time, so, actually, in space relation. This is, actually, moment, minimal path length, but for us it is important now that dasein – is a proof of path availability. Question "Where are You?" means actualization and "transferring" to human's conciseness of that almost never can be actualized in normal condition: it (question) causes transcend and being globally aware of – "Where do you go?".

Availability of path means that personality has overcome existential abandons and become human existing, in other words individually accomplishing itself, own life (phrase: personality has become subject of own life path is not appropriate here, – we agree with R. May that summarizing of human to subject or object always simplifies and primitivezes existence, personality being). And, of course, no matter how we approach to path studying, the key question always remains the correlation of realized and unrealized.

Path is being experienced (and that is why it is – PATH), but how? It is hard question. Our primitively-dichotomically organized thinking ("or" – "or") starts to beat for searching of bright ersatz – ideal and its contrast. And it finds: here "flame revolutionist", faith fanatic, scientist-ascetic, great painter. These are the examples of PATH – we are sure – but is it really like this?

Let's remind in this relation small, but unique, deeply by its meaning, micro novel of B.M. Teplov "Mozart and Salieri", in which it is shown very clearly who actually is genius and exactly why. Mozart here is very alive, moving, diverse person. He is not inspired

(burdened) by some hope, overvalue of serving to beauty, truth, something else...

He just lives – interesting, hard, differently. And that is why he is authentic and self-sufficient, that is why he is creative and genius. And... Salieri, human with good taste, great abilities, but he is that, who can be called “flame servant (slave) or super idea”. He is all the time under the sign of idea. All his thoughts and feelings are taken by it – “one, but flame passion”. And that is why he is not interesting, ineffective, and, really, dangerous.

This is slave of own world project, – existentialists would say, this is partly human, – Marks and Fromm would say. But here what is interesting for us – one and other have path. What is then principally difference? We will risk assuming that it is in different degree of path realizing (we will not speak about moral here, because this theme would take us very far). This realizing of Salieri is much stronger; its grade is much higher. He consciously has conquered himself to great goal and become its slave, stopped. Mozart, let’s repeat, just lives. Word “just” is a keyword and very complicated here. Does he understand own goals, own role, importance in his environment? No doubts, he does. But it is not major for him. World around, people, own openness to all of these and new deep feeling, related to these. This is the major. Exactly they show him a path.

Let’s remind Jung one more time – human makes the most right, fundamental steps, if it is able to listen to own conscience. It will tell, and let it be unusual, illogical, strange – against all stereotypes and expectations, that have been created, but, at the end, it will turn out that to do in such way – is only right variant. Self-sufficiency – the most important, deep instance of internal world, conjunction of the most important feelings and experiences, including archetypes – doesn’t need hypostasis in mature age look like this?

Doesn’t it define the path? And again, following Jung, we will say – path cannot be understood, it shouldn’t be tried to understand in no case, it shall be experienced. When modern psychology tries to solve problem of personality life path, it uses very many terms – “perspectives”, “time”, “events”, “reflection”, “values”, “life plans”, “environment”, socialization”... etc.

When tries are made to unite, integrate all of these, first impression is like some abstract scheme- chimera is being built, which has no relation to live concrete (“average!”) human, except for very disturbed persons like Pushkin’s Salieri, Don Quixote and people similar to them. Too “much of conscience”, despite it sounds strange.

Actually, such people are always neurotic and psychologically unhealthy. Do they have a path? Yes, but not the one they demonstrate, impose to others and themselves. Their path, usually, is a path of reactive person, that always is afraid, defenses, have complexes, and because of this – very often dangerous.

But actually, every human has own path, without special thinking about it, without praising itself and fear of it. It just live, and that means to go by own way. Balance of realizing top values and contexts, and unrealized experiences-moves, exactly defines path’s normality and productivity.

But there is another important nuance – operational. Path – is a direction: let’s imagine this figuratively, that it is road, which human is going on. It came from somewhere, it was somewhere now, it would come somewhere... The most important question for us here is where? Everybody, of course, has own path. But, after all, does human choose or built the path? Question is not accidental. Because, this is about “closeness in the world”, and about social and cultural-historical factors influence, and about self-sufficiency, and about human conscience independence grade in prospective of its life existence.

It seems for us that, actually human normally is not worried much about movement end point (in manner of “fictitious finalism of A. Adler”). There are partial goals (buy something, understand something, do something, become somebody), but they are only “intermediate movement points” for healthy authentic personality. End and beginning of movement cannot be actually realized and goal-setting is not extended on them. But this is not fatality. It is peculiar theme, which is defined for each of us by need and compilation of retrospective and prognostic experiences (self-sufficiency).

Do we choose the theme or it chooses us? “Either – or” is not suitable here... Baby, fetus – embodiment of two needs reflections,

which include great concentration of all existence experience, exactly this, this baby is not quite “closed” in this world accidentally (exactly here, exactly now). It is awaited, and life situation has been already prepared till his physical appearance.

It defines both directing (globally-strategically) and “end point” – when this creature, having given all possible need energy, remains to exist further only in ideal plan – as reflection of embodiment – in subject, human, memory.

It turns out, human neither choose, nor heading or paving. Moreover, when it starts to go like thus (actually choosing, heading, paving) – it and its environment feel great discomfort – “it goes not by its way” – people speak wisely.

Of course, path is a road, which exists as its beginning and end exist. This is the road of only my self-sufficiency, my need, only my destiny. What am then I? I am actually given a lot. I can listen to and go by own way, individually choosing temp, time, stops, companions. I can go out of this path and return back, and pass over something, stop somewhere for a while. I can turn off the way and then – go neurotically, fanatically without seeing the road (and I will come – not there, and this tragedy is experienced by me completely only at the end of life)...

In general, finishing this small chapter, we would like to underline: personality life path appears to be quite difficult problem conjunction, to which scientifically psychology only awkwardly starts to touch. It seems to us that genetic conceptual approach can be quite productive and effective.

Motivational regulators for life journey of personality

This conception, as content of personality direction organization, was developed by S.L. Rubinstein [Rubinstein, 2003, 1972, 2003]. Conception main idea is about that, differently to alive creatures, human own history, but not just cycles of development, which repeat. It's activity, changing reality, objectives in culture products, which are passed from generation to generation.

The connection between generations is carried out in this way, due to this – next generations don't repeat, but continue the work of previous and rely on results of predecessor, even when they start to struggle with them.

Human history is an activity, in which it has reached its goal, made mistakes and corrected them. That is why, studying of needs, interests, ideals, guidelines and tendencies, in general personality direction provide the possibility for forecasting of human life path and thus prevent the mistakes.

Motivation content is very easy to define by answering to such questions:

- What does human want?
- To what does it strive?
- What does it can?

Answer for the question: what does the human want, what does source of its motivation strives for, which satisfy its needs.

Human is not locked inside creature that lives and develops from itself. Its existence, as live organism, foresees exchange between it and nature. In order to sustain life human needs substances and products, which are out of it, and for it's continuing in other people human needs other human.

The amount of human needs is enlarging in the process of historical development. This need, which is reflected by human's psychic, is realized by it as need. Human relation with surrounding world and addiction to him turns out in this.

Besides things, necessary for human existence, two other needs exist, which are necessary and are not experienced subjectively as needs. These are interests. They are born in anxiety:

- 1) Initial, more or less undefined condition;
- 2) Dynamic tendency, which appears as strive;
- 3) After that the striving subject is clearly outlined, to what human pays its attention.

During that, while tendency defines the subject, for which striving is directed, they are realized and become more consciously activity motives, which more or less adequately reflect objective drives of human activity. However, tendency provokes to activity, the retarded

movement moments are usually related to it, which enforce dynamically directed character of tendencies.

Directing includes three tightly interrelated moments:

- a) Subject content, because directing is always directed at something, some subject;
- b) Tension, which appears at this
- c) Dynamic tendencies and components, created by them, which cause appearance of psychical processes.

However dynamic aspect cannot be separated from contextual and try to consider dynamical moments as self-sufficient mechanism of psychic and behavior. Absolutely dynamical relations themselves, independently to content, “work” only in affective and pathological conditions.

Dynamic tendencies appear, according to Z. Freud, in form of appetencies.

In unconscious appetite subject is not realized. That is why object is not important, and directing itself, expressed by appetite, appears as such, which is set by nature in individual, its organism, which comes from inside, its deepness.

Psychic reflects organic problems first of all because of organic feelings. As far as organic needs are reflected in organic feelings, which include the moment of dynamic intension or have more or less sharp affective shade, they will appear in form of appetencies.

Appetence is organic need, revealed by organic (interceptive) sensitiveness. Appetence has somatic irritation appearance source inside of organism as reflection of organic need. Impulse intension is general peculiarity of appetencies. Appetence creates impulse for action as more or less lasting intension.

Studying about appetencies was mainly created by Z. Freud, mainly basis on clinical research studying materials, which results were analyzed by scientist, considering general notions of his conception.

Z. Freud distinguishes two groups of appetencies: sexual appetencies and “I” appetencies or self-preservation, and then Eros appetencies and death appetency. But having included second group into its system, Freud actually concentrated his research on studying

of sexuality and came to pansexuality, considered all human life as permeated by sexual factors influence.

According to Freud, internal appetency is self-sufficient factor. It appears in organism, closed for itself, revealing beyond consciously relations of personality and environment. Appetency acts from the inside of organism: you cannot escape from it. That is why there is something fatal in it. Freud is convinced that appetencies define human's fate. According to Freud, appetencies are main motivation for human activity, which is dependent to pleasure principle, in other words it is automatically regulated by pleasure, satisfaction, pain or discontent feeling.

Appetency always requires satisfaction. But immediate appetency satisfaction is not always possible. Environment often puts own bans on it, human faces its "censor". Then appetency is either pushed in unconsciousness or sublimed; sexual appetency looks for other ways of satisfaction and finds in such way satisfaction in different forms of human's creative activity.

Appetencies, which are pushed out of conscience, turn out in hide symbolic form, while sleeping – in dreams, and in reality at first by the most innocent way – slips of the tongue, lapses, wrong actions and forgetting. When for reaction for unsatisfied, pushed out appetencies, these innocent means become not enough, the neurosis appears inevitably.

Z. Freud separates initial appetency, sensitive moment from psychical human activity, when it has realized its need. Appetency is only initial stage of organic need reflection in organic, interceptor sensitiveness.

Appetency is one of the many forms of need. It is initial stage of need realizing, and appetency itself shall not be obligatory "stuck" at organic sensitiveness level: it and conscience in such case would be non-penetrating one in other areas. It relates also to sexual appetency. It more or less deeply and organically permeates all personality life, and conscience life is included in it: sexual appetency gains love forms; thus human need for human is a real human need.

Orientation, which is expressed in appetencies, is created by need in something that is beyond the individual. And any other

dynamic tendency contains realized relation with something that is outside.

Information from the inside comes to foreground of appetency, from internal to external; in other cases, vice versa, this two ways relation or correlation appear, firstly directing from external to internal.

Appropriateness resists to appetency. But there is no antagonism between appetency and appropriateness; human obeys to appropriateness against its appetencies and desires. Appropriateness becomes essential goal not because human doesn't want it, but because it realized this "want" as important goal, and its accomplishing became own deal.

In reversibility of this addiction between goal and appetency, striving, willing, peculiar feature of directing and tendencies, which encourage its originating, appears.

Special place among tendencies has instruction (setting).

Instruction of human is a position, attitude to goal or tasks, which turns out in selective directing and readiness for activity, which encourages its accomplishing. Motor instruction of organism is "working" condition, body adjustment to some movements. In the same motor way sensor instruction for organ or organism adjustment to best task perception or to accomplishing of corresponding operation is expressed.

Change of settings means rebuilding of individual psychical structure, related with redistribution of that what is essential for it. Instruction appears due to distribution and interaction of internal tendencies, summarizes them. It is not immediately movement in some direction, instruction foresees human's directing.

Instruction as human's position includes many different components – from elementary needs and appetencies to views and beliefs.

Instruction plays important role in human activity:

1. Changes prospective, in which human percepts any subject content;
2. Redistributing importance of different moments;
3. Causes change of accents and intonations;

4. Outlines different essentials in other prospective, from other side.

Instruction, in which perceptive content is activated, has essential meaning for perception, learning of reality by human. It is related to apperception, apperception of not only beliefs, but the whole personality existence.

Instruction is relation of need to situation. It is process that has phase character, general personality disposition that defines real human's position, its concrete expression and obeys to regularities: its creation, concentration, irradiation, switching of setting.

Inclination as directing to some activity shall be separated to interest and directing.

Motivation sources can be in unreachable for conscience dark "deepness" of tendencies and needs that are realized. Human's nature appears in needs, which has own needs, shows activity, suffers, in other words like passion creature. Its deeds are caused by sufferings, desiring for pleasure and it is proof of tension and activity.

Need covers world of esthetic and moral feelings: admiration, tenderness, worries, excitements; all personality conscious life reflects in it. Need is reflected newly. During conscious life human feelings are involved to settings area, obey their moral control. Sexual and other needs are caused not only by appetency. It turns to desire by realizing subject, to which appetency is directed.

Activity, directed to satisfying of available needs, by creating new subjects for their satisfaction, creates new needs.

Organic needs appear during their satisfaction. But human needs are not restricted by those, which immediately connected with organic life. During the process of historical development the needs develop, by decreasing and differentiating, but also new needs appear, which are not immediately connected with available ones. Thus the need for reading, visiting theater, listen to the music appear in human. By creating cultural areas, human's activity creates corresponding needs in created benefits.

Other essential motives appear in relation to needs:

- a) Realizing of tasks, which life sets for human;
- b) Obligations, which it sets for human;

c) Motivation of human for activity, which is beyond that, which immediately serves for satisfying of already available needs.

This activity can provoke appearance of new needs, because not only needs create activity, but sometimes activity creates interests.

Word “interest” is very meaningful. In everyday language and in different sciences it is used in different meanings. We can have interest for human, in whom we are not interested in, and vice versa – due to some conditions we can have interest for human, which is not interested in us.

Interest in psychological sense is not equal neither social interest in general, nor its subjective expression. Interest in psychological sense is personality directing, which is only caused by realizing of its social needs.

Specific of interest is about that interest is concentration on some subject of thoughts, personality instruction, desire to meet closer with subject, deepen in it, concentrate own attention on it.

Guess. Guess is thought directing, thoughts-worries, thoughts-concerns, thoughts-initiations which has emotional directing. Directing of thoughts and interests is quite different to desires directing, because need is revealed in it.

Interest turns out in directing of attention, thoughts, guesses, need for aspirations, desires, freedom. Interest is an interest of person to something or somebody: unsubjected interests do not exist at all.

Interest always has character of two-ways relation. If we are interested in some subject, it means that this subject is interesting. It causes desire to meet closer with him, deepen in it. It grabs attention and thoughts are concentrated on it.

We do not only that we need, and deal not only with what we are interested in. We gave moral ideas about obligation, which regulate our behavior.

Appropriate, from one side, opposites to human, because it is realized as essential, independent to human will; also if we realize something as appropriate, and not only know it is considered as such,

appropriate become subject of our desires – ideal. Ideal is not only the compilation of behavior norms:

1. Sometimes this is the image that embodies valuable and attractive human features, human image that serves as example;
2. Reflection of desired, that was idealized;
3. Sometimes ideal can have compensatory-antagonistic relation to real human look;
4. It can especially concentrate on that, what human values the most, and on that it lacks;
5. Ideal is not that human really is, that it would like to be.

But it would be incorrect to oppose appropriate and existing, that, what human is, and that, what it would like to be: the last one is also remarkable to conclude the idea about it. Human ideal is thus foreseen embodiment of what it can become. This striving for best is positive tendency of human developments, which after embodiment in image-example become a drive and regulate development.

Ideals are formed exceptionally and immediately under the influence of society.

Each age has own ideals, own view of human, which causes time and environment. Age spirit is embodiment of its essential features. Sometimes ideal is generalized image, image as synthesis of especially important, valuable features. Ideal mostly appears as historical personality, which embodies these features especially full and brightly.

In childhood and juvenile age, ideal is mostly embodied by people from the closest environment: father, mother, older brother, somebody from environment, afterwards – teacher. Later, the ideal – the person, for whom teenager, young man would look like, becomes historical person, very often – somebody from contemporaries.

Human ideals reveal brightly its directing. Ideals are formed under the influence of society values.

Needs, interests, ideals conclude different aspects of personality directing, what appears to be motivation of its activity.

There is a law: until there are actual primary, more urgent needs and interests, the secondary needs, less urgent, will go back; and when more urgent needs lose their sharpness and actuality, the new needs appear then. Needs and interests appear in conciseness in some order.

Personality composition is mostly defined by:

1) Personality level of needs, interests, tendencies.

They provide the possibility to reach the conclusion about diversity or barrenness of human internal content. Some people restrict themselves by elementary, primitive interests; their role is brought to obeying; their influence for other people is restricted. Activity of other people is caused by mental interests, related to mental areas of human activity. Human's look considerably changes depending on how much the activity is caused by mental interests;

2) area of its demands, interests, ideals.

The scope and width of this area stipulates the meaningfulness, range of human. The different area of interests defines the various spiritual life due to content – from spiritually poor, miserable life of some people to spiritually rich and meaningful life of other people.

The width of personality spiritual life obviously stipulates the appearance of questions about level of its development. We cannot speak about its special width and wealth if all demands and interests of human are concentrated on elementary ones. The enlargement in area of interests may occur only through transition to higher levels of development;

3) A human is not born as a personality: it becomes a personality.

The establishment of personality is the same as the development of organism, which is the process of organic ripening. It is not only developed as each organism but it has its own history.

Each human is to some extent a participant and subject in history of mankind and within a certain sense has its own history. Thus, in order to realize the essence of its development everyone shall put the following questions to itself:

- Who have I been?
- What have I done?
- Whom have I become?

It is always necessary to put those questions to yourself by that way.

It would be wrong to think that a personality shows itself with own deeds, products from its activity, its work, remaining such one as it used to be. It is necessary to have the internal possibilities in order to make something significant. However, a human potential dies and pines away if a human is not realized, and it grows and is formed only when it is realized in products of its work. People, who realized themselves, have the positive attitude to their work, products of their activity, having not exhausted themselves in them; they preserve the internal power and are able of new achievements.

The path that a human overcomes, changing in its development and passing to another its step, – is the constant activity. The practical and theoretical psychological development of human is not only shown in human affairs but happens.

This is the key to understanding the development of personality, its formation during the life. Psychological qualities of personality are not only the prerequisite but the result from its deeds and actions. The thought of scientist is formed when he formulates it in his works, the thought of public, political leader – in its deeds. His deeds as a result from his considerations, plans, intentions, as well as his opinions stipulate his activity.

The consciousness of historical leader is developed as the realization of that what is carried out and with his participation. Likewise, when a cutting tool of sculptor cuts a human image from stone block, he defines not only the features of the one, who is depicted but the person of sculptor himself. The style of creator is the expression of his individuality but the individuality of creator himself is formed during the work on creation.

It is necessary, of course, to have the remarkable talent in order to master the achievements of science and art.

Any human has the biography, history of its own “life journey”. It is not in vain that the biography of human includes where it studied and what learnt, where and how worked, what it has done, its own achievements. It means that the history of human, which shall characterize it, includes first of all that one from achievements of

mankind, which influenced on it during study and what it has done for its further development, place and role of this human for historical onward of mankind.

Having joined the history of mankind, a personality makes the important affair for history, i.e. affair, noticeable for history: for history of science, scientific onward and intellectual development of mankind, history of art, aesthetical education and development of personality, in other words, it becomes a historical personality.

The history of each human has its own events – key moments, prerequisites for changes in life of individual, when, while taking some or other decision, a human changes the direction of own life journey for a long time.

The system for motivation of personality that defines the direction of life journey and systems of concepts, thanks to which a personality can cognize itself, is shown namely by this way.

AFTERWORDS

To understand a personality as integrity, being self-developed, – is one from cardinal tasks for genetic psychology of personality, sphere of psychological knowledge, which today goes through the process of establishment, however it has the great future.

The research of such complex systems as personality, their real understanding requires applying the corresponding method. It shall be adequate to the object, being studied. And, at the same time, the method is the embodiment and methodological reflexive expression of bases for theoretical position. Genetically-psychological opinion on personality means its understanding as a unique integrity, being self-developed, self-regulated, and is the carrier of eternal universal spirit.

Modern science in fact is not able to research the formations with such degree of complexity as scientific empirical fact: almost all methods and methodological procedures are directed to “stop” in time and decomposition of a complex object into elementary particles, hereby the actual destruction of object takes place and its most important properties (which only make it to be namely this object hopelessly disappear from visual field of researcher).

Further motion in this empirical paradigm, as L.S. Vygotsky fairly mentioned, already cannot only give something principally new and important but starts causing to disappointment and scientific negativism.

The cultural historical theory established the unique methodological procedure, experimentally genetic method, which overcomes “element-by-element” approach to complex phenomenon and its stop in time (in fact in the course of existence and establishment). It is known, which fundamental phenomena this method allowed determining in terms of appropriation of universal expertise by human in the form of own abilities.

But this method just is not designed for work with unique integrity, being self-developed (personality). Thus, the problem on method was top-priority and fundamental for us. It seems to us that we managed to settle that genetically modeling method (within the

meaning, set in this book), is to full extent adequate to the object under research – existing and constantly changing to human personality.

The book reflects our attempt “to see” the psychology of personality namely from this position and to feel its possibilities (of position) for explanation of numerous mysteries in human existence. It seems that we were not mistaken in heuristicity of chosen perspective, although, let’s mention that it was very uneasy to preserve purely scientific heuristic opinion – the desire “to slip” to analysis for existing theories of personality and ... to build our own one was very attractive.

We hope that we managed to avoid these temptations and the book is still about personality but not about its theories.

According to the original theoretical paradigm, established by us, the basis for psychology of personality genesis is the action of need as genetically initial unit of development and existence of personality. Being energetically significant informative flow, the need specifically unites the biological and social determinants and acts in the form of eternal driving force for self-development of human being – personality.

The discordant unity of the biological and social, conscious and unconscious that occurs “in the point of the world” – personality provides with its dynamics, and thus the existence generates the most important, attributive properties of personality.

The constant energy flow of the need creates the real prerequisites for formation of purely reciprocal mechanisms by personality itself, which are built on rather powerful social factors that are transformed in ontogenesis of human being into biological (morphological) structures.

The novelty, even bravery of our opinion on genesis of personality is that we consciously accept the point of view that the biological and the social “in” personality is the correlation (as it is usually postulated in modern science), in fact these two fundamental determinants of life create the real (not only metaphorical!) unity, and the social in ontogenesis of human becomes the biological.

This is the cardinal thesis. Human relations of two loving beings, power of need, which is shown in them, met, are objectivated and form a creature – a new being, biological due to definitions as it is alive. But it is born by social relations and it makes it to be a human living being originally. Originally it is a miracle (O.F. Losev called a human personality namely by this way).

The inward world of new personality as a first derivative from energy in unity of the biological and social in the need, is a lively and beautiful picture of what may happen as a result from dynamic interactions and mutual transitions of the biological and social. Thus, the nature in fact reflects itself (feasts its eyes) in this miracle, created by itself...

Potentially and actually already the embryo of human, which is the Creation of two social beings, is the personality in its other specific forms of existence. No matter unusual and discordant this our opinion would be, we insist on it and mention with pleasure that it coincides with those empirical data, received recently by world biology and medicine in relation to early ontogenesis of human.

The fruitful unity of these two ways for scientific search – genetic psychology and biology of human – may lead to really revolutionary improvements in our opinions of human, spiritual, personalistic. Perhaps, we will rethink the religious world outlook once more...

We hope that we managed to realize the unique opinion on how the inward picture of human world, materializing in experiences, builds up the tissue of life itself from own mental states.

The problem of structure appears quite logically. Rigidity and inopportunity of disputes, whether a personality has the structure in fact, is obvious: any complex system is obligatorily the structure and as a personality is a system, being self-developed, its structure is processually realized during the whole time of existence, providing with vital activity of human and at the same time acquiring more and more developed, delicate forms.

In this book we would like very much to overcome the simplified logical mechanistic approach to definition of personality structure. This approach was mentioned by G. Allport, who told that each

researcher artificially introduces any psychical phenomena into personality structure from those ones, which he “likes” more.

It seems to us that this artificiality is overcome by one short but fundamentally significant thought – personality structure appears as original reflection of the world, in which it is expected to live... We would like that this thought was not disregarded by those ones, who are interested in psychology of personality.

In the whole we hope for attentive attitude of reader to our book and are grateful for it.

* * *

Finishing and summing up the conversation about genesis in realization of personality, I decided that it is necessary to set forth the consideration about perspectives for research on psychology of personality. Genetically psychological analysis for theories of personality, first of all dynamic unity of the biological and social as a discordant unit of personality, which is fixed in need, allows speaking about development of real theoretical bases for genetic model of existence and psychological growth of personality (Genetically psychological theory of existence and growth of personality). The power of need as the force of life is deployed in time and creates the alternate flow of prevalence in functioning of individual, either biological (that becomes sensitive to social influences), or social (when the means are created and mediated), which is the real mechanism for development of personality. Let's explain. Originally the biological creates the social readiness of individual for construction of psychological means, which become the units of consciousness that are morphologically fixed, thus, becoming the biological (or creating the biological background for the social), and it is continued for ever by this way.

The need in continuation of family line and interactions with another human is the creation of you and another being and acts as a creative manifestation of personal growth.

This aspiration for love, personal continuation of you and living miracle-being is the key one in genetic psychology.

The learning process as the need itself runs through the whole existence of human. It unites the biological and social components of need. The social and the biological in fact do not influence on personality, on the contrary, they do not pass into one another in it, again proving the possibility and potentiality in unity of antipodes. Existing in ontogenesis, sensitive periods are those knots, where the steps of development are made: appropriated social means change the morphophysiology of human and changes in organism in their turn direct further learning process... In fact, there is no end for life and flow of need. When I die – I disappear biologically but the social flow of need has already made and will make these steps, which will form the new biological from this my flow that will be I in many aspects.

LIST OF LITERATURE

1. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya K.A. Activity and personality psychology. – M.: Nauka, 1980. – p. 336.
2. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya K.A. Life strategy. – M., 1991.
3. Adler A. Science to live. // Personality psychology in the foreign psychologist works. Chrestomathy. – SPb: Piter, 2000. – pp. 52-64.
4. Adler A. To understand human nature. – SPb.: Akademichesky proekt, 1997.
5. Adler A. Individual psychology practice and theory. – M.: Klass, 1995. – p. 331.
6. Aidarova L.I. Small pupils and native language. – M.: Znanie, 1983. – p. 94.
7. Aleksandrova A.Y. Science and scientist perception problems. – L.: Nauka, 1938. – p. 512.
8. Amonashvili S.A. To school at six // Pedagogical search. – M.: Pedagogika, 1987.
9. Amonashvili S.A. Hello children! Teacher handbook. – M.: Prosvestchieniye. 1988.- p. 208.
10. Analytic philosophy: Selected texts/Composed by A.F. Griaznov. – M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1993. – p. 181.
11. Ananyev B.G. Complex human studying and psychological diagnostics // Questions of psychology. – 1968. – No. 6. – pp. 21-33.
12. Ananyev B.G. Human as perception subject. – L.: Publishing house of Leningrad University, 1968a. – p. 338.
13. Andreyev I.D. Theory as form of scientific knowledge organizing. – M.: Nauka, 1979. – 304 p.
14. Andreyev G.M. Identity with social environment // Social situation psychology. – SPb: Piter, 2003. – pp. 248-256.
15. Antsyferova L.I. Personality psychology as developing system. – Personality forming and development psychology. – M.: Nauka, 1981. – pp. 3 – 18.
16. Antsyferova L.I. Personality forming and development psychology. – Personality psychology in native psychologists' works. – SPb: Piter, 2002. – pp. 207 – 212.

17. Antsyferova L.I. Psychological content of subject phenomenon and subjective-activity approach. – Subject problem in psychological science. – M.: Akademicheskyy proekt, 2000. – pp. 27 – 42.
18. Aristotle. On the soul. – M.: Nauka, 1976. – p. 448.
19. Arsenyev A.S. Goal problem at bringing up and education. Goal at personality forming // Philosophic-psychological problems of education development / Redacted by V.V. Davydov. – M.: Pedagogika, 1981. – pp. 54-73.
20. Arshavina L.I. Junior pupils' analytic components development // Psychological-pedagogical aspects of school studying processes / Redacted by S.D. Maksymenko. – K.: Rad. School, 1983. – pp. 77-97.
21. Asmolov A.G. Personality as subject of psychological research. – M., 1984. – p. 304.
22. Babansky Y.K. Studying process optimization (general didactics aspect). – M.: Pedagogika, 1977.
23. Ball G.A. Kostyuk and his methodological lessons // Psych. magazines. – 2000. – Vol. 21. – No. 3. – pp. 112-116.
24. Ball G.A. Theory of studying tasks. Psychological-pedagogical aspect. – M.: Pedagogika, 1990. – p. 184.
25. Basov M.Y. Selected psychological works. – M.: Pedagogika, 1975. – p. 432.
26. Batyshev G.S. Human activity nature as philosophical principle // Human problems in modern philosophy. – M.: Nauka, 1969. – pp. 73–144.
27. Bakhtin M.M. Dostoevsky's poetic problems. – M., 1979.
28. Bakhtin M.M. Esthetic of verbal art. – M., 1972. – p. 321.
29. Berdyaev N. Problem of human. – Put, 1936. – No. 50. – pp. 12-26.
30. Berns R. I-conception development and bringing up. – M.: Progress, 1986. – p. 421.
31. Bernstein N.A. Notes on moves and activity physiology. – M.: Medytsyna, 1966. – p. 349.
32. Bekhterev V.M. Objective psychology. – M., 1912. – Edition 1. – 600 p.
33. Bekhterev V.M. Psychological definition of personality. – Personality psychology. // Chrestomathy. – SPb: Piter, 2000. – pp. 15-17.

34. Binswanger L. Existentially-analytic school of thought. – Existential psychology. – M., 2001. – pp. 308-332.
35. Blonsky P.P. Note on scientifically psychological // Blonsky P.P. Selected psychological works. – M.: Prosvestchieniye, 1964. – pp. 33-131.
36. Blium G. Psychoanalytic theories of personality. – M.: KSP, 1996. – p. 247.
37. Bogoyavlenskaya D.B. Intellectual activity as creativeness problem. – Rostov: Publishing house of Rostov University, 1983. – p. 174.
38. Bogoyavlenskaya D.B. Activity problem in creativeness problematic. // Vopr. Psykhol. – 1999. – No. 2.
39. Bogoyavlenskyy D.N., Menchynska N.A. Studying psychology // Psychological science in USSR. – M.: Nauka, 1960. – Vol. 2. – pp. 286-336.
40. Bozhovych L.I. Personality and its development in childhood age. – M.: Prosvestchieniye, 1968. – p. 464 .
41. Bozhovych L.I. About some problems and methods of pupil personality psychology studying // Pupil personality psychology questions. – M.: APN RSFSR Publishing house, 1961. – pp. 3-31.
42. Bozhovych L.I. Personality forming stages in ontogenesis // Development psychology. SPb: Piter, 2001. – pp. 227-271.
43. Boyprav M.D. Studying experiment as psychological condition for scientific notions forming: Auto abstract PhD. – K., 1982.
44. Bondarenko A.F. Psychological help: theory and practice. – K.: Ukrtekhpress, 1997. – p. 215.
45. Bor N. Atomic physics and human perception. – M.: Nauka, 1961. – p. 151.
46. Brown D. Freud's psychology and postfreudists. – M.: Refl-buk, K.: Vakler, 1998. – p. 420.
47. Broglie Louis de. On the paths of science. – M.: Nauka, 1962. – p. 295.
48. Brushlinskyy A.V. Activity and mediation // Psychology magazine. – 1998. – Vol. 19. No. 6. – pp. 118-126.
49. Brushlinskyy A.V. Development problem in psychology thinking // Development principle in psychology. – M.: Nauka, 1978. – pp. 38-63.
50. Brushlinskyy A.V. About forming of psychological // Personality development and psychology of forming. – M.: Nauka, 1981. – pp. 106-126.

51. Buber M. Me and You // Quintessence. Philosophical almanac 1991. – M.: Politizdat, 1992. – pp. 294-370.
52. Budilova E.A. Methodology, theory and experiment in scientifically creativeness // Vopr. Psykhol. – 1979. – No. 3. – pp. 106-124.
53. Bulakhov Y.F. Relation of theory and method in scientific perception // Philosophical sciences – 1981. – No. 4. – P. 135-137.
54. Burmenskaya G.V., Kabanova O.A., Lidars A.G. Age-psychological consulting. – M.: MGU, 1990. – p. 135.
55. Buyakas T.M. Initial way of personality development: psychological works possibilities // Psychological questions. – 2003. – No. 5. – pp. 68-79.
56. Bykov V.V. Science methods. – M.: Nauka, 1974. – p. 215.
57. Bacon F. Great science restoration // Works. – M.: Mysl, 1977. – Vol. 1. – p. 567.
58. In the world of teenager / Edited by A.A. Bodaleva. – M., 1982.
59. Vallon A. Psychological development of child. – M.: Prosvestchieniye, 1967. – p. 195.
60. Vasilkevich Kh.N. Junior pupils forming of creative musical thinking: Auto abstract ... PhD – K., 1982. – p. 19.
61. Vasyliuk F.E. Methodological analysis in psychology. – M.: Smysl, 2003. – p. 238.
62. Vasyliuk F.E. Experience psychology. – M.: Moscow State University, 1984.
63. Vernadskyy V.I. Biosphere and noosphere. – M., 1989.
64. Vernadskyy V.I. Philosophy of naturalist thought. – M.: Nauka, 1988. – p. 516.
65. Verch J. Voices of intellect. Sociocultural approach to meditative action. – M.: Grivola, 1996. – p. 174.
66. Wittgenstein L. Philosophical works. – M.: Gnosis, 1994. – P. I. – p. 521.
67. Winnicott D.W. Little children and their mothers. – M.: Klass, 1998. – p. 80.
68. Vishniakova N.F. Creative acmeology. – Minsk, 1999. – p. 295.
69. Age possibilities of knowledge learning (junior school forms). – M.: Prosvestchieniye, 1996. – p. 311.

70. Perception and action / Edited by A.V. Zaporozhets. – M.: 1967. – p. 332.

71. Vygotsky L.S. Pupil mental development at studying // Pedagogical psychology. – M.: Pedagogika, 1991.

72. Vygotsky L.S. Historical sense of psychological crisis // Selected works. – M.: Pedagogika, 1982. – Vol. 1.

73. Vygotsky L.S. History of higher psychical functions: Works compilation. – M.: Pedagogika – 1, 1983. – Vol. 3. – p. 366.

74. Vygotsky L.S. Pedagogical psychology. – M.: Pedagogika, 1991a. – p. 480.

75. Vygotsky L.S. Age problem // Collected works: In six volumes. – M.: Pedagogika, 1983a. – Vol. 4. – p. 332.

76. Vygotsky L.S. Collected works: In six volumes, Vol. 5. – Problems of Defectology. – M.: Pedagogika, 1982a.

77. Vysotsky V.S. Selected. – M., 1997. – p. 337.

78. Galperin P.Ya. Introduction to Psychology. M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1976. – p. 150.

79. Galperin P.Ya. “Cuts” method and stage forming method in child thinking studying // Questions of Psychology. – 1966. – No. 4. – pp. 123-135.

80. Galperin P.Ya., Zaporozhets A.V., Elkonin D.B. Knowledge forming problems and skills of pupils and new teaching methods at school // Questions of Psychology. – 1963. – No. 5. – pp. 61-72.

81. Galperin P.Ya. Talyzina N.F. Initial geometrical notions forming on the grounds of pupils actions organizing // Questions of Psychology. – 1957. – No. 1. – pp. 23-44.

82. Hegel G.V.F. Encyclopedia of philosophical sciences. Science of logic. – M.: Nauka, 1974. – Vol .1. – p. 452.

83. Hegel. Works. . – M.: Nauka. – Vol. 4. – 1963.

84. Goethe G. Collected works: In 10 volumes. – M., 1976. – Vol. 7.

85. Gippenreiter Y.B. Introduction to Psychology: Lecture course. – M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1995.

86. Glazyrina V.M. Junior teenagers’ psychological peculiarities of self-control forming in process of mathematical tasks solving: Auto abstract PhD. – K., 1985. – p. 24.

87. Golovakha E.I. Life perspective and personality values orientation // Psychology of Personality. – SPb: Piter, 2003. – pp. 256-268.
88. Gorsky D.P. Science general methodology and dialectical logic. – M.: Nauka, 1969. – p. 352.
89. Graham Loren G. Natural science, philosophy and sciences about human behavior in Soviet Union. – M.: Politizdat, 1991. – p. 476.
90. Gurevych A.Y. Historical synthesis and school of “Annalov” “. – M.: Indrik, 1993. – p. 328.
91. Gurieva V.A. Children and teenagers psychogenic disorders. – M., 1996.
92. Davydov V.V. Developing teaching problems. M.: Pedagogika, 1996. – p. 540.
93. Davydov V.V. Types of generalization in studying. – M.: Pedagogika, 1972. – p. 422.
94. Davydov V.V. Genesis and personality development in childhood age // Questions of Psychology. – 1992. – No. 1-2. – pp. 22-32.
95. Davydov V.V. On two main stages of child and pedagogical psychology development. Teaching and education psychology // Organization question of forming experiment. – M.: Pedagogika, 1978. – Vol. 4. – pp. 4-15.
96. Davydov V.V. Last statements. – M., 1998. – p. 87.
97. Davydov V.V. Theory of developing teaching. – M.: INTOR, 1996. – p. 541.
98. Davydov V.V., Markova A.K. Thinking development at school age // Development principle in psychology / Edited by L.I. Antsyferova. – M.: Nauka, 1978. – pp. 245-316.
99. Deckard R. Selected works. – M.: GIPL, 1950. – p. 710.
100. James W. Psychology. – M.: Pedagogika, 1991. – p. 368.
101. Dialectic. Perception. Science / Edited by V.A.Lektarskogo, V.S. Tiukhtina. – M.: Nauka, 1988.
102. Dorokhnina V.T. Studying tasks transformation reasons for studying // Questions of Psychology. – 1980. – No. 3. – pp. 54-63.
103. Drigus M.T. Research of successful studying subjective determinants: conceptual approach // Actual problems of Psychology: traditions and modernity. – K., 1993.- Vol. 1.- pp. 187-193.

104. Dusavytskyy A.K. Personality development in studying activity. – M.: Pedagogical house, 1996.
105. Diachenko O.M. Abilities development problems: before and after L.S. Vygotsky // Questions of Psychology. – 1996. – No. 5. – pp. 98-109.
106. Egorov A.G. Experimental psychology development questions // Psychological magazines – 1986. – Vol. 7. – No.3. – pp. 3-17.
107. Annual publication of Postclassical researches laboratory of RAN / Edited by E.V. Petrovskaya – M.: Ad Maiginern, 1994. – p. 422.
108. Zagviazinsky V.I. Methodology and methodic of didactic research. – M., Pedagogika, 1982. – p. 160 .
109. Zalkind A.B. Main questions of paedology. – M.: Rabotnik prosveschenia, 1930.
110. Zankov L.V. On subject and methods of didactical researches. – M.: Pedagogika, 1982. – p. 196.
111. Zaporozhets A.V. Perception and action. – M., 1967. – p. 322.
112. Zaporozhets A.V. Main problems of psychic ontogenesis // Selected psychological works. – M.: Pedagogika, 1986. – pp. 223-258.
113. Zeigarnyk B.V. and others. Behavior self-regulation in norm and pathology // Psychological magazines. – 1989. – No. 2. – pp. 122-132.
114. Zeigarnyk B.V. Psychopathology. – M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1976. – p. 238.
115. Zeigarnik B.V. K. Levin personality theory. – M.: Moscow Sate University, 1981. – p. 116.
116. Zimniaya I.A. Pedagogical psychology. – M., 1999.
117. Zinchenko V.P. Theoretical world of psychology // Questions of Psychology. – 2003. – No. 5. – pp. 3-17.
118. Zinchenko V.P. Pedagogy psychological grounds. – M., 2002. – p. 429.
119. Zinchenko V.P., Morgunov E.B. Developing human. – M.: Trivola, 1994. – p. 332.
120. Ivanov V.P. Human activity – perception – art. – K.: Hauk. Dumka, 1977.- p. 251.
121. Ilyenkov E.V. Dialectic logic. – M.: Nauka, 1992. – p. 216.
122. Ilyenkov E.V. Spirit cosmology. // Philosophy and culture. – M.: Politizdat, 1991. – pp. 415–436.

123. Ilyenkov E.V. What is personality? – From what personality begins / Edited by R.I. Kosolapov. – M.: Politizdat, 1991a. – pp. 319-357.
124. Ilyenkov E.F. Ideal. // Philosophy and culture. – M.: Politizdat, 1991b. – pp. 204 – 212.
125. Illin V.V. Gnoseological functions of categories. – M.: Mysl, 1982. – p. 368.
126. History of mentality, historical anthropology / Red.-sost. V. Mukhina. . – M.: IVI RAN, 1996. – p. 255.
127. Kassirer E. Experiment about human: introduction in philosophy of human culture // Human problem in western philosophy. – M.: Progress, 1988. – pp. 3–30.
128. Categories of materialistic dialectic in psychology. – M.: Nauka, 1988. – p. 244.
129. Campbell D. Experiment models in social psychology and practical researches. – M.: Progress, 1980. – p. 319.
130. Kenning K. Three first years of child. – Spiritual perception. – Kaluga, 2002. – p. 148.
131. Kernberg O. Aggression at personality disorder. – M.: Klass, 1998. – p. 368.
132. Klapared E. Child psychology and experimental pedagogic. – M., 1919. – p. 187.
133. Kle M. Teenage psychology (Psychosexual development). – M.: Pedagogika, 1991. – p. 176.
134. Klimenko V.V. How to raise a wunderkind. – Kharkiv: Folio, 1996. – p. 464.
135. Kon I.S. Opening of “I”. – M.: Politizdat, 1978. – p. 367.
136. Kopnin P.V. Gnoseological and logical grounds of science. – M.: Mysl, 1974. – p. 468.
137. Korzhova E.U. Psychological perception of human destiny. – SPb.: Soyuz, 2002. – 334p.
138. Kornilova T.V. Mediation act or artifact? // Psychological magazine. – 1999. – Vol. 20. – No. 6. – pp. 104-109.
139. Kostiuk G.S. Teaching-educational process and personality psychical development – K.: Sov. School, 1989. – p. 608.
140. Kostiuk G.S. Studying and psychical development of pupils // Psychological science, teacher, pupil. – K.: Sov. school, 1979. – pp. 19-32.

141. Kostiuk G.S. Development principle of psychology // Methodological and theoretical problems of psychology. – M.: Nauka, 1969. – pp. 118–152.
142. Kostiuk G.S. On individual approach to pupils in studying work // Communist education. – 1937. – No. 8. – pp. 52-64.
143. Kostiuk G.S. Psychological aspects of experimental pedagogical researches // Kostiuk G.S. Selected psychological works. – M.: Pedagogika, 1988. – pp. 76–86.
144. Kotyrlo V.K., Dutkevych T.V. The role of joint activity in forming perception activity of pre-scholars // Questions of Psychology – 1991. – No. 2. – pp. 50–59.
145. Craig G. Developmental psychology. – SPb.: Piter, 2001. – p. 992.
146. Kremen V.G., Illin V.V. “Philosophy: philosophers, ideas, concepts. – K.: Kniga, 2005. – p. 525.
147. Kuzansky N. Compositions: In 2 volumes. – M., 1980. – Vol. 2.
148. Lazursky A.F. Natural experiment and his school using. – M., 1919. – p. 316.
149. Lazursky A.F. About personality composition. – Selected works in Psychology. – M., 1997. – pp. 9-13.
150. Lakan Z. Seminars. – M.: Logos, 1998. – Book 1. – p. 432.
151. Lakan Z., Pontalis Z.B. Psychoanalysis dictionary. – M.: Higher school, 1996. – p. 623.
152. Levitov N.D. On human psychical conditions. – M.: Pedagogika, 1964.
153. Leontyev A.N. Psychic development problems. – M.: Nauka, 1984. – p. 493.
154. Leontyev A.N. Activity. Conscience. Personality. // Selected psychical works: In 2 volumes. – Vol. 2. M.: Pedagogika, 1983. – pp. 94-231.
155. Leontyev A.N. Selected psychological works: In 2 volumes. – M.: Pedagogika, 1983. – Vol. 1. – p. 392 p. – Vol. 2. – p. 320.
156. Leontyev A.N. Learning of scientifically notions by students as problem of pedagogical psychology // Works of soviet authors over the period of 1910-1945 years. – M., 1980. – pp. 161–166.

157. Lersh F. Understanding of personality in psychology. – Human approaches in western psychology XX century. – K.: Pulsary, 2001. – pp. 93-121.

158. Lysina M.I. Child's genesis of communication forms // Development principle in psychology. – M.: Nauka, 1978. – pp. 268-294.

159. Lichko A.E. Teenager psychopathies and character accents. – L.: Medytsyna, 1983. – p. 255.

160. Loginova N.A. Personality development and its life way. – Development principles in psychology / Edited by L.I. Antsyferova. – M.: Nauka, 1978. – pp. 156-172.

161. Lomov B.F. Methodological and theoretical psychological problems. . – M.: Nauka, 1984. – p. 444.

162. Losev A.F. Philosophy. Mythology. Culture. – Politizdat, 1991.

163. Lurye A.R. On historical development of learning processes. – M.: Nauka, 1974. – p. 171.

164. Lurye A.R., Zeigarnik B.V., Poliakov Y.V. About using of psychological tests in clinical practice // Magazine of neuriatria and psychiatry named after S.S. Korsakov. – 1974.- No. 12.- pp. 171-183.

165. Lysiuk L.G. Empirical picture of productive goal setting of 2-4 years children // Questions of Psychology. – 2000. – No. 1. – pp. 98 – 109.

166. Maddy S. Personality theories. Comparative analysis. – SPb: Rech, 2002. – p. 539.

167. Maksymenko S.D. Genetic-modeling method research of age and pedagogical psychology // Thes. to XXII International psychological congress, GDR, Leipzig, 6-12 of July. – M., 1980. – p. 37.

168. Maksymenko S.D. Genetic-modeling method in teaching research and pupils mental development // Radyanska shkola. – 1981. – No. 12. – pp. 23-29.

169. Maksymenko S.D. Genetic psychology. – M.: Refl-buk, K.: Vakler, 2000. – p. 319.

170. Maksymenko S.D. Genetic psychology: problems and perspectives // Practicing psychologist magazine. – 1998. – No. 4.

171. Maksymenko S.D. General psychology. – Vinnytsia: Nova knyga, 2004 – 701 p. (5 editions).

172. Maksymenko S.D. History of psychological analysis // Philosophically and sociological thought. – 1995. – No. 3-4. – pp. 39-46.

173. Maksymenko S.D. Methodological aspects of psychological studying // Psychology.1988. – Issue 31. – pp. 3-10.
174. Maksymenko S.D. General psychology. – M. – K: Refl-buk, Vakler, 1999. – p. 528. (7 editions: 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2010, 2011, 2012).
175. Maksymenko S.D. Development of psychics in ontogenesis in 2 volumes. – K.: Forum, 2002
176. Maksymenko S.D. Method problem in age and pedagogical psychology // Psychological questions. – 1989. – No. 4. – pp. 31-39.
177. Maksymenko S.D. Psychology in social and pedagogical practice. – K.: Nauk. dumka, 1999.- p. 216 p.
178. Maksymenko S.D. Theory and practice of psychology-pedagogical research. – K.: KDIP, 1990. – p. 240.
179. Maksymenko S.D. Genesis in realization of personality. – K.: “KMM”, 2006 (in three languages, Ukrainian (2006), Russian (2006), English (2007)).
180. Mamardashvili M.K. How I understand philosophy. – M.: Progress, 1990. – p. 368.
181. Mamardashvili M.K. Learning arrow (notes on natural-historical gnoseology). – M.: Yazyki russkoi kul'tyru, 1997. – p. 394.
182. Markova A.K., Matis T.A., Orlov A.B. Forming of studying motivation. – M.: Prosvestchieneniye, 1990. – p.102.
183. Markova A.K. Studying activity forming and pupil personality development. – M.: Pedagogika. – p. 221.
184. Marx K., Engels F. German ideology // Marx K., Engels F. Comp. – M.,1970, Vol. 3. – pp. 7-544.
185. Maslou A. Motivation and personality. – SPb.: Evraziya, 2001. – p. 472.
186. Maslou A. Existence psychology. – M. – K.: Refl-buk, Vakler, 1997. – p. 300.
187. Maslou A. Personality self-actualization // Personality psychology. – M., 1982.
188. Materialistic dialectic and natural sciences methods. – M.: Nauka, 1963. – p. 608.
189. Matiushkin A.M. Psychological structure, dynamic and development of learning activity // Questions of Psychology. – 1982. – No. 4. – pp. 5-17.

190. Mashbits E.I. Psychological basis of studying activity managing. – K.: Vyscha shkola, 1987. – p. 223.
191. May R. Art of psychological consulting. – M.: Aprel-press: EKSMO-press, 2001.- p. 252.
192. May. R. Existential psychology establishing. // Human approaches in western psychology of XX century. – K.: Pulsary, 2001. – pp. 124-164.
193. Managetty N.A. System and personality. – M.: Ontopsychologiya, 2003. – p. 319.
194. Menchynska N.A. 50 years of soviet psychology studying // Sov. pedagogika. – 1967. – No. 10. – pp. 126.
195. Menchynska N.A. Teaching and development of junior pupils. – M.: Pedagogika, 1970. – p. 72.
196. Merkulov I.P. Hypothesis method in history of scientifically learning. – M.: Nauka, 1984. – p. 188.
197. Merlin V.S. Personality as subject of psychological research. – Perm, 1988.
198. Methodological and theoretical psychological problems / Redacted by E.V. Shorohova. – M.: Nauka, 1969. – p. 376.
199. Mescheriakov B.G., Zinchenko V.P. L.S. Vygotsky and modern cultural-historical psychology (critical analysis of M. Cole book) // Questions of Psychology. – 2000. – No. 2. – pp. 102– 117.
200. Mid M. Cultural and childhood world. – M.: Nauka, 1988. – p. 429.
201. Mykhaylov F.T. Public conscience and individual self-conscience. – M.: Nauka, 1990. – p. 224.
202. Mykhaylov F.T. Philosophically-methodological problems of psychological researches // Questions of Psychology. – 1981. – No. 1. – pp. 44-56.
203. Moliako V.A. Pupils forming methods of technical thinking. – K.: Rad. shkola, 1985. – p. 57.
204. Montessori M. Help me to do it myself. – M.: "Karanmund", 2002. – p. 270.
205. Mostepanenko M.B. Philosophy and methods of scientific knowledge. – L.: Publishing house of Leningrad University, 1972. – p. 261.
206. Mukhina V.S. Six years old child in school. – M.: Prosvestchieniye, 1990. – p. 174.
207. Miasischiev V.N. Personality and neuroses. – L.: Nauka, 1960.

208. Nakonechna M.M. Help to other as psychological mean of personality development. Auto abstract of PhD – Kyiv, 2009. – p. 20.

209. Nakonechna M.M. Help other: problem analysis / Nakonechna M.M; edited by academician S.D. Maksymenko // Scientific Proceedings of G.S. Kostyuk Institute of Psychology of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. – K. : Hlavnyk, 2005. – Issue. 26, vol. 3. – pp. 203–207.

210. Nakonechna M.M. Psychological research understanding of help to other concept / M.M. Nakonechna; Edited by N.V. Chepelieva // Actual problems of Psychology: Psychological hermeneutics – K. : Millennium, 2006. – Vol. 2, issue 8. – pp. 129–133.

211. Nezhov P.H., Medvedev A.M. Method of studies of content analysis in schoolchildren // Bulletin of Moscow State University. Series: Psychology. – 1988. – No. 2. – pp. 14-24.

212. Nepomniashchaya N.I. Psychodiagnostics of personality. – M.: Vldos, 2001. – p. 189.

213. Neumann Erich. Origin and evolution of consciousness. – M.: Refbuk, K.: Vakler, 1998. – p. 464.

214. Obukhova L.F. Child psychology: theory, facts, problems. – M.: Trivola, 1995. – p. 356.

215. Obukhova L.F. The concept of Jean Piaget: Pros and Cons. – M.: Pedagogika, 1981.

216. Learning and development / Edited by L.V. Zankov. – M.: Prosvestchieniye, 1975. – p. 440.

217. Allport G. Personality in Psychology. – M.: KSP+, SPb: Yuventa, 1982. – p. 325.

218. Allport G. Achievement of personhood. – M.: Smysl, 2002. – p. 461.

219. Experience of system studies the child's mind / Edited by N.I. Nepomniashchey. – M.: Pedagogika, 1976. – p. 232.

220. Orlov A.B. From chaos to order and back to where ... "all in all" // Questions of Psychology. 2000. – No. 2. – pp. 52-55.

221. Orlov Yu.M. Ascent to personality. – M., 1991.

222. Pavlov I.P. Selected works. – M.: Publishing house of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR, 1951. – p. 438.

223. Papucha N.V. The success of learning as the problem of personality formation (according to the material of secondary school age) //

Education and training in Poland: Materials of International scientific-practical conference – Nizhyn, 1998. – pp. 140-148.

224. Papucha N.V., Krychkovska T.D. Personality: development, socialization, education. – Huzhyn: Editing and Publishing Department of Nizhyn State University named after M. Gogol, 2001. – p. 146.

225. Papucha N.V. Features of psychological help after psychological trauma in early adolescence // Personality and transformation processes in the society. Materials of III Kharkiv International psychological readings. – Kharkiv, 1999. – pp. 268-271.

226. Petrovskyy V.A. History of Soviet Psychology. – M.: Prosvestchieneniye, 1967. – p. 367.

227. Petrovskyy V.A. The idea of free causality in personality psychology // Psychology of personality. – SPb: Piter, 2003. – pp. 436-448.

228. Piaget J. Selected psychological works. – M.: Progress, 1969. – p. 659.

229. Piaget J. Piaget's theory // History of foreign psychology: 30-60 years of XX century. – M., 1986.

230. Plato. Works. – M., 1963. – Vol. 1.

231. Plato. Works: In 3 volumes. – M., 1970. – Vol. 2.

232. Platonov K.K. The concept of dynamic functional of personality organization. – Psychology of personality. Readings. – pp. 119-129.

233. Practical psychodiagnosis. – Samara, Bakhrakh, 1998. – p. 668.

234. Platonov K.K. Organization and development of personality. – M., 1968. – p. 315.

235. Poya D. How to solve a task. – M.: Uchpedgiz, 1959. – p. 206.

236. Poluyanov Ya..A. Children draw. – M.: Pedagogika, 1988. – p. 176.

237. Ponomariov Ya.A. Knowledge, cognition and mental development. – M.: Nauka, 1960. – p. 264.

238. Ponomariov Ya.A. The psychology of creativity. – M.: Nauka, 1976. – p. 302.

239. Prayer W. Child's soul. – M., 1912. – p. 460.

240. The principle of development in psychology / Edited by L.I. Antsyferova, G.S. Kostyuk. – M.: Nauka, 1978. – p. 358.

241. Problem of subject in psychological science / Edited by A.V. Brushlinsky. – M.: Academ proekt, 2000. – p. 320.

242. Prokhorov A.O. Mental states and their functions. – Kazan, 1994.

243. Mental states / Edited by L.V. Kulikova. – SPb.: Piter, 2000. – p. 512.
244. Psychoanalysis in the development: SPb. / Compiling editor. A.P. Pornenko, I.Yu. Romanov. – Yekaterinburg: Delovaya kniga, 1998. – p. 176.
245. Psychology of modern teenager / Edited by D.K. Feldstein. – M.: Pedagogika, 1987. – p. 240.
246. Psychology of personality formation and development / Edited by L.I. Antsyferova. – M.: Nauka, 1981.- p. 365.
247. Psychology / Edited by Kostiuk G.S. – K.: Radyanska shkola, 1968. – p. 572.
248. Psychology of inner world / Ordered by T. Goncharenko. – K., 2003. – p. 127.
249. Poincare L. On science. – M.: Nauka, 1983. – p. 167.
250. Development of perception in the early preschool years / Edited by A.V. Zaporozhets, M.I. Lysina. – M.: 1966. – p. 301.
251. Repkin V.V. Structure of learning activity // Bulletin of Kharkov University. – 1976. – No. 132. Series “Psychology”, issue. 9. – pp. 10-16.
252. Repkin V.V. Formation of educational activity in the early school years // Bulletin of Kharkov University. – 1976. – No. 171. – Series “Psychology”, issue. 11. – pp. 40-49.
253. Richter P.F. Educator leads the future luminaries // Wisdom of education. – M.: Pedagogika, 1987. – pp. 58-59.
254. Rozanov V.V. Jackson’s law. Metaphysics of Christianity. – SPb., 1913. – pp. 39-41.
255. Rogers C. Look at Psychotherapy: Becoming a human. – M., 1994.
256. Rogers C. On the science of personality // History of foreign psychology. Texts. – M.: Moscow State University, 1986. – pp. 200-231.
257. Rogers C. Client-centered Therapy. – Psychology of Personality. // Readings. – SPb.: Piter, 2000. – pp. 224-233.
258. Romenets V.A. History of Psychology over the period of XIX – early XX century: Textbook. – K.: Vyscha shkola, 1995. – p. 614.
259. Rubinstein S.L. Being and consciousness. Human and the World. – SPb.: Piter, 2003. – p. 508.

260. Rubinstein S.L. Thinking of Psychology // Scholarly notes of Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia. – Л., 1940. – Vol. 14. – pp. 5-13.

261. Rubinstein S.L. Learning and development // Readings in developmental and educational psychology: Works of Soviet authors over a period of 1918-1945 years. – M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1980. – pp. 186-194.

262. Rubinstein S.L. Principles and the development path of psychology. – M.: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of USSR, 1959.- p. 352.

263. Rubinstein S.L. Problems of General Psychology. – M.: Nauka, 1972. – p. 423.

264. Rubinstein S.L. Human and the World // Problems of General Psychology. – M.: Pedagogika, 1973.-pp. 255-285.

265. Rubtsov V.V. Organization and development of joint action in children in learning process. – M.: Pedagogika, 1987. – p. 160 .

266. Sullivan H.S. Interpersonal theory in psychiatry. – M.: “KSPT”, SPb: “Yuventa”, 1999. – p. 346.

267. Savchenko O.Ya. Didactic of primary school. – K.: Geneza, 2002. – p. 368.

268. Sartre J.-P. Original relation to another person: love, language, masochism. // The problem of human in Western philosophy. – M.: Progress, 1988. – pp. 207–228.

269. Sechenov I.M. Selected works. – M.: Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of USSR, 1952. – Vol. 1. – p. 771.

270. Sikorskyy I.A. Child’s soul. – K.: 1911. – p. 112.

271. Slobodchykov V.I., Isayev Ye.I. Anthropological principle in developmental psychology // Questions of Psychology. – 1998. – No. 6. – pp. 3–17.

272. Smirnov A.A. Logical methods of analysis of scientific knowledge. – M.: Nauka, 1986. – p. 256.

273. Smirnov S.D. Psychology of an image: the problem of mental reflection activity. – M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1985. – p. 232.

274. Sobchuk L.M. Introduction to Psychology of Personality. – Moscow, 2000. – p. 506.

275. Sokolova E.T Self-awareness and self-confidence in case of personality abnormalities. – M.: Moscow State University, 1989. – p. 214.
276. Spinoza B. Selected works,- 1957. – Vol. 1.
277. Stevens S.S. Experimental Psychology: In 2 volumes. – M.: Progress, 1960.
278. Talyzina N.F. Principles of Soviet psychology and psychodiagnosis problems of cognitive activities // Readings in developmental and educational psychology. – M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1981. – pp. 269-274.
279. Talyzina N.F. Learning process management – M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1975. – p. 343.
280. Teplov B.M. Selected psychological works. – M.: Pedagogika, 1985. – Vol.1. – p. 328.
281. Teplov B.M. On objective method in psychology // Proceedings of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR. – 1953. – pp. 49-74.
282. Titarenko T.M. Life's journey of personality // Fundamentals of Applied Psychology. – K.: Lybid, 1999. – p. 536.
283. Tkachenko A.N. Principles and categories of Psychology. – K.: Vyshcha shkola, 1978. – p. 193.
284. Tokarieva N.M. Features of forming methods of constructing semantic structure of the text in students of secondary school age: Author's thesis, Dissertation of the candidate of psychological sciences. – K., 1997. – p. 24.
285. Tulviste P. On theoretical problems of historical development of thinking // Development principles in Psychology / Edited by. L.I. Antsyferova. – M.: Nauka, 1977. – pp. 81–103.
286. Uznadze D.N. General Psychology. – Piter: Smysl, 2004. – p. 412.
287. Willis A. Spirit // Eye of mind. – Bakhrakh. – M., 2003. – pp. 105-108.
288. Ursul A.D. Cybernetics and the dialectics. – M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1983. – p. 198.
289. Ukhtomsky A.A. Compositions. – L.: Publishing house of Leningrad University, 1945. – Vol. 5.
290. Ushakov D.V. Psychology of giftedness and problem of the subject // Problem of subject in psychological science. – M.: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000. – pp. 212–226.

291. Ushinsky K.D. Pedagogical works: In 6 volumes. – M.: Pedagogika, 1990. – Vol. 5. – p. 528.
292. Florensky P. The Pillar and Ground of the Truth. – M.: Put, 1914.
293. Formation of students' learning activities /Edited by V.V.Davydov. – M., 1982.- p. 216.
294. Frankl V. Man's Search for Meaning. – M.: Progress, 1990. – p. 364.
295. Freud S. Basic principles of psychoanalysis. – M.: Refl-buk, K.: Vakler, 1998. – p. 284.
296. Freud S. Basic psychological theories of psychoanalysis. – SPb: Aleteia, 1998. – p. 251.
297. Freud S. Separation of psychical personality. – Psychology of Personality.// Reader. – SPb.: Piter, 2000. – pp. 10-30.
298. Freud A., Freud S. Infantile sexuality and psychoanalysis of childhood neuroses. – SPb: V.-E. Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1997. – p. 387.
299. Fraisse P., Piaget J.. Experimental Psychology. – M., 1966. – Issue 1 and 2. – p. 422. – Issue 3. – p. 317. – Issue 5. – p. 108.
300. Fromm E. Anatomy of Human Destructiveness. – M., 1994.
301. Fromm E. Soul of human. – M.: LLC Publishing House AST-LTD, 1998. – p. 204.
302. Fromm E. Concept of love // Psychology of Personality. – SPb: Piter, 2001. – pp. 100-124.
303. Heckhausen H. Motivation and activity. – M.: Pedagogika, 1986. – Vol. 1. – p. 407.
304. Hjelle L., Ziegler D. Personality Theories. – SPb: Piter, 1999. – p. 606.
305. Tsukerman G.A. Experience of typological analysis of younger students as subjects of educational activity // Voprosy psikhologii. – 1999. – No. 6. – pp. 3-17.
306. Chelpanov G.I. Psychology and school: Collection of articles. – M., 1912. – p. 207.
307. Chamberlain J. Mind of your newborn baby. – M.: Klass, 2004. – p. 220.
308. Chepelieva N.V. Theoretical foundations of psychological hermeneutics // Actual problems of psychology: Volume 2: Psychological hermeneutics. – K., 2006. – Issue 1. – p. 127.
309. Chepelieva N.V. The life situation of personality // Fundamentals of Applied Psychology. – K.: Lybid, 1999.- pp. 112-135.

310. Shageyeva Z.A., Shvyryov V.S. Experience in the structure of scientific and cognitive activity // *Voprosy filosofii*. – 1989. – No.5. – pp. 41-67.

311. Sharden T. *The Phenomenon of Human*. – M.: Nauka, 1987. – p. 240.

312. Shvalb Yu.M. Psychological models of goal-setting. – K.: Stylos, 1997. – p. 238.

313. Shvalb Yu.M. Development of students' goal-setting in learning process // *Psychological and pedagogical aspects of educational process at school* / Edited by S.D. Maksymenko. – K.: Radyanska shkola, 1983. – pp. 66-77.

314. Shvyryov V.S., Dzhumadurieva S.M. The ascent from the abstract to the concrete as a method of developing theoretical knowledge // *Dialectics, knowledge, science* / Edited by V.A. Lektorskiy, V.S. Tyukhina. – M.: Nauka, 1988. – pp. 54-62.

315. Shynkaruk V.I. Unity of dialectics, logic and epistemology. – K.: Naukova dumka, 1977. – p. 365.

316. Shykhlyrev P.N. *Modern Social Psychology*. – M.: KSP, 1998. – p. 448.

317. Sholokhov M.A. *The Quiet Don*. – M.: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1969, Vol. 4. – p. 471.

318. Shpranger E. Life forms // *History of psychology reader*. – M., 1980. – pp 286 -300.

319. Stern W. Personalistic psychology // *History of Western psychology*. – M.: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1986. – pp. 186-200.

320. Stern W. *Applied technology*. – K.: Gosizdat Ukrainy, 1925. – p. 112.

321. *Existential psychology* / Edited by R. May. – M.: EKSMO, 2001. – p. 619.

322. Elkonin D.B. *Selected psychological works*. – M.: Pedagogika, 1989. – p. 553.

323. Elkonin D.B. On the problem of periodization of mental development in childhood // *Voprosy psikhologii*. – 1971. – No. 4. – p. 6-20.

324. Elkonin D.B. *Educational Psychology of younger schoolboy*. – M.: Znanie, 1974. – p. 64.

325. Erickson E. Childhood and Society. – SPb.: Universitetskaya kniga, 1996. – p. 592.
326. Yudin Ye.H. System approach and working principles. – M.: Nauka, 1978. – p. 391.
327. Jung C.G. Libido, its metamorphosis and symbols // Selected works on analytical psychology. – T.P. Tsyurykh, 1939. – p. 531.
328. Jung C.G. Soul and myth. – Port-Royal – Sovershenstvo, Kiev–Moskva, 1997. – p. 383
329. Jung C.G. Approaching to unconscious // Global issues and universal human values. – M.: Progress, 1990. – pp. 351–436.
330. Jung C.G. Problems of soul of our time. – M.: Progress, 1994. – p. 336.
331. Jung C.G. Symbolic life. – M.: Komto–Tsentr, 2003. – p. 325.
332. Jung C.G. Collected edition. Conflicts of child’s soul. – M.: Kahan, 1994a.
333. Jung C.G. The structure of the mind and the process of individuation. – M.: Nauka, 1996. – p. 269.
334. Jung C.G. The Tavistock Lectures. – M.: Refl-buk, K.: Vakler, 1998. – p. 346.
335. Jung C.G. Human and its symbols. – M., 1997. – p. 367.
336. Jacobson S.H., Safonova N.M.. Analysis of the formation mechanisms of voluntary attention in preschoolers // Voprosy psikhologii. – 1999. – No. 3–5. – pp. 3–10.
337. Yalom I. Psychotherapeutic stories. – M.: EKSMO, 2002. – p. 959.
338. Yaroshevsky M.H. History of Psychology. – M.: Mysl, 1996. – p. 586.
339. Yaroshevsky M.H. Psychology in 20th century. – M.: Politizdat, 1974. – p. 347.
340. Balint M. Thrills and Regressions. – N.Y., 1959.
341. Buhler Ch. Meaning Living in the Mature Years // Aging and Leisure / R.W. Kleemeir (Ed.) – N.Y., 1961.
- 342 Csikszentmihalyi M. Flow: the Psychology of Optimal Experience. – Harper@Row, 1990.
343. Watson J.B. Behaviorism. – London: Regan Paul. Trench Traubner, 1931.

Scientific edition

Serhii Dmytrovych Maksymenko

**GENETIC PRINCIPLES OF CREATIVE PERSONALITY CONFIDENT
AS A PROPULSION OF MENTAL DEVELOPMENT**

Monograph

Translated by Dr. Vitalii Lunov

Maksymenko, S.D. (2021). *Genetic principles of creative personality confident as a propulsion of mental development*. Ottawa: Accent Graphics Communications & Publishing. Glasgow: Society for the support of publishing initiatives and scientific mobility Limited.

Run 300 copies. Order № 21/05-2021

Published by

**Accent Graphics Communications & Publishing
807-2625 Regina st., Ottawa, Ontario, K2B 5W8
Canada**

ISBN-978-1-77192-605-8

Supported by

**Society for the support of publishing initiatives and scientific mobility Limited (Glasgow, Scotland)
272 Bath Street, Glasgow, G2 4JR Scotland
<https://scientificassociation.co.uk/>**