

Scientific journal

Digest

Cultural-Historical Psychology

№ 1—2/2005

To the authors and the readers

There are hardly any broader concepts than «culture» and «history». Uniting them in such a concept as «cultural-historical» makes the combination even broader, which makes it even more difficult to define the subject matter of what this concept attributes and not to go beyond this subject matter. Nevertheless, there are cultural-historical anthropology, linguistics, and aesthetics. Cultural-historical psychoanalysis is also widely known (this is exactly what Karl Gustav Jung called Sigmund Freud's doctrine, binding it to the certain epoch and thus restricting its universal application). In one row with the above stands the cultural-historical psychology, but it's much more difficult, if not altogether impossible, to bind it to a certain epoch. The same stands true for Jung's psychoanalytic doctrine (analytic psychology), which is definitely cultural-historical. Psychologists refer to the cultural-historical psychology sometimes as the science of the future (the aim and the dream), yet sometimes as the science of the past, and sometimes as the developing science, which is the distinctive feature of any «on-going» science.

Talking about the essential strategic direction of the new journal, it would be better, perhaps, not to be too hasty in defining the subject of the cultural-historical psychology, but to relate it to the traditions of Lev Semenovich Vygotsky's school of thought, realizing, of course, that this approach doesn't have either the monopoly, or the pretence to be the only rightful one to develop psychology in the context of culture and history.

Chairman of the Editorial Council
Vitaly Rubtsov,
Editor-in-Chief
Vladimir Zinchenko

To the authors and the readers

It is common among psychologists to speak about the cultural-historical psychology as a science that belongs to the future, or as an aim or dream, or as a science that belongs to the past, or as a science in the state of becoming, — and all that is characteristic of any science that is actually alive.

The easiest way to determine the direction of development of the new journal during the immediate future, which is at the same time the right one, is to impede the rush to define the subject matter of the cultural-historical psychology. The direction of development of the journal is to be tied to the tradition and scientific school of L.S. Vygotsky, — obviously keeping in mind that this direction in psychology does not obtain monopoly and does not claim unique and exclusive right to develop psychology within the context of history and culture. One can often come across references that justly name W.Wundt as the progenitor of the cultural-historical approach in psychology. Others, including even Socrates, are sometimes given that title too. A genealogical tree of a science is in no way more easily drawn than a genealogical tree of a clan or of an individual. The problem of naming, on which an example is eagerly provided by the cultural-historical psychology, is confusing to the same degree. The term that we use was not coined by L.S. Vygotsky himself. He used to apply such terms as “cultural development”, “cultural-psychological theory”.

So when were Vygotsky’s ideas directly and categorically labeled as “cultural historical psychology”? This term appeared in the year of Vygotsky’s demise in the title of an article written by one of his most fierce persecutors, P.I.Razmyslov, who was working at the Institute of Psychology and during some period of time was assigned as director of that Institute. The article title was “About the Vygotsky’s & Luria’s ‘cultural-historical theory of psychology’”. If not for the quotation marks inside the title and no content except seething furious and disparaging remarks, this article might be considered part of the epitaphy to the work of two friends and colleagues —

authors of the theory. Volens, but most probably nolens, Razmyslov gave Vygotsky’s theory the name that has been sticking to it ever since.

P.I.Razmyslov was sure that together with his comrades in this premeditated crime of destroying Vygotsky’s theory they managed to bury this scientific direction for good after and due to forbidding to publish Vygotsky’s works. It is possible to imagine his disappointment when in 1956, after more than 20 years, a volume of “Selected Works by L.S.Vygotsky” was published (A.N.Leont’ev and A.R.Luria were the editors). Razmyslov’s patience was shattered when the preparation for the publication of the next volume “Development of the Higher Psychic Functions” started (B.M.Teplov joined the previous two editors then). In 1959, when the content of that volume was discussed during the “enhanced meeting” of the editorial board of the Journal “Voprosy Psikhologii” (Russian Psychological Research) — and the editorial board was so large at the time that it fit only in the biggest auditorium in the Institute of Psychology, — P.I.Razmyslov, who was considered the “chief specialist” in Vygotsky’s studies, presented a keynote. When the speaker screwed himself up to hysterical shouting, blaming Vygotsky for being antimarxist, as Razmyslov usually did, — Georgy P.Schedrovitsky, who was young then and more than a little bold and perky always, yelled “Slander!” quite clearly. Razmyslov fainted and fell down, and had to be brought back to his senses. The discussion ended at that point, as well as the career of Razmyslov as the critic of Vygotsky’s theory. The only thing that was left from him as his contribution to psychology was the name he gave to Vygotsky’s theory.

The name has been accepted anyway and, as it often happens with language matters, few people wonder when, where and in what circumstances it was used for the first time. It is more important that Vygotsky’s theory became an established fact of history and culture. This fact is confirmed not only because this theory is quite widespread

among people who major in humanities in our country and all over the world, but also by the uneasiness it causes amongst its opponents. One of such attempts to overthrow the theory of Vygotsky is discussed in the article presenting the answers that V.V. Davydov gave to the interview questions asked by Prof. Jacques Carpey (The Netherlands), that is published in this issue. We are planning to keep introducing the history and fascinating fate of the cultural-historical approach to our reader. Obviously, the Journal is open to criticism.

The readers might find the reminiscences about what the essence of the cultural-historical approach consists of not exceedingly unuseful.

The historicism, or historical research, as implied by Vygotsky, meant “applying the category of ‘development’ to the research of phenomena. To research something historically means to re-research it in motion” (Vygotsky, CW, v. 3, p. 62). Vygotsky warned us that there is no impenetrable boundary between historical research and the research of actually existing forms of being, doing etc. The historical analysis as Vygotsky meant it is directed not only upon the past and actual forms, but upon the future forms as well. Vygotsky was concerned about the problem of the zone (more precisely put – the perspective) of the proximal development of the psychic functions, the problem of formation of the image of the future – the actual field of the future etc. Putting it in other words, the historical analysis is spread upon all the “three colours of time” – past, present and future.

The “cultural” is more complicated. All the things stated above should already have explained to the reader why there is no strict and precise definition of “culture” in Vygotsky’s theory. Maybe he did not feel any need of such definition, being a witness of the dusk of the golden age of Russian culture, that for some reasons of bashfulness was granted the name of the silver age. The so called “Proletarian Culture” (Proletcult) did not yet erase the memories of the culture that was not so long gone, and thus he did not feel obliged to explain his own understanding of the culture per se. Vygotsky limited himself by weaving the cultural means into the historical approach that he was elaborating, but it was so important for him that he often called his approach “cultural-psychological”.

Making a distinction between organic and cultural development, Vygotsky provided a new

understanding of the history of the latter one. He draw together the concepts of higher psychic function, cultural development and mastering one’s own behavioral processes. But this did not suffice him, and he plunged into the most guarded sanctum of the Bolshevik ideology. He practically equated child personality and cultural development of a child, saying that personality is an “historical” notion. The worldview was treated the same way. “The worldview is what characterizes the behavior of a human being as a whole, it is the cultural attitude of the child towards the outer world”. The child’s gradual embeddedness in culture, in civilization also was called by Vygotsky “development in the true sense of the word”. Culture as well as language was seen by Vygotsky as an ideal form, the acquisition and mastering of which is means and goal of development, and the development itself, all at the same time. The ideal forms, for example, as units of affects and meaning of the human consciousness, exist outside individual psyches as art and other kinds of human creation. This aspect of Vygotsky’s theory prompted D.B. El’konin to call it “non-classical”.

All said is enough to understand the reasons for aggression towards Vygotsky’s theory, and enough to understand that the word “culture” in the name of the theory, whoever coined the term, is more than appropriate. But nowadays we have to prove constantly that our approach, that we dare to call “cultural”, is cultural indeed. We cannot refer to the ideological conditions of the Soviet times anymore, explaining why psychology in our country ignored different phenomena of the culture of the world in the XXth century. It is good to know that cultural-historical psychology had enough merit to be put amongst these worth-knowing-of phenomena, but now we should try our best to ensure that it would not lose its place of honour in the XXI century.

Cultural-historical psychology, as well as the achievements of Vygotsky’s scientific school, does not belong to the past only, and this was confirmed once more by the publication of the first issue of our Journal. Fortunately, it is not the only testimony. It is difficult to overestimate the role of the journal “Voprosy Psikhologii” (Russian Psychological Research) in the preservation and development of the cultural-historical psychology. That journal has been generously providing space not only for the scientific school of L.S. Vygotsky, but also to the scientific schools, genetically connected with it, such as the schools of A.R. Luria, A.N. Leont’ev, L.I. Bozhovich, P.Ya. Gal’perin,

A.V. Zaporozhets, B.V. Zeigarnik, P.I. Zinchenko, D.B. El'konin, L.A. Venger, V.V. Davydov, M.I. Lisina... We ought to say that this new journal is not a rival, but a supporter of the older one; the title of colleague is yet to be earned.

The task of development of the cultural-historical psychology, as well as the attention towards culture in general is of specific importance today, when the signs of the beginning anti-cultural revolution are seen more and more clearly. If the culture in our society will continue degrading at such rate, soon we would remember the culture of the Soviet period as the silver age of Russian culture. No pun intended. Because the history of the cul-

ture, as O. Freudenberg puts it, is not the chronicles of the past, but of the immortal present. Our history is too eager to let go of some things and hoards other things far too greedily. It tells us that there is a problem both in the such a lengthy discussion of the title of Vygotsky's theory, and in the title of our journal, correspondingly. The relations between history and culture are not at all harmonious. The history attempts to break the culture sometimes, and the culture attempts to overcome the history, – with dubious results.

*V.P. Zinchenko, B.G. Mescheriakov,
V.V. Rubtsov, A.A. Margolis*

Social interaction and education: cultural-historical context

V.V. Rubtsov

Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education,
Rector of the MSUPE, Director of the Psychological Institute of the Russian Academy of Education

L.S.Vygotsky, G.H.Mead and J.Piaget formulated two things that became stepping stones for the problem of social interaction and education and for designing the actual and future directions in psychology. First of all, the scientific community got acutely aware that social interaction and development of thinking are not fused nor independent processes, either they are reversible (in the sense of isomorphism) or even equivalent. They determine each other, because the status and flow of one is innately dependent on the status and flow of the other. Children are able to find some social interactions useful, that means actually entering the space of development and proceeding forth in their achievements, when their level of thinking is corresponding. But this very level is the result of previous social interactions.

The second thing is that the content of the concept “zone of proximal development” implies another paradigm of development and thus a new approach to understanding the processes of education and learning. Instead of seeing education as a natural and individual process which divides the participants of the process according to the roles of educator and educatee, the idea of education as a process of assistance and joint activity is developed. And the main mechanics of this process which makes it cultural and socially-determined, is the tool-mediation of the cognitive acts as such by the ways of the participants’ interaction. The problem of not only what is to be taught, but also how it should be taught, that is, the problem of organization of effective forms of joint learning activity thus comes to the fore.

The kinds and models of interaction

A.Forman (Forman, 1986; Forman, Cazden, 1986) compared the process of individual problem-solving with cooperative problem-solving using the Piaget’s problems known as the “problems from the chemical combination series” as examples, and showed the relation between the strategy of problem-solving and the meaning of the information provided to the subject before and after testing. She outlined 7 kinds of interaction that allow to analyse the forms of joint solution-seeking: three levels of procedural interaction (parallel, associative, cooperative), metaprocedural interactions containing the discussion of planning or implementing the solution, two kinds of interaction connected with the process of decision-making (joking and sharing of experience), which are not procedural nor metaprocedural but are important both within the context of cognition and affective interaction of the subjects during their joint activity.

According to these data, the problem of group and collective education at school should be regarded from a different angle. The correctly organized forms of joint activity (and not only cooperation) might become an effective way of overcoming the difficulties that arise because of the different pace and level of development of the children belonging to different social strata. The criterion of such organization is the effort of coordinating their different points of view carried out by the partners, that provides the ground for the adequate solving of the problem.

Joint learning activity

At the end of 1970s – beginning of the 1980s the experimental research of the topic “social interaction and learning” was moved to the classroom situation and focused upon the effective forms of organization of the teacher-student and student-student interaction (Moll, 1991). The notion of paedagogical agreement becomes of importance. The main condition of the paedagogical agreement is the group work of the students, and the main function of the agreement is the creation of communication conditions in which the teacher by means of his/her questions and remarks contributes to the occurrence of the “situations of crisis” that lead to analysis and understanding of the content of education; the teacher also leads the interacting students that represent different attitudes and cognitive abilities.

The researchers were able to find quite effective form of influencing the children’s co-ordination during solving a collective task by means of establishing a method of analysis of one’s activity via tool-mediation by signs (symbols). In particular, the differences among the participants’ points of view regarding specific strategy of action within a group were overcome by organization of a situation of comparison and integration of contradictory strategies; the children used specific symbolic representations of such strategies and conducted the analysis themselves. Conflicts within communication arose because of misinterpretation of other person’s representation of his/her strategies. The paedagogical organization of the resolution of communication conflicts was based on simple training children to decode an unfamiliar symbolic/coding system.

The results of the research testify that this approach towards educational situations contributes to development of an effective way of thinking in most children who took part in the experiment. When a group of children obtains such skill, it enhances the group’s ability for self-regulation and co-ordination of the problem-solving activity. The children learn to model the schemata of their activity/performance, that allows them to plan their work together.

The perspective of use of the new information technologies

An effective method of organization of cooperation in education consists of the use of the

matter model of the solution jointly-created by the children, as a basic means of their educational communication with each other. For this case it is helpful to utilize specific computer programs and programs for other devices, when each of the participants fulfils his/her part of the work with the problem either on the field of the common monitor or at his/her personal monitor; it becomes necessary to inform the partner of the actions made and their results represented on the monitor. The educational interaction organized this way includes several stages of development of the students’ educational communication. During the last stage of interaction the matter conditions are most complicated, and the depth of developed communication model allows to perform the transition from one wholistic system that provides structure to the matter situation, to another system. In the meanwhile the adult may or may not interfere into the students’ communication, and the adult’s main functions remain as follows: co-ordination of transaction and communication acts exchange between the participants and introduction of necessary alterations into the process of discussion during problem-solving.

The problem of education based upon the system of developing communications and cooperation

Transforming the group work: the new paradigm of education. There are two main types of organization of joint actions in education and corresponding mechanisms of psychological regulation of joint activity. They are connected with different ways of distributing the activity among the participants, which manifests in analysis, transformation and modelling of the ways of cooperative work, demonstrated by the adult. Thus, the first type of activity organization is characterized by exact copying of the ways of activity distribution that are demonstrated by the adult in forms of some models and schemata. Although confronting the situation when the imposed way of interaction does not work, the participants find themselves unable to proceed. In such case the children’s work either desintegrates or the activity should be rebuilt by means of some extra tools.

To perform the second type of activity organization, the situation has to be changed drastically. The children are not only able to accomplish the demonstrated form of cooperative activity, but are able to alter it with some assistance from the adult.

This requires from the children the ability to analyse the tools and ways of accomplishing the future activity, and what is more important, the ability to analyse the opportunities to perform their own action within joint activity. In such situations the way of student-student and teacher-student interaction changes along with the students' activity and teacher's functions, the skills of cooperative planning and modelling of the activity are formed. This type of organization provides conditions for relation between the problem-solving and the way of performing joint actions.

These two types of organization prove the existence of different forms of child development and of different educational paradigms – via copying the actions of the adult and via transforming student-student and student-teacher communication. To accomplish the latter type of organization of educational activity it is necessary to broaden the spectrum of the educational actions known by adding a specific system of joint actions, including

such actions as: inclusion of different models of action and their co-ordination into the activity, cooperative modelling of the samples of joint activity organization demonstrated by the adult, and also communication and mutual understanding during the process of assistance and search for new ways of organizing work together.

From authoritarian paedagogics – to paedagogics of collaboration. The collected empirical data concerning the role of social interaction in the process of education highlight new recourses of the child intellectual development, and thus they become a real basis for improving the content and methods of education, actually, for creation of new paedagogics, the main principle of which is the collaboration among children and adults. Such collaboration provides conditions for creativity during the process of child's acquisition of the samples of culture and history and excludes the authoritarian style of guiding the thinking of the child.

Tool-mediation within cultural-historical theory and its practical implications

V.B. Khoziev

Ph. D., Professor,

Head of the Clinical Psychology Department of the International University of Nature,
Society and Human “Dubna”

Several generations of psychologists proved that meaning is the unit of culture that the child meets in each act of his/her ontogenetic development. It is worth noting that the more vast and detailed the research was becoming, the more evident was the connection of the topic of “meaning” to the main conditions of child development: the adult, the object, the situation, the characteristics of joint activity with the adult etc. Correspondingly, the method of research also changed: instead of the search of the notorious internal and external validity, the scientists, using different justifications, turned towards the experimental-genetic modelling of the tool-mediation conditions, though maybe with less effectivity that it demonstrated during the simple experiments with double stimulation method in Vygotsky’s scientific school.

The experimental-genetic method that became the central part of the cultural-historical theory had to imply all the totality of the circumstances fixed in the conceptual system of Vygotsky. Its conceptual ambition covered unifying development and tool-mediation, structure, genesis and function, within a wholistic model, representation of “normal” and “pathological”, supporting the process of formation and tracking the process of desintegration etc. The method had to include natural development of phenomena and not turn artificial at the same time. So, as A.A. Puzyrey put it, the first reality for the researcher within the cultural-historical approach was “not the psyche of the subject, but the very act of transforming, rebuilding his/her psyche”. In the experimental act of tool-mediation there was systemically modelled cultural determination and genetic order of the formation of new action. The characteristic feature of the Vygotsky’s method was limited tool-mediation that resembled the Piaget’s method somehow; Piaget had a system of questions, and Vygotsky – a system of objects and symbols, included in the context of activity. To

demonstrate the tool during double stimulation procedure is enough to start the first act of tool-mediation, but what the lot of the further formation might be, and – what is more important – whether there is any other pathway of formation, – these questions are not answered within this paradigm.

The description of meaning of operation with tools became the most important condition for the further investigation of tool-mediation in Soviet-then-Russian psychology. As Vygotsky put it, the adequate implementation of the tool was possible only if the subject was simultaneously directed at the important conditions of such implementation, by means of sign (symbol). The research conducted by Vygotsky’s scientific school showed that tool-mediation could be interpreted as systematic acquisition of tools, during which the subject’s development takes place. The experiment of implementing the parallelogram of tool-mediation allowed to model the ontogenesis of the higher psychic functions as passing through stages of the subject’s acquisition and usage of tools present in different forms (A.N. Leon’tyev). In this case the tool-mediation was seen not only as the most important condition that determines not only the structure, but also the functions and genesis of psychic formations. The variations of cross-sectional method allowed to outline most generally the tool-mediation function that was semiotic, whereas the detalization of the change of the orientation forms by tools, – that is mainly psychological function, – was discovered only during the procedures of double stimulation and forming experiment

The scholars were not satisfied by the opportunities provided by the method of double stimulation; they strived to build the method and direct it towards determined experimental genesis, and it drove the theory of planned-stadial formation to such kind of organization of the tool-mediation that allowed not only to control, but also to sup-

port the process of creating neoformations (P.Ya.Gal'perin). The forming studies approached the natural material of human activity and the natural versions of social interaction which could be seen in the wide range of research conducted by P.Ya.Galperin, D.B.El'konin, A.V.Zaporozhets, V.V.Davydov, L.A.Venger and their students and followers, and this approach could be characterized as predetermined by the necessity of including various and superfluous reference points, that always are present in the real-life activity, even into the tools of laboratory experiment. The experimental tradition of eliminating, levelling and reduction of the tools was not able to preserve its vantage ground in psychology, whereas the drawing together of the planned-stadial formation and the task of natural experiment gradually became the norm of research, because there were a number of cases when it was evident that the formation of actions was absolutely impossible within the limited conditions of orientation. On the other hand, construction of a psychologically-founded hierarchy of tools allowed to direct the process of reflective experimental analysis during the creation of neoformations in a number of investigations.

Another logic of research that stems from the cultural-historical paradigm and uses the method of formation as its foundation, was re-directed from limiting the subjects' access to means (to prove that these means were needed) to providing the subjects with everything necessary (and even superfluous, as it results to be), to obtain the desirable neoformation. The methodological consequences of such position lead to the following: the proven possibility of such formation with fixed conditions and pathway of tool-mediation became the new knowledge. The tracking of the genesis becomes the closest thing to understanding the cause of the phenomenon and discovering its organism.

So there are two lines: the first line – the line of development (alteration, transformation, acquisition/mastering) of the tool is presented as movement from the first-stage tool that is most closely connected by the subject with the problem situation itself, from the tool that sometimes mirrors the features of the object, – to the symbolic, “sign-ified” image of the object. The second line is connected with the transformation of the image of action during the process of tool-mediation, that occurs as a change of the system of relations between the “old” and the “new” forms of orientation. Mentioning the initial “externalness” of the tools of the activity being formed, is a good fea-

ture of the planned-stadial formation theory, helpful to promote its use in experimental research, because the tools exist not only as the attitudes towards reality, created during the evolution of the society, but also as the main ways of building and acquisition/mastering of psychic processes.

In the planned-stadial formation approach the right of choosing, constructing and perfecting the tools during formation is initially given to the researcher, and this right becomes the object of consideration along with the phenomenon that is formed. During nearly 50 years of understanding the euristics and elaborating the techniques of the planned-stadial formation approach, the tool-mediation was seen as a technical stage of organization and of timely shift of the orientation tools of the subject while coming from one stage of formation to the next one. During different moments of the development of the approach, the formation itself was focussed on different circumstances: on the proof of the principal possibility of the constructivist approach to scientific research; on outlining the procedure details and schemata of the method; on discovering new experimental phenomenology; on applying the method to different forms of orientation etc. The tool-mediation itself was gradually becoming a constant parameter of the method and was driven to the margins of the researchers' interests.

But the intrinsic law of the experimental psychology states that every technical aspect of the research, however elaborated, sooner or later becomes the main problem (task) of the research. The transition from the particular tasks of forming separated actions, which was characteristic for the first stage of development of the planned-stadial formation approach (1950-1970s) to forming systems of actions and to the modern stage of the research of activity formation inspired the change of attitude towards tool-mediation. It is logical that the same planned-stadial formation approach was given the mission of displaying the wide range of tool-mediation. The particular task of elaborating the method lead to the fact that the name of the method became the ID card of the theory (this situation is not frequent in psychology), and perfectly organized tool-mediation determined the exquisiteness of experimental research, culture and traditions of the scientific school of P.Ya.Gal'perin. This movement – from technical to central – is itself a representation of the logic of tool-mediation, especially when the covert task of the research was achieving systematic tool-mediation.

Culture, development, and methodology in psychology: beyond alienation through data

Jaan Valsiner

Professor

Clark University, Worcester, USA

In the recent two decades psychologists have begun to use the term ‘culture’. Both cross-cultural and cultural psychology have gained prominence in psychology. J. Valsiner analyses what is the appeal—and peril—of trying to bring ‘culture’ as a theoretical concept into psychology? There are certain difficulties awaiting researchers on this path.

– ‘Culture’ has been a value-laden term—‘having culture’ has been usually viewed as better than ‘not having culture’.

– Classification eliminates phenomena. The crucial tension in psychologists’ discourse about culture is that between treating it as an existing entity (e.g., «culture IS X») – while behind that entity is a process of becoming (e.g., «culturing leads to X»). In the social sciences we habitually turn phenomena of becoming into those of being – treating what has emerged as it now is, and not as it came to be.

– In most of psychology, culture has been used to designate some group of people who “belong together” by value of some shared features. In each picture of unity—of a country, ethnic or language group, etc. – a case of its opposite (disunity) is embedded.

Both cultural psychology and cross-cultural psychology use the term ‘culture’ – but in slightly different ways.

Cross-cultural psychology often involves comparisons between two or more groups of individuals. The groups thus compared are different ethnic, geographic, or administratively united groups—which are labeled “cultures”. In general, “cultures” defined as groups of human beings in cross-cultural psychology have the following properties:

Qualitative homogeneity. It is assumed that each and every “member of the culture” (that is, person who “belongs to” that culture) shares with each and every other member the same set of cultural features.

Temporal stability. It is assumed that the set of cultural features (shared by the persons who are “members of the culture”) is the same over time—even as the membership of persons in a culture changes from generation to generation. Even if historical changes take place in a given society, culture is characterized through focus on its stability.

The cross-cultural knowledge construction strategy overlooks the hierarchical organization of human social life. The organizing role of different levels (and combinations) of social institutions is not taken into account in this construction of data about cultures as represented by populations of assumedly homogeneous kinds. Explanation of the empirically discovered differences in cross-cultural psychology are not explainable within the theoretical system of cross-cultural psychology, except in tautological terms (e.g., Culture A “causes” the sample from A to be different from sample from B, which is “caused” by culture B). It is obvious that cross-cultural psychology’s use of the term “culture” is limited to being an over-generalizing label. If some evidence allows one to treat particular phenomena (as found within a sample) as if these represent a larger collective unit (labeled culture— a given ethnic or language group, or a political-administrative unit— a country), then the evidence obtained becomes generalized to all «members of the culture.»

In contrast with cross-cultural psychology, different versions of cultural psychology operate with notions of culture of inherently the systemic kind). It is the individual case—studied as an integrated system in its interaction with environment—that is the basis for all scientific data in psychology.

The notion of aggregation of data before these are analyzed to reveal their qualitative functioning would lead to reduction of precision and elimination of possibility to generalize.

Based on the systemic analysis of the individual-in-social-context, a generalized model of the cultural functioning of the person is constructed. That systemic model is further tested empirically on the basis of another selected individual (e.g., z who belongs to two societies), which leads to the modification of the systemic model. The modified model is further tested on a selected individual case, and so on. Together with such hermeneutic construction of knowledge about person as culturally functioning system, the generalized model becomes ideally applicable to human beings in their generic state. Such generalizations thus apply to all humankind, as these are seen to generate the inter-individual differences between persons.

Cultural psychology is part of general psychology as a basic science, while cross-cultural psychology belongs to differential psychology. The two are complementary to each other. A good cross-cultural psychological project or study should be preceded by a careful analysis of the culture(s) in question.

The data are derived from phenomena, and that derivation must preserve those aspects of the phenomena that the researcher considers theoretically relevant. Human thinking is qualitative first, and may involve a move from the thinking with the help of structural notions (nominal

scale) into their quantified derivatives (ordinal, interval, or ratio scales). Yet, at the end of quantification, the researcher makes sense of the investigation in qualitative terms.

The original nominal scale nature of the constructed data – which still represented the phenomena (minus the hesitations and doubts of the interviewee) becomes replaced by ordinal scale assumptions, and may be treated as interval or even ratio scale data. This is a process of data alienation—at each step of further move into quantification, the data become less representative of the original phenomena—and hence less adequate for scientific analysis.

Rating scales as a method of data-generation eliminates access to the very phenomena that are being investigated. The rater becomes constituted as the measuring instrument – ratings that are an externalized product of the speedy introspective processes within the rater – become projected onto the target object as if these ratings were properties of that object.

This complexity can be elucidated through changing the orientation of rating scales from instruments that produce outcomes (ratings) to methods of tracking the processes of arriving at those outcomes. A similar innovation is possible in the realm of personality inventories.

Hugo Munsterberg, founder of psychotechnics, as the precursor of L.S. Vygotsky in the methodology of psychological research

V.M. Munipov

Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education,
Professor of the Ergonomics Department of the Moscow Institute of Radio Electronics and Automation

The inquiry of Vygotsky, presented in the work “The historical meaning of crisis in psychology” was mainly composed as a dialogue-in-absence with Munsterberg. Both scholars were deeply interested in the same problem – problem of the methodology of psychological research. They focused their attention upon building practical psychology in correspondence with academic psychology. In the program of development of applied psychology Vygotsky saw the “pre-image” of “general psychological science”. The above-mentioned work is dedicated to drawing a sketch of such general science at the meeting point of nature sciences and cultural-historical tradition. Thus, achieving the maximum of its development in that “general science”, the Munsterberg’s program of development of applied psychology as science, obtained certain wholeness as a methodological research. To duly appreciate the contribution of Munsterberg, another scholar of the same depth was necessary. That scholar was L.S. Vygotsky.

In the psychotechnics of Munsterberg that was not developed enough in theoretical and practical sense, L.S. Vygotsky identified rich methodological potential, that could be applied to the reform of psychology, the potential that could become the main driving force of crisis in psychology. Psychotechnics, as Vygotsky puts it, forces to appropriate and integrate into science the huge vaults of practical psychological experiences and skills, hoarded for millenia, – because the church, the military, the politics, the industry all tried to put psyche in order and direct it, so they are based on huge amount of psychological experience, although inordered. Psychotechnics, said Vygotsky, might play the same role for psychology as medicine did for physiology and technics – for physical science.

Psychotechnics, according to Munsterberg, is needed to transform practical life psychologically, to solve cultural tasks. Psychotechnics is about techniques. The task of psychologically transforming cultural life could not be achieved without method-

ology. Munsterberg and Vygotsky were first to identify the technical level of science, apart from the theoretical and the empirical. The technical level of science is a specific form of transforming the mental reality, the meaning, value and ideal centre of which being the practical psychological knowledge.

If the scientific theory is the summit and goal of all the learning activity, then within practical psychology scientific theory becomes empirical foundations for obtaining practical knowledge and building concepts. Vygotsky defined psychotechnics as the philosophy of practice. The philosophy of practice, as F.Ye. Vasiliuk explains, is not a philosophical knowledge of practice and not a practically oriented cognition, applied only for achieving practical goals. The philosophy of practice is not seen as methodology of *connaissance* only, which considers scientific truth as the highest value. Because knowing is accomplished within the philosophy of practice, it has to keep its procedures aligned to its embeddedness into the knowledgeable practice of being. The knowing that embodies the philosophy of practice does not contemplate practice from the outside; it stays within practice and looks through it upon the world it discloses.

The dialogue between Munsterberg and Vygotsky is important for understanding of the shift from classical to postclassical psychology. There is another stage on Vygotsky’s creative biography that is not yet studied thoroughly enough; this stage is connected to the attempt to develop practical psychology in Russia in accordance with the methodological scaffolds outlined in the “Historical meaning of the crisis in psychology”, the creation in the 20–30-s of the XX century of the scientific school of psychotechnics by I.N. Spielrein, L.S. Vygotsky and S.G. Gellerstein. This period will be addressed in the next article of the series. Paraphrasing V.P. Zinchenko, it is possible to say that for the psychological science the views of Munsterberg, Vygotsky, Spielrein and Gellerstein are not the past, but the present, although not fully understood and appropriated.

The autobiographic narrative in the context of cultural-historical psychology

Ye. Ye. Sapogova

Ph. D., Professor,

Head of the Psychology Department of the Tula State University

The cultural-historical theory is important for modern research because of the attempts to understand the sign (symbol) as a tool for opening the consciousness into the cultural-historical perspective. This sign is not socially imposed upon the subject, but the subject is more or less free to choose it from culture. The sign, the symbol, the text – all these are not only tools for mastering/appropriation of culture, but they are tools for personal self-determination of a human being in culture, for expanding personal boundaries, for self-transcendence (Sapogova, 1993). These tools are double-directed – each of them is directed simultaneously toward the social and cultural circumstances, and to the human subjectivity.

During the last few years the researchers' attention is focused upon a human being in his/her uniqueness, along with his/her lifespan, with the subjectively found ways of coping with life, meaning-making and bringing order to the life experiences. The interest towards the self-made descriptions of the lifespan leads to development of the new methods of their psychological investigation and interpretation.

Narrative psychology is one of the rapidly developing modern explanatory paradigms, in which the cultural artifacts are seen as narrative structures (texts) – bearers of specific human meanings, which are acquired by the person during the process of socialization. Life and relationships of people are formed by culturally fixed narratives of different kind that are acquired during socialization. The basic concepts, plots, motifs, characters of those stories are used for interpretation and meaning-making, structuring and describing personal experience, in fact, they constitute the basis of the organization of the content of consciousness. The lifespan of a person is considered a meaningful wholeness, existing for this same person and for others in the form of a completed story – autobiographic narrative (Trubina, 2002; Hunningsen, 2000). The advocates of the

narrative approach suggest to consider narrative as an universal characteristic of any culture, because each culture accumulates and transmits its own symbols, meanings and values by means of texts. From this point of view various cultural texts with meanings fixed within them become an important component of the cultural sociogenesis as a continuous here-and-now self-creation, no matter what system of signs and symbols they are represented in.

The culturally created set of texts available for each developing human being is an inexhaustible semiotic resource for self-identification, meaning-making and self-presentation, superfluous for each separate life. The classic texts (fairy tales and folklore, didactic and religious texts, classic fiction etc.), megatexts, such as the Bible, which are important not only for separate ethnocultures but for larger world communities, the texts that had left a vast repertoire for the certain stage of cultural-historical development of the society, age cohorts and certain economic and ideological circumstances; the texts that are neither widespread nor propagated in the stratum of time and culture available to the person, but that are chosen personally by him/herself during growing-up because from his/her point of view they are the best forms of objectivization of his/her personal meanings and experiences.

The text (narrative) becomes a fundamental component of social interaction at each stage of growing up, connecting the person with culture, with other people. There is a “canonical” set of texts that is demands to be transmitted from the elder generation to the younger one. Each society presents to its members at different stages of development an excessive (superfluous) set of fabulae, plots, characters could be used as examples for identification, construction the “picture of the world”, the system of relationships “I-World” and organization of individual life events in a story. Using certain social – cultural concepts as instrumental tools of self-understanding, the subject

tries to catch in the texts s/he reads the meanings of his/her existence, to finds his/her essence, and the texts that s/he creates about him/herself, unfolded upon described and symbolically represented events, reflect personal strivings of the subject to know him/herself, interpret him/herself, construct him/herself.

From preschool age human beings can perform not only as readers or listeners, but as narrators or self-narrators. During growing-up a person constructs him/herself as a part of the contemporaneous world by means of telling stories. In some time these stories become “work-in-itself” (Kristeva, 2004) in the subjects’ consciousness – autobiographic narrative that accomplishes not only the functions of self-description and self-presentation, but also those of self-understanding and self-planning (life creation).

Constructing his/her autobiographic narrative, the subject him/herself names and ascribes meaning to particular life episodes, which are projected in his/her personality, the subject him/herself is responsible for “thickening of meaning”, “centers of importance” in the focus points of his/her texts. The unit of construction of autobiographic narrative is the event – reflected, hoarded in memory and “thickly described” act or occasion that happened or were performed or contemplated during a particular part of the subject’s life, especially if they were loaded with personal meaning. An event could be seen as a cognitive construct that plays the role of a medium, mediator

between experience and language but not belonging strictly neither to experience, nor to language. Simultaneously, the event is both hermeneutical tool for transforming non-differentiated continuum of the “raw” data of experience or imagination into verbal structures (including metaphors) which a person uses to describe experience in his/her narratives and make meaning of it, organize and transmit it (Trubina, 2002; Lacoff, Johnson, 2004).

It’s worth noticing that an event in narrative not always coincides with normative life event. It might be subjectively chosen episode of life filled with existential meaning specific only for this particular person. The subject saturates some life episodes with excessive meaning and builds them into autobiographical text, rebuilding its previous content and bringing light to the boundaries of the future. All the events are important and valuable as parts of autobiography not by themselves, but within the context of subjective consciousness, even if an outside observer supposes some events of the subject’s life to be significant.

The autobiographic narrative, simultaneously told (created) by the subject and read by him/herself as an alienated product, surpasses the polysemy in favor of the subject’s choice made here and now, and thus accomplishes emotional, motivational, cognitive and therapeutic functions. The construction of autobiography is not only summarizing the past, but also some planning of the future.

Prayer – silence – psychotherapy*

F.Y. Vasiliuk

Ph. D.,

Dean of the Faculty “Psychological Consulting” of the MSUPE

I am disclosing one of the secrets of the psychotherapeutic work: the first sentence uttered by the client during the very first meeting with you, the therapist, however shallow, occasional and non-obligatory this meeting might seem, contains the clue for all the mysterious interweavings of the most profound meanings – the meanings that you will strive together to reach during months or even years of hard work.

I suppose that the “Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, by W.Shakespeare” , by L.S.Vygotsky (1987) has the same symbolical meaning, as stated above, for the analysis of all Vygotsky’s creation. This work of Vygotsky is dedicated to what he called “the second meaning of the tragedy” – “the religiousness of the tragedy”, “the silence and the prayer”, the dimension, where Art comes to its end and Religion begins (p.290).

This “essay” of Vygotsky enspells the philosophy of tragic loneliness and its overcoming by prayer. The tragedy of Hamlet, as well as the real tragedy of our life, occurs at the boundary, at the threshold of two worlds. But the meaning of tragedy lies in reintegration that overcomes this schisis. The unity is remade by prayer, “because where prayer is, there nothing tragic can be, there tragedy ends” (p.290).

Ophelia is the living symbol of prayer in Shakespeare’s tragedy. Within the spectrum of hues, scale of tones Ophelia opposes and complements Hamlet. He is black, she is white, he embodies the tragedy itself, and she embodies the prayer that overcomes the tragedy, but both of them are outside of the common world, both yield to mad-

ness. No matter how much the marxist-leninist materialistic zealots tried to hide Vygotsky’s religiousness from us, it is obvious that such words could be written only by a person who obtained a profound personal experience of prayer.

The destiny of psychotherapy is the help for human soul in pain, that’s why the main thing psychotherapy strives to understand is the mystery of human overcoming of pain. In this point psychotherapy and religion, psychotherapy and prayer come together. The question about the attitude towards pain is the core question of the philosophy of psychotherapy.

The synergeion psychotherapy sees a human being as a creature that lives not only in the horizontal dimension of “vast social horizons” or in the cellars of the unconsciousness, but in the total fullness of the God’s world. The synergeion psychotherapy does not deny or belittle the meaning of awareness and experience, but puts its main aspirations upon the prayer. The maxima of the synergeion psychotherapy states: in the place of experience there prayer should be. The core method of the synergeion psychotherapy is silence, the awe-fulled silence of prayer.

In 1987 the “Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark” by Vygotsky was published at last. This book was permeated by the spirit of prayer, and thus did not fit into the “marxist portrait du parade” of Vygotsky. But what was accomplished in the end: the volumes of Vygotsky’s works are on the shelf – his “words, words, words”, – and in the last volume there is the last thing that Vygotsky said to us – it is Hamlet, it is Ophelia, it is prayer. Then silence comes.

* The author acknowledges the Russian Foundation for Humanities for providing financial assistance for the research on the problems of synergeion psychology, grant N 96-03-04563.

The principle of active rest in thinking and action

V.P. Zinchenko

Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education,
Professor of the Institute of General and Special Education, Head of the Psychology Department of the
International University of Nature, Society and Human "Dubna"

The idea that thinking is an action does not arouse doubts after the works of H. Bergson, L.S. Vygotsky, M. Wertheimer, J. Piaget, A.V. Zaporozhetz, and P.Y. Galperin. In the same way the works of H. Poincare, W. Kohler, K. Duncker, B.M. Kedrov have shown convincingly that a decision comes not at the moment of fierce activity, but in the state of rest when a person moves away from a task. The solution to the problem situation can be found in the differentiation of an action into external and inner forms, physical and mental, material and ideal, objective and subjective etc. In fact all these opposites are very relative. If external action loses its mental modality, while the inner one loses its subject-matter modality, they lose the status of an action and are eliminated.

Experimental psychology in the XX century revealed the naivety of such dichotomies. Physical and tonic stages have been singled out in movements; in particular, it was shown that inhibition can require a bigger effort than exaltation. It is sometimes more difficult to refrain from an action or a statement than to perform or make them. Not only the meaningfulness of intervals or pauses observed in behavior and actions has been revealed, but their activity as well. A.A. Uchtomsky introduced the concept of «active rest» which can be much more intensive than the most frantic motor storms.

The so-called interiorization of external physical activity does not imply its elimination. The activity goes on «internally» as witnessed, among other things, by eye movements, the movements of speech-motor organs, changes in the brain's bioelectrical activity, as well as by the data of self-observation on the operation of images and even on muscular sensations. H. Bergson said that the

maximum of mental effort is required in the transition from an idea to an image. M. Bakhtin meant the same by the sensation of the activity of generation. A. Einstein pointed out the dominating role of images and muscular sensations in his thinking. Earlier I. M. Sechenov categorized personal actions as an element of thinking.

All the activities mentioned and not mentioned above are invisible to an observer's naked eye, which by no way means that inner action (activity) does not take place.

It is expedient to start reconciling the opposites mentioned above by rejecting the extremely diffuse dichotomy of the inner and the external. The latter has been treated in research as completely external, objective, part of being. It is useful to go back to the initial wholeness of behavior, activity, mental processes which, however, can exist either in the inner or in the external form, while still being behavior, activity, mental processes and functions. The presence of both the external and inner form in the same act, their alternation being a norm, can be illustrated by the Moebius band. In philosophical language this is designated as the continuum of being and consciousness. The analysis of the inner and external forms of words, actions and images will reveal the reversibility of external and inner forms, their interaction in the generation of new words, actions and images. In particular, it will reveal how the inner form is generated externally, while the external form is generated within. When we deal with the whole, we require external perfection and inner justification (A. Einstein), inner authenticity. It is active rest, probably the most intense of all activity forms, that is the source of everything that is alive and new, the crucial condition (and mechanism) of creativity.

Psychometric approach to child animism

B.G. Mescheriakov

Ph. D.,

Professor of the Psychology Department of the International University of Nature,
Society and Human "Dubna"

Nowadays many foreign researchers consider the phenomenon of child animism to be almost an artifact of the method of interviewing (clinical interview) used by J.Piaget (e.g. Williams, 2000). This is the point from which the main goal of this work emerges – to consider the opportunities presented by new methods of registration of the children’s ideas of “living” and “non-living” beings/things.

In the lengthy discussion about the reality of the phenomenon of child animism, the point of whether it is appropriate to ascribe to the child the capability for dichotomic classification of objects and phenomena into the categories “living” and “non-living” was not questioned. At the same time there is enough evidence for formulation of an alternative hypothesis: if the main feature of living is movement or some other quantitative characteristic (i.e. usefulness or the degree of similarity to some prototype), then the representation of living and non-living should constitute not a dichotomy, but a quasi-continuum, according to which things can be more or less living (as well as moving and useful). The article presents the results of 4 empirical studies con-

ducted under the author’s supervision in 2002–2004; to assess the phenomenon of child animism and other particular features of child reasoning about living and non-living, the methods of pair comparison and rating were used.

The methodical differences between the studies are presented in the Table 1.

All assessment of children was conducted in an individual setting, in a separate room in the kindergarten or at the child’s home (more rarely).

The obtained data confirm large difference between children’ reasoning about living and non-living – and the normative reasoning, although pure animistic answers are not very probable among modern children of late preschool age (5–6 years old). The main findings could be summarized as such: 1) the psychometric methods could be used without too much difficulty while assessing preschool children and their ideas of living and non-living beings/things, in particular; 2) these methods are sensitive enough to track the age dynamics of the cognitive development during preschool age (by method of one-year interval cross-sectional study); 3) the scales of ‘livingness’ composed by means of the methods of pair com-

Author	Number of groups and subjects	Methods of data collection	Number of objects
I.P. Gorbunova (Tobol'sk, Russia)	3 groups (4-, 5- and 6-year-olds), 8 children in each group	Pair comparison	11 cards, from which 55 pairs were composed
K.A. Vodop'yanova (Dubna, Russia)	4 groups (3-, 4-, 5- and 6-year-olds), 10 children in each group	Pair comparison, free classification	9 cards, from which 36 pairs were composed
O.M. Khnykina (Dubna, Russia)	3 groups (4-, 5- and 6-year-olds), 10 children in each group	Pair comparison, rating	8 cards from K.A.Vodop'yanova's set
Ye.Ye. Chizhova (Dubna, Russia)	3 groups (4-, 5- and 6-year-olds), 12 children in each group	Rating, dichotomic classification	8 cards

parison and rating obtain acceptable coherency and stability; 4) the proposed index of normativeness of reasoning (T), based upon the (estimated by means of t-test) measures of importance of the differences between mean ranks of all pairs of objects or different clusters of such pairs, allows one to estimate in general the degree of discrepancy between child reasoning and norms of scientific worldview. (It is important that different aspects of the T index provide separate estimation of cognitive errors of different kinds. Thus, the T2 aspect reflects the animistic errors, while the T3 aspect reveals the errors that are somehow opposite – i.e. classifying plants as non-living objects.); 5) we can claim with a great deal of confidence that the inclination towards animistic responses

shows itself in 3- and 4-year-olds and weakens towards the end of preschool age; it is interesting that according to the data obtained by means of more traditional methods (Berzonsky, 1988), among the groups of 5-, 6- and 7-year-olds, the highest level of animistic responses was found among the 5-year-olds; 6) nevertheless, the elder preschool children' ideas of living and non-living differ significantly from the norms of scientific thinking.

The data obtained by means of psychometric methods are supposed to computation (factor and cluster analysis). The results of the content analysis of the characteristics that the respondents ascribe to the “more living” things, are worth of specific consideration.

Leading activity in developmental psychology: the concept and the principle

N.N. Veresov

Ph. D.,

Researcher at the Oulu University (Finland)

There is no thing in which the force, the limit-ness and the explanatory potential and its boundaries of the concept of activity in psychology shows as clearly as in the concept and principle of leading activity. However, the principle of leading activity must not be understood as a banal concretization of a general idea about the leading role of activity, applied to certain empirical phenomena.

Thus it is reasonable to refer to one of the most famous periodizations of mental development, suggested by D.B. El'konin. The ontogenesis of consciousness is considered a process of continuous change of activities within the system "child-society". And during each stage a leading activity is identified, the mastering and appropriation of which is connected to the most important psychological novel formations of this age.

This periodization seems to represent an example of a stadial (staged) linear approach to understanding development, although not only the stages, but the criteria for defining stages, and the mechanisms i.e. inner contradictions, promoting development, are defined strictly.

Is any other interpretation possible? Yes it is, if we compare El'konin's approach to some concepts of cultural-historical theory, such as social situation of development and interaction of real and ideal forms (L.S. Vygotsky).

Investigating the process of formation of learning activity and its presuppositions, the author managed to demonstrate in experiments that social situation of development and leading activity do not completely coincide. A new leading activity does not emerge directly from the old leading activity. For example, the learning activity does not emerge directly from role-play. It emerges within the whole social situation of

development of a preschool age child. However, the role-playing activity might develop, it cannot transform into learning activity by itself, outside from the encompassing social situation of development.

The presuppositions of emergence of learning activity are formed not only within role-playing activity. These presuppositions are ripening or created gradually within the whole social situation of development. A primary school pupil does not cease to play, the learning activity, which emerges in the said social situation of development reconstructs the whole system of the child's activities, and creates a new social situation of development, which contains place for role-playing too. Role-playing gives the Olympic torch to the learning activity, and learning activity becomes the leading activity, but this torch is not transmitted directly, role-playing "leaves" it on the field of social situation of development, on which field the presuppositions of learning activity are ripening. (Note: more detailed version can be found at: Veresov N., Hakkarainen P. (2000) About the presuppositions for development of the learning activity of elder preschool children. VMARO / Journal of the International Association of Developmental Teaching, 8, 44–62; Veresov N., Hakkarainen P. (2001) Stanovleniye vedushej dejatelnosti u starshih doshkol'nikov (Development of learning activity in elder preschool children.) / Voprosy psikhologii, 1, 43–59).

Including El'konin's periodization into wider context, we can see that for El'konin, as well as for Vygotsky, activity is nothing more, but nothing less than one of the forms of a more profound process of interaction of ideal and real forms. Activity is not the only possible form, not a gener-

al one, it works during stable periods, it provides for functional aspects of development, but does not define it, because the form of the relation cannot define the relation itself.

On one hand, it might seem that El'konin's periodization is a scheme of a linear process of leading activity changes that lead to psychological novel formations. On the other hand, there is some evidence suggesting another interpretation.

We should speak not about leading activity as it is, but about a system of activities, within which the concept of leading activity might be understood. If we allow the child to perform only one leading activity and deprive him (her) of all the others, then child development is forfeit. Moreover, the switch from one leading activity to another is one of the aspects of the switch from one system of activities to another, i.e. an aspect of development of this very system of activities, because: "Each stage represents a system of different kinds of activity, and each of them accomplishes its function. One should consider the internal relation between different activities and the switches from one to another should provide a scheme of emergence of new kinds of activity and of the change of their system" (El'konin D.B. (1989) Selected works. Moscow. P. 509).

Thus, the existing view of development of the psyche as a linear individually chronological process of the change of leading activities does not only imply grave objections, but in many ways does not correspond to how this problem was considered by both Vygotsky and El'konin. The change of leading activities is quite real, but all the same external linear process, behind which there's hidden and by which is represented continual structure reorganization of all the system of child's activities as a living organic system of interaction of ideal and real forms. This is what ensures the continuity of development both in the stages of stability and crises.

Let us turn now to the concept of psychological novel formation. Even now one can meet the understanding of psychological novel formations as some new mental processes and functions that emerge during certain age periods. But the concept of psychological novel formation in Vygotsky's and El'konin's works meant something more. Vygotsky understood age novel formations as new type of personality structure and person's activity, these mental and social changes that emerge for the first time at this age and which define the main aspects of child's consciousness.

Development is a process of reconstruction, reorganization of personality structure and consciousness as a whole, and not only emergence of some new traits and qualities, separate mental processes. Vygotsky called this systemic structure of consciousness.

There is one more problem. Logical analysis shows that the linear view of the change of leading activities and as a consequence of emergence of novel formations as some new personality qualities means by definition that novel formations emerge only and exclusively during the stable periods of development, when the child has a got a leading activity. But if we suppose that the relation between leading activity and novel formations is non-linear, if we consider them to be aspects of a holistic system "personality structure system of activities as a form of relation", it becomes evident that novel formations emerge both during stable periods and periods of crisis.

Thus, if we try to rise a question about the correspondence of the concepts "social situation of development", "leading activity" and "psychological novel formations" of the age, if we try to seriously understand, what does the famous El'konin's periodization scheme represent, we should start with providing definitions for these concepts, defining which psychological reality do they represent, and the most important thing is how do they correspond with other concepts of Vygotsky's psychological theory.

We can see that behind the relatively simple scheme of change of leading activities there's hidden one most complicated process of development of activity and consciousness as organic system. Behind the externally linear process of shift from one leading activity to another there's hidden the deep process of human search and finding of space of wholly new quality possibilities at each new stage of development.

We could argue however long about what is the right criterion of defining the stages, the ages of mental development, probably, leading activity might be such a criterion, but it becomes evident that consciousness itself is an organic system, non-linear by definition, and its development is a process of continuous functional and structural reorganization. Consciousness is an organism by nature, a spiritual organism. The psychology that aims at building modern theory of consciousness, must follow not the traditional logic of empiricism, but should start from the logic of development of organic systems; it must become organic

psychology and at the same time genetic psychology, that re-creates each abstract theoretical reasoning the live logic of becoming, of real, concrete forms of consciousness as organic system and

organ of individuality, simultaneously. On this path activity theory in psychology demonstrates not only the possibilities not yet attempted, but also its boundaries.

The concept of age novel formation in modern developmental psychology

Ye.Ye. Kravtsova

Ph. D., Director of the L.S.Vygotsky Psychological Institute of the RSGU

One of the main concepts of modern child psychology is the concept of leading activity, which defines particular aspects of child development during certain age. The child's transition from one age stage to another is related to the change of leading activities. The conditions for development of the leading activity are at the same time the conditions for fruitful mental development of the child at different age stages. Although such methodological approach is fruitful, several fundamental problems are not yet solved within this framework.

The first problem is connected to the characteristics of leading activities themselves. The second problem consists of understanding the mechanism of switch from one leading activity to another. The third problem is connected with the interrelation of leading activities with the conditions of mental and personality development during the ontogenesis.

We suppose that to solve these and several other fundamental problems one should define the psychological characteristics of the age by means of age psychological novel formations. It allows answering the questions about conditions, mechanisms and laws of mental development.

The beginning of a stability period is related to the end of a previous period of crisis. L.S. Vygotsky stressed that the most important thing that happens during ages of crisis, is represented in the novel formation of crisis. Empirical evidence suggests that the novel formation of crisis is connected to the emergence of new self-consciousness. At the end of a crisis period the child gets new self-consciousness that manifests itself first of all in particular features of self-perception and attitude towards oneself. The development during post-critical stage is connected with change of this new self-consciousness.

The child accomplishes the novel formation of the stage of crisis in communication, but nonetheless the child is not able to use it to change his or her activity. This task belongs to the adult.

When the novel formation of the age of crisis is included into real life situations, it leads to emer-

gence of other novel formation, which becomes the novel formation of a stable period. When it emerges and assimilates the novel formation of the age of crisis, one can speak of the beginning of a stable period. At the beginning of the stable period the child also accomplishes his/her novel formation in communication with other people, especially with adults. The inclusion of the novel formation of the stable period into real life leads to emergence of new activity, that obtains the status of leading activity, and the novel formation of stable period becomes the foundation and the main criterion of this activity.

In both cases – with the novel formation of the age of crisis and with novel formation of the stable period – the child starts by accomplishing it in communication with other people. After this the child, using adult's assistance, learns to apply it in day-to-day life. In the first case the inclusion of novel formation into life does not suggest any changes in the child's activity. In this case the adult helps the child to make new meaning of familiar actions. As a result a novel formation of stable period emerges. At the end of the stable period the child becomes subject of his/her own leading activity. It means that the child has mastered all its components and may perform it by him/herself in all the circumstances, deliberately, reflecting upon its process. Special criterion of the child being subject of his/her own leading activities is the ability to verbalize it.

The ability of the child to build and perform the leading activity by him/herself leads to the change of relationship between the child and the adult. At the previous stages of a stable period the adult gradually helped the child to perform and develop the leading activity, but when the child learns to accomplish it by him/herself his/her attitude towards the adult changes a lot. The child, say, overgrows the old relationships with adult. Thus, one can conclude that the leading activity is built upon the novel formation and not vice versa, as many representatives of the activity theory claim.

Another conclusion of the above stated analysis consists of the changes in activity emerge after the changes in communication. The changes in communication of the child with adult, which emerge upon the basis of the novel formation of the age of crisis and which are connected to accomplishing child's new self-consciousness in real life precede not the operational, technical aspect of the activity, but the emergence of the novel formation of the stable period. Thus, the psychological age novel formations reflect the consciousness and self-consciousness of the subject. In one case the self-consciousness is connected with new meaning, which helps the child to form new attitudes towards his/her own actions. In the other case self-consciousness helps the child to build new activity and become its subject. This partitioning of self-consciousness corresponds well to the general (personality-based) and partial (activity-based) self-esteem, identified within modern psychology.

So we can say that during one age period the changes in self-consciousness occur twice. The novel formation of the age of crisis is connected to development of the child's personality. It is something s/he can accomplish him/herself. The novel formation of stable period that becomes a foundation of the leading activity is directly connected to the mental development of the child. So, during one age period the relationships of the child with the adult change twice. The first change is connected to the emergence of the child's new attitude towards him/herself as a result of the crisis. In the other case the changes are connected with his/her ability to accomplish the leading activity and be aware of him/herself as its subject. It

destroys the old relations with the adult. The child is not able to become aware of this new quality of relations, and this leads to the crisis of development, which manifests itself, first of all, in negative attitude towards the adult and his demands.

We can conclude that psychological age novel formations not only characterize the particular features of certain period, but allow solve many fundamental problems of psychological science. This approach allows solve the question of criteria of the leading activities by means of the novel formation of stable period, thus, it becomes evident how the transition from one leading activity to another is performed.

The comparison of the novel formation and leading activity and the interrelation allow conclude that leading activity could not be reduced to the structure of activity, and the difficulties of identifying the motive of the leading activity.

Novel formations are tightly connected with each other. And it allows solve the problem of succession and consistency, that is important both in theoretical and practical senses. The particular characteristics of communication of the child with adult could be used as a foundation of developmental teaching. Besides, the particular characteristics of the novel formations of stable periods and periods of crisis help distinguish between personality development and mental development.

The research of novel formations of particular periods of development showed that they are tightly connected with each other and are different from all the other components of mental and personality development.

Readiness for thinking

V.P. Zinchenko

Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education
Professor of the Institute of General and Special Education, Head of the Psychology Department of the
International University of Nature, Society and Human "Dubna"

In the "Conclusion" to the book "Theory of developmental teaching" V.V. Davydov stated –as the most important results of his scientific group's work, – that constant appropriation of full-bodied concepts and skills during learning activity promotes development of theoretical thinking in schoolchildren. The theoretical thinking and its components develop, and learning activity and acts of learning are obtained, formed. So a new fundamental task is put: to study the formation of leaning activity, the process of its internalization, and to identify particular characteristics of development of cognitive processes and personality of schoolchildren, during the latter. V.V.Davydov wrote about the necessity of continuous elaboration of the problem of internal connectedness of development of the theoretical thinking and formation of acts of learning.

The subject-matter of learning and formation is learning activity and acts of learning, and its goal is the development of theoretical thinking and its above-mentioned components. The development of theoretical thinking of the students was an additional (and not direct) result of developing learning activity. Davydov's strategy quite corresponds to the ideas of L.S. Vygotsky about complicated relations between education and development: "We provided education worth a Pfennig, but child's development because of it is worth a Mark. One step in education can equate a hundred steps in development. This is what the most positive aspect of the new theory consists in. This theory teaches us to see the difference between such education, that gives as much as it gives, and the education that in fact gives more than it gives directly" (L.S. Vygotsky, Collected Works, vol.2, p.230)

Development stems not from every kind of education, but only from the education that goes

ahead and leads the way for development! And, last but definitely not least: "Pedagogics should orient itself not towards the past, but towards the upcoming day and child development. This is the only condition that gives teaching the opportunity to awake to life the processes that now stay in the zone of proximal development". (L.S. Vygotsky, Collected Works, vol.2, p.251) The keyword here is to "awake to life" but not to "get formed". L.S. Vygotsky follows the same logic whilst discussing the problem of cultural development. Also he did not avoid the problem of personality development: "The essence of cultural development... consists in the fact that the person masters/appropriates the processes of his/her own behavior, but the necessary presupposition for mastering is the formation of personality, that's why formation of certain functions are always derived and defined by the development of personality as a whole". (L.S. Vygotsky, Collected Works, vol.2, p.316)

What was Davydov's role in elaboration and development of "Vygotsky's hypothesis about education and human development"? Let's try to understand how within the framework of developmental teaching the development of thinking becomes possible. L.S. Vygotsky and V.V. Davydov each found their own foundations for investigation of scientific concepts formation. L.S. Vygotsky formulated the principle of development in the teaching of the system of scientific knowledge; the application of this principle promotes overcoming of the prevailing spontaneous-reactive type of teaching. V.V. Davydov brought up the task of developing theoretical thinking in schoolchildren. His outline of theoretical thinking included minimum of its characteristics: analysis, reflection and planning. All these characteristics are activity-oriented by nature, so they could be

operationalized; the forms of such operationalization became collaboration, partnership, collective shared activity, dialogue, discursive practices, that lead to the situation of compassionate understanding. The goals of these forms were to involve the students in and teach them to work with concepts as the most important type of thinking (as activity). The success of the system of developmental teaching was achieved by means of getting rid of the “mystery of thinking” which was not (to be) solved neither by philosophy and logic, nor by science. Nevertheless, V.V. Davydov made the impossible possible. Without understanding the mystery of thinking, he started creating it.

The subject matter of education became the formation of concepts and their development. The work of analysis of the developing concepts was conducted in collaboration of the students with the teacher and with each other. During such work the students discovered the movement of meaning and sense, that is, the life of the concepts and not their formal content. The reflection upon one’s own actions was not flowing back to the teacher, it was not like some delayed feedback, when the student who got good or bad mark was not able to understand what it was put for. The teaching that consisted in mutual reflective collaboration (discussion) of the student with his/her teacher and peers, disclosed the ways of thinking activity for them and also the ways of appropriation and usage of concepts. This strategy helped avoiding the gap between knowledge and action.

The substitution of theoretical-reflective teaching instead of spontaneous-reactive (L.S. Vygotsky) or explanatory-illustrative (I.Ya. Lerner) – is much more significant than substituting reflex loop instead of reflex arc which was accomplished by N.A. Bernstein. It was natural for V.V. Davydov to use the version of emergence and development of the psyche that was succinctly put by H. Vallont as “form action to thought”, maybe not as a model, but as an example for theory and practice of education (teaching). The developmental teaching that is constructed according to this example is an “intelligent” teaching, and thus learning activity becomes an activity of intelligence; when developing concepts become subject matter of said activity, it becomes theoretical. Thus, development of thinking, albeit not in its full range, becomes the direct, and not indirect result of teaching, which becomes not an aspect, but a form of development of thinking.

Let us return to the above-cited “Conclusion” to the last book by V.V. Davydov. The author wrote: “Actually... the scientific “equipment” is basically elaborated and with its help one can define the global developmental effect of the learning activity accomplished by schoolchildren and the acts of learning that constitute it, using the functioning and development of said intellectual acts”. (Davydov, *Theory of developmental teaching*, p.520). Later on, he suggests a direction of further investigation as elaboration of “such a complicated problem as internal connectedness of the development of theoretical thinking and formation of the acts of learning” (Ibid., p.521) V.P. Zinchenko notes that sometimes the obtained result becomes more grand than the one who obtained it. The global result is already achieved, the internal connectedness proved. The created centaur of theoretical-reflective teaching promotes readiness for thinking, which might be considered more important than formation of separate intellectual acts. The condition of readiness for something is widely-known in psychology, whether it be readiness for perception or for action. Unfortunately, readiness for thinking is a condition of not frequent occurrence, especially after the end of childhood. It is repressed by reactive educational system already in primary school, although it still is in the favourable sensitive period of development which indicates its probable further strengthening. The maximum form of the developing readiness is the “unsated hunger of thought” (O. Mandelshtam), which stands next to “spiritual thirst”. Too often instead of readiness for thinking we can find readiness for believing, to non-believing, to being sceptical, or even banal laziness of mind, or “vanity of vanities and vexation of spirit”.

The system of developmental teaching of El’konin-Davydov does not suppress, but promotes the child’s readiness for thinking and on this foundation forms the readiness for conceptual thinking. In the consciousness, each concept is represented as a figure against the background of corresponding relations of commonality. From this background we choose the path that is adequate for our thinking. Thus, the degree of commonality functionally “defines all the totality of possible operations of thinking with given concept” (L.S. Vygotsky, *Collected Works*, vol. 2, p. 275).

Approaching the conclusion on the article, V.P. Zinchenko formulates his view of the possible

perspectives of further work on development of thinking. The readiness for conceptual thinking is important, it drives us closer to the imperative stated by A.F. Losev: to think by pure thought, and not to feel or sense, to think by means of thought purified of empirical residue. Maybe Davydov's ideal is this terminal form of development of theoretical thinking, which encompasses the categories of "common", "specific" and "unique". To achieve it, one should gradually broaden the activity pro-

jection of theoretical thinking, including in it other activity components, other tools of thinking. For thinking (but not for action or behavior, of course!) all means are acceptable. One should not ignore the components that could be called "outside-activity" – such as intuition and contemplation, that is, as J.G. Fichte put it, a synonym of activity. The development of contemplativeness is no less fascinating (and useful) task than the development of imagination, thinking, activity.

V.V. Davydov – the founder of scientific school and director of the Psychological Institute

V.V. Rubtsov

Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education,
Rector of the MSUPE, Director of the Psychological Institute of the Russian Academy of Education

On August, the 31th, 2005, V.V. Davydov, prominent Russian psychologist and founder of a new scientific school, would have turned 75 years old. His main ideas were put down in the fundamental works “Types of generalization in teaching” [13], “Problems of developmental teaching” [14], “Theory of developmental teaching” [15]. The theoretical foundation of Davydov’s work in the activity approach to the research of higher mental functions, and the cultural-historical theory of L.S. Vygotsky, A.N. Leont’ev, A.R. Luria, A.V. Zaporozhets, P.Ya. Gal’perin, D.B. El’konin. The basis of Davydov’s theory is the idea of unity of education and development. In the psycho-educational research the logical-objective and logical-psychological analyses of the content and methods of teaching, age-determined abilities of children should be closely connected.

In his thesis for obtaining the Candidate of Sciences degree (1958), V.V. Davydov collected data that characterize the basic stages of the formation of mental actions in children (on the examples of count and concept of “number” formation in preschool children). Together with D.B. El’konin they founded a unique educational establishment – the experimental school №91 in Moscow, sponsored by the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR. At this school V.V. Davydov and his colleagues conducted fundamental research designed to identify the real particular characteristics of age and capabilities of thinking in primary schoolchildren, to study the laws of formation of their learning activity, to disclose the logical-psychological presuppositions for composing teaching programs.

In 1970, in his thesis for obtaining the Doctor of Sciences degree, and also in the book “Types of generalization in teaching” that was based upon it and published later in 1972, V.V. Davydov showed, using large amount of empirical evidence, that the traditional system of primary school teaching was based upon outdated logical-psy-

chological presuppositions which were connected with empirical theory of thinking. The real perfecting of the system of teaching at school suggests another kind of logical-psychological presuppositions, connected to the dialectic materialistic understanding of the processes of thinking, especially of the processes of generalization of the studied material. V.V. Davydov elaborated the theory of interrelatedness of the learning activity with the processes of construction of meaningful abstractions and generalizations in schoolchildren. Nowadays, this theory exerts significant influence over psychological substantiation of the content and methods of organization of teaching process.

The foundation of Davydov’s scientific school consists of three main directions of research, the three proverbial whales that define its theoretical, scientific and didactic boundaries: the theory of content generalization and concept formation, the psychological theory of learning activity and the system of developmental teaching.

I. The theory of content generalization and concept formation is the core of the scientific school of V.V. Davydov. Content generalization is a way of thinking. The thought that is built upon generalization of this type, identifies the significant initial relation within the object, which defines the qualities and features of this object which constitute its essence.

II. The psychological theory of learning activity is the theory of learning activity per se. The learning activity is one of the main types of human activity (along with work and play) and is directed to mastering/appropriation of the generalized ways of object-related and cognitive actions, generalized theoretical knowledge. The essence of learning activity lies within solving the tasks of learning, the goal and result of which consist in transformation of the subject him/herself, which occurs through appropriation of the generalized ways of action (D.B. El’konin [58]). To put an educational task means to introduce the students

into situation that requires orientation to its content-oriented generalized common way of solving it, in all its particular versions of conditions.

III. The system of developmental teaching is the didactic system of El'konin & Davydov. It includes the course of math, composed by S.F. Gorbov, G.G. Mikulina, O.V. Savelyeva, N.L. Tabachnikova; the course of native language, composed by V.V. Repkin et al, and L.I. Aydarova; the course of arts and artistic crafts (Yu.A. Poluyanov); the course "Literature as an aesthetic discipline" (G.N. Kudina and Z.N. Novlianskaya); "Nature science" (Ye.V. Chudinova and Ye.N. Bukvaryova); "Philosophy for children" (A.A. Margolis, S.D. Kovalyov, M.V. Telegin et al.)

For evaluating the effectivity of learning activity, the systems of assessment of theoretical thinking and its components (such as analysis, reflection, planning, systemic characteristics of thinking) were elaborated for different object matter. Also the scientific group elaborated the criteria for assessing the levels of learning activity development, as a whole as well as its separate components.

The system of developmental teaching is not stagnating. Its further elaboration is determined by the necessity of solving social problems, first of all, constructing the system of developmental education and modernization of the educational system as a whole.

Nowadays several attempts have been made to create programs of developmental teaching for adolescents, and a series of researches was conducted concerning the creation of educational environment at schools. One of the first theories in this field become the theory of educational

environment for children from 5 to 17 years old (V.V. Rubtsov, A.A. Margolis, V.A. Guruzhapov [52]). The direction of research lead by Yu.V.Gromyko [21], substantiating the necessity of such disciplines at school, as "Sign", "Task" and "Problem", seems promising.

Davydov's idea about the initial collective-shared forms of organization of the learning activity is essential for the development of the main postulates of the learning activity theory. The genesis of the learning-cognitive action is innately connected to sharing of this activity amongst its participants, it depends on the type of transactions during problem-solving. New data allow to cast critical glance upon the scientific debates of V.V. Davydov and L.S. Vygotsky about scientific concepts formation. The system of object-related actions which are specific for identification of significant relations in its initial form is the organization of such actions as collective-shared amongst the participants of said activity. It allows keeping in mind that the shift from object-related actions to their mental accomplishment is connected to generalization of the ways of organizing the actions. The scheme of organization that emerges in this process becomes meaning and sign of that common relatedness which defines all the amount of given concepts.

It is evident that the scientific school of V.V. Davydov is a living and evolving organism.

The life of V.V. Davydov harmoniously combined his activity as a researcher and as the director of the Institute. Vasily Vasil'yevich Davydov was a special person, a brilliant and unique example of scientific leader, a fabulous "hero of our times".

The problem of the method of cultural-historical psychology

F.T. Mikhaylov

Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education,
Head Researcher of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, Head of the Department of Philosophy
and Culturology of the Moscow State Medical University, Professor of the Psychological Faculty
of the M.V. Lomonosov MSU

First of all, with pain in my heart I must state that cultural-historical psychology became a myth. Psychology is ruled by methods of practical correction of mental abnormalities. The fashionable concepts of psychoanalysis, tests and exercises drew away the very idea of cultural historicism in formation of higher mental functions of the sage organism, *Homo sapiens*. The subject field of countless compartments of psychology contains the mechanics of interactions of psychic conditions, states of obsessive thoughts and morbid experiences that require engineering correction. Psychology returned to Cartesian dualism of the soul with its own particular spiritual mechanics of unavoidable embodiment of the world, and human being with its purely physical mechanics.

I was present at the latest seminar of Boris El'konin's laboratory, where the first stage of accomplishment of the general concept of El'konin-Davydov's school was summarized and the direction of further development of this concept was defined. Probably, this direction should be the concept of Step of Development as a Unit, starting point of the whole theory. The step of development is a transition from the ideal example of the object, which is mastered and appropriated by the child, towards its new reality.

The first thesis of B. El'konin in his book "Introduction to developmental psychology" is: "The general and abstract representation of the act of development is vygotskian idea of the act of development as comparison of real and ideal forms" (p.165).

This is nothing less than a claim of definition of an axiom for new theory, but... Actually, in Vygotsky's texts we can find the concepts of ideal and real forms in each act of new meaning-making. Also he wrote a lot about mediation of subject-subject communication by means of sign (symbol). Although it was done in the very beginning of his work in psychology. But in his latest Spinozist works the idea of mediation by sign

(symbol) is overcome by the concept of intersubjective speech field.

The psychic unit searched by Boris El'konin is not a step of development. It is the tidings, the act of addressing others and oneself as other. So we could state that the main thesis of Boris El'konin's theory was chosen by his own volition. And this thesis was not chosen quite well. If we consider an act of creation, an act of self-determination as the subject of development reduced to the dynamic of transitions of ideal and real forms of subjective development, it will mean that we exploit one of possible abstractions, but this abstraction is not the true problem of human knowledge and psychology in particular: how the exclusively subjective motivation of all voluntary and goal-oriented activity of human beings became possible?

I will start from the search of the true axiom of human knowledge, keeping in mind that subjective, mental motivation of each further step of development of human activity per se brings us back to the third antinomy of pure reason of Immanuel Kant.

On one hand (this is the thesis) those people are right, who include human life into cause and effect relations with the outer world. But on the other hand (and this is antithesis), the human being lives through and by his/her future, acquiring motivation for each act from the image of this act's goal. Thus, standing out against all living beings on this planet, human beings create themselves voluntarily and according to goals! This is the third antinomy of pure reason. And now straight to the goal. L.S. Vygotsky shared the same beliefs.

So, what the undying value of Vygotsky's creation consists in? It consists in the awareness of equity of Kant's thesis and antithesis! All the antinomies of Kant are set and solved the following way: the thesis contains within itself and gives birth to the antithesis. This dynamic equity of the seeming contradictory meanings is productive for the development of new meaning of the antino-

mies, the unity of contradictions as a solution for the problem hidden within the antinomies. Indeed, this very equity drives each our step along the life path. Do we surrender to objective circumstances when we are not able to overcome them? Nay! Without an attempt to change them any human being cannot go on. Human fate lies in the struggle for goal-oriented and voluntary change of circumstances that results in self-transformation. Creativity is the essence of human life.

The unique human aptitude to accomplish goal-oriented voluntary acts directed towards other people's compassion with hope for mutual understanding to free joint being with them, which is a being of good, moral being, this is the beginning and the highest value of human history and culture! But alas, the free will of human being can drive to suppression of other people's free will to limitation of their freedom, even to taking their lives (being of evil). And nobody can decide speak and act without the foreboding of its most important result: other people's attitude to him. And this means other people's attitudes towards each of us as a personality, towards the motives and possible results of our words and acts. And the most important in such attitude is not the evaluation of our utilitarian usability, the most important thing is that these attitudes are always compared with the space of our own freedom – freedom of thought, freedom of feeling, freedom of action. We are not always aware of it, but it always motivates other people's reaction to our words and deeds. The meaning-carrying foreboding of such moral reaction forces us to transform, each time, each our address to other people within the moral field of communication. This way we recreate this field as an intersubjective reality. So it happens that intelligence, higher emotions, moral imperative (the Kant's "moral law inside us"), volition, intuition really embody one aptitude – the aptitude to not to take everything as it is, but transform what is, making up new images into new realities of being. This aptitude and its power within the separated world of common symbols of the victory of life and spirit is higher emotions. In the separate world of discourse it is intelligence. In the subjective world of one's self it is volition. And in all the worlds of human activity always directed to everyone, including oneself, it is morality.

It is important to remember that L.S. Vygotsky himself, analyzing the causes of historical crisis in psychology, saw the main cause in the psychologists' shuttle movement from nature to culture and back again, thus, they try to discover the roots of spirituality either in the human body and its reactions to the stimuli of environment, or in the historical forms of cultural communication. But they are not able to understand the contradictory equity of these contrasts, clearly defined by the third antinomy of Kant. Kant is not an authority for them, he is a philosopher, not a psychologist. But this statement of Kant, sameness of embodiment and subjectivity, brings us back to Spinoza and his unique and whole substance of being – this is an axiom of general human knowledge. The axiom of psychological theory is: all bodily functions ensuring ongoing human life are motivated by voluntary goal-setting, but at the same time they are bodily functions included into circulation of substances, dependant on common colds and bad habits. And the main question of psychology is: how the subjective motivation of all life processes of Homo sapiens is possible?

The subjective motivation of life activity of all species and sub-species of animals upon this Earth is nothing but objective self-determination of live as natural phenomenon. In science the common measures of meaning, of being able to think Being for theoretical awareness of subjective motivation of living being define the logic of development of psychological theory. This source must preserve itself in definitions of each step of theoretical meaning-making of intersubjective speech field, within which human being masters and appropriates the aptitude to motivate all his life actions subjectively. The unit of such aptitude is not a particular abstraction, such as inter-transitions of real forms into ideal forms and back again, but the tidings – the act of addressing others and oneself as other-in-onself. The speech tools of addressing are reconsidered each time they are creatively transformed according to the goal, that's why human being becomes the creator of linguistic forms, even the simplest ones, which may seem cliché. And this is not philosophy, deceiving, trying to insert itself instead of psychological investigation of the beginnings of the soul, this is the most profound psychology in its fundamental theoretical explanation.

The story of one conference, told by V.V. Davydov to Jacques Carpey (on the June, 13th, 1994)

The article presents the story about one All-Russian conference dedicated to the perspectives of development of the cultural-historical psychology, that was not held in 1981. Also the article contains the abstracts submitted for the conference by L.I.Bozhovich, A.V.Zaporozhets, D.B.El'konin.

THE MEANING OF THE CULTURAL-HISTORICAL THEORY OF L.S.VYGOTSKY FOR THE MODERN PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH OF PERSONALITY

L.I. Bozhovich

L.S.Vygotsky's theory of the cultural-historical development of the psyche, of the higher psychic functions of human being, their development and interfunctional relations, that were called "psychic systems", opened the way for research of child personality, which was continued by the scientific group lead by L.I.Bozhovich.

The conducted research allowed coming to the following conclusions:

The affective and motivational aspects of the child personality develop according to the same laws as the cognitive psychic processes do, – this fact was also confirmed during the experimental research of will (volition).

The fundamental characteristic of the personality consists in its directedness: during the process of development a relatively stable motivational hierarchy is constructed.

Such systemic neoformations as character traits (or personality qualities) are formed on the basis of acquisition of certain behavioral patterns. This process requires the obligatory condition – presence of the motive corresponding to this particular trait, which impels the child to master these specific forms of behavior.

The feelings that emerge during the social development of the human needs are constructed

differently, they are tool-mediated in comparison to the elementary emotions, they obtain a different place within the structure of personality and they fulfill different functions within the behavior, performance and psychic development of a human being.

In the core of child personality development there are the processes of 'intelligentization' and "volitization" of the affective-motivational sphere, and the formation of the higher psychic systems upon the basis of such processes. These systems are the source of a particular motivational force which is specific for human beings.

L.S.VYGOTSKY'S ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF EMOTION

A.V. Zaporozhets

During all his scientific activity L.S. Vygotsky kept returning to the elaboration of the theoretical aspects of the psychology of emotions, warning against "intelligentism" in the attempts of understanding the laws of human spiritual life.

Vygotsky saw emotions as an inner psychological mechanism of connecting thinking with the sensory-object activity/performance of the subject, who is not only contemplating the surrounding world passively, but relates to it with certain bias, actively alters it in correspondence with his/her needs and interests.

Taking guidance from the assumptions stated by Vygotsky in "The Problem of Emotions" and the "Psychology of Art", and also in the works dedicated to the development of normal and abnormal children, the author and his colleagues conducted a series of psychological, psychopaedagogical and psychophysiological research of the genesis of emotions in toddlers and preschool children.

The research shows that:

The appearance of social emotions is innately influenced by the formation of the simplest prosocial motives in children; these motives are created as a result of acquisition of certain requirements that adults establish concerning the child's activity. Due to certain circumstances the child starts establishing these requirements towards him/herself and so they turn into the intrinsic motives of his/her behaviour (Ya.Z.Neverovich);

The internal emotional attitude towards people, the beginning of empathic experiences that play an important role in the development of the prosocial motives of behaviour, evolves during the child's overt practical interaction with other people; the goal-oriented forms of such interaction are cultivated and regulated by the society;

The main type of activity (and at the early stages of development – the only type of activity) that determines the development of the child's feelings, is the practical sensory-object activity which is conducted jointly and within the process of communication with other people. Later, upon the basis of this overt practical activity a specific internal activity is built – that is the activity of affective imagination, which is, as Vygotsky put it, the “second expression” of human emotions, during which the emotions are not only expressed, but also transformed and developed.

During the process of development the anticipatory emotional regulation of actions emerges, that allows the child to avoid actions that are erratic and non-adequate for his/her needs and value dispositions (these data were obtained by Neverovich);

Vygotsky's assumption about the higher, specifically human, “intelligent” emotions being cortical was confirmed; the physiological basis of these emotions is a complicated interaction among the cortical and sub-cortical mechanisms (data obtained during the electrophysiological investigations by T.P.Khrizman and her colleagues).

The study of development of child emotions, as Vygotsky correctly indicated, is very important for the elaboration of the general theory of the ontogenetical development of the human psyche. It is also important for the solution of some psycho-paedagogical problems of child rearing, because this process necessarily requires the formation of certain emotional attitude towards one's surroundings, according to the values, ideals and norms of the society.

The research conducted by Zaporozhets et al. indicates the existence of tightly-knit and sequentially evolving relations between the intellectual and the motivational-emotional aspects of child personality.

VYGOTSKY TODAY

D.B.El'konin

The scientific explorations of L.S.Vygotsky were focussed on the problem of the consciousness/awareness. Tracking the way of investigation of this problem from the idea of consciousness as a “reflex of reflexes” to the theory of systemic and meaningful structure of the consciousness is important for those who would like to highlight the new things that Vygotsky brought to science and to understand some issues that were not so thoroughly described by him.

The first large circle of theoretical and experimental research by Vygotsky and his colleagues was dedicated to outlining the particular features of the human psyche and was directed against the tendencies to “biologize” it.

The bottom line for this research was drawn by Vygotsky in his manuscript “The Tool and the Sign” (that was finally published in the 6th volume of the “Collected Works” in 1984). In this work one may find a very important conclusion about the necessity of total review and re-description of the structure of the “elementary” processes in child behaviour.

First of all, Vygotsky constructed a new method of investigation that was called the experimental-genetic method – a way to artificially reconstruct the genesis of a process investigated. The application of a method requires a hypothesis. The essence of Vygotsky's hypothesis is that all the higher psychic processes are tool-mediated by specific signs (symbols) which emerged during the historical development.

Vygotsky kept mentioning that the process of tool-mediation is a social process: the psychic functions are given in the form of social relationships which are the source of development of these functions in human beings. This assumption holds the foundations of a new, non-classical psychology.

The experimental research of concept formation could be considered a turning point on the road to the solution of the main problem. This research showed that the sign becomes a sign only at the

point when it is saturated with meaning. And a sign saturated with meaning can mediate social forms of interaction which constitute the foundation of development of the consciousness.

The works of the later period form an inseparable, tightly-knit bundle. The research on scientific concepts showed that meaning exists only within the context of the system and is determined by the system. The research on written speech lead to theoretical investigation of internal speech, and at the same time it allowed to state that the thought does not pour itself into words but comes to life by means of words. Thus, these studies encompass not only investigation of the structure itself, but also of the dynamics, life of that structure.

The turn towards investigation of the concepts enriched the experimental-genetic method signif-

icantly; this method deals not with elements, but with units. Vygotsky managed to find the smallest unit of unity of thought and speech in the meaning of the word.

Almost all the research of the last stage was organically connected with the issue of education and psychic development. Solving this problem, Vygotsky managed to resolve the contradiction that existed between the acquisition of culture and development of higher psychic functions.

It is difficult to find among our contemporaries a scholar with such a wide range of scientific interests as Vygotsky had. He drew in the information from the most various areas: defectology, neuroscience, psychiatry etc. – all that to answer the general questions of psychological science, to construct a new non-classical psychology.

The editorial board of the journal congratulates honoured Gita L'vovna Vygodskaya with her anniversary and joins the best wishes of the author

Gita L'vovna honourably continued the family tradition. During many years she worked with deaf children, published several works based upon her experience. These works are widely quoted in textbooks and monographs. Her former students are spread across the whole world, but they never forget to wish her happy birthday, to invite her for a visit, to tell her about their successes.

Gita L'vovna is often invited to various psychological meetings to tell about her father. She clearly sees the importance of a living word, of a daughter's testimony – and one should not forget that for nine years she was the subject of L.S.Vygotsky's research, his observations and experiments, – and thus she eagerly shares her memories about him. To a large degree, it was these memoirs that made Gita L'vovna's book "L.S.Vygotsky.Touches to the portrait" (co-authored with T.M.Lifanova, published in 1996) a bestseller.

The main concern of Gita L'vovna is the archive of Lev Semyonovich. She carefully keeps each small piece of paper, each notebook filled by her great father's script, – she is aware that all these belong not to her, but to the History. She is the keeper of these testimonies and she sees to augment them further. The translations of L.S. Vygotsky's works are sent to her from all over the world, and they contribute a lot to her library. One can say that Gita L'vovna binds together the time, the past and present, preserving them for future.

We would like to wish her very many happy returns of the day in good health and in that remarkable clarity of mind that she possesses now, to be surrounded – as now – by human kindness and warmth, by beauty that is so necessary to everyone, and especially – to such an extraordinary woman as Gita L'vovna Vygodskaya.

K.M.Korepanova

Centennial of Alexander Vladimirovich Zaporozhets (1905 – 1981)

Alexander Vladimirovich Zaporozhets, famous Russian psychologist, disciple of L.S. Vygotsky, was, together with A.N. Leont'yev and A.R. Luria, one of the founders of the activity theory in Russian psychology. He studied the emergence and development of sensory, perceptual, mental actions. He formulated the principle of emotional correction of behavior and activity, elaborated the theory of development of voluntary movements

and actions. He also made significant contribution to child psychology, suggested a dynamic theory of "mental age".

In the next issue of the Journal there will be an article dedicated to the life and works of A.V. Zaporozhets.

V.P. Zinchenko

90th anniversary of Mikhail Grigorievich Yaroshevsky (1915 – 2001)

On August, the 26th, 2005, Mikhail Grigor'evich Yaroshevsky, one of the most prominent theoreticians and historians of psychology, would have turned 90 years old.

The work of M.G. Yaroshevsky always was closely connected with the Psychological Institute (now PI RAE). In 1945 he presented the dissertation on "A.A. Potebnia's theory of language and consciousness".

One of the most important contributions made by M.G. Yaroshevsky was the elaboration of the theory of studying science, methodology and principles of historical psychology of science. This approach suggested keeping in mind the historical circumstances and other determinants that influenced the emergence and development of psychological theories and scientific schools. M.G. Yaroshevsky analyzed many of the Russian scientific psychological schools – the schools of Chelpanov, Vygotsky, Smirnov, Teplov. He analyzed the factors that contributed to their emergence, dynamics of their develop-

ment and stagnation, and proved the importance of studying the social situation of development of psychological science in Russia. He was the first to study and describe particular characteristics of Russian psychology which gave birth to what he called "behavior studies", which was founded upon the works of Sechenov, Lange, Ukhtomsky, Pavlov, Bernstein and which was developed further in the works of Rubinstein and Leont'yev.

The last decades of M.G. Yaroshevsky's life were exceptionally productive; during these years were written "L.S. Vygotsky: in search for the new psychology", "Historical psychology of science", "Behavior studies: the Russian path" etc.

The ideas of M.G. Yaroshevsky keep living in the works of his disciples, his numerous opponents, and in the works of the Laboratory of historical psychology of personality, which was founded by him.

T.D. Martsinkovskaya

OUR AUTHORS

- Valsiner Jaan** — Professor, Clark University, Worcester, USA.
jvalsiner@clarku.edu
- Vasiliuk Feodor Yefimovich** — Ph. D. Dean of the Faculty "Psychological Consulting" of the MSUPE.
- Veresov Nikolai Nikolaevich** — Ph. D., Researcher at the Oulu University (Finland).
nikolai.veresov@oulu.fi
- Zinchenko Vladimir Petrovich** — Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education, Professor of the Institute of General and Special Education, Head of the Psychology Department of the International University of Nature, Society and Human "Dubna".
Zinchrae@mtu-net.ru
- Korepanova Klara Mikhailovna** — Head of the Instructional Division of the L.S. Vygotsky Psychological Institute of the RSGU.
- Kravtsova Yelena Yevgen'yevna** — Ph. D., Director of the L.S. Vygotsky Psychological Institute of the RSGU.
- Margolis Arkady Aronovich** — Ph. D. First vice-rector of the MSUPE, Professor of the Pedagogical Psychology Department and of the International Department of Cultural-Historical Psychology.
amargolis@mail.ru
- Martsinkovskaya Tatiana Davydovna** — Ph. D., Professor, Head of the Laboratory of Personality Psychology of the Psychological Institute of the Russian Academy of Education.
marsinkovskaya@isicreate.ru
- Mescheriakov Boris Gur'yevich** — Ph. D., Professor of the Psychology Department of the International University of Nature, Society and Human "Dubna".
borlogic@orexovo.net

Mikhailov Felix Trofimovich

– Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education Head Researcher of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, Head of the Department of Philosophy and Culturology of the Moscow State Medical University, Professor of the Psychological Faculty of the M.V. Lomonosov MSU.
felix@starnet.ru

Munipov Vladimir Mikhaylovich

– Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education, Professor of the Ergonomics Department of the Moscow Institute of Radio Electronics and Automation.
munipov@HCI.ru

Rubtsov Vitaly Vladimirovich

– Ph. D., Professor, Member of the Russian Academy of Education, Rector of the MSUPE, Director of the Psychological Institute of the Russian Academy of Education.

Sapogova Yelena Yevgen'yevna

– Ph. D., Professor, Head of the Psychology Department of the Tula State University.
Les@dom.tsu.tula.ru

Khoziev Vadim Borisovich

– Ph. D., Professor, Head of the Clinical Psychology Department of the International University of Nature, Society and Human "Dubna".
v_hoziev@mail.ru

Contents

INTRODUCTION

To the authors and readers <i>V.P. Zinchenko, B.G. Mescheriakov,</i> <i>V.V. Rubtsov, A.A. Margolis</i>	3
---	---

THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

Social interaction and education: cultural-historical context <i>V.V. Rubtsov</i>	6
Tool-mediation within cultural-historical theory and its practical implications <i>V.B. Khoziev</i>	9
Culture, development, and methodology in psychology: beyond alienation through data <i>J. Valsiner</i>	11
Hugo Munsterberg, founder of psychotechnics, as the precursor of L.S.Vygotsky in the methodology of psychological research <i>V.M. Munipov</i>	13
The autobiographic narrative in the context of cultural-historical psychology <i>Ye.Ye. Sapogova</i>	14

DISCUSSIONS AND DISCOURSE

Prayer-Silence-Psychotherapy <i>F.Ye. Vasiliuk</i>	16
The principle of active rest in thinking and action <i>V.P. Zinchenko</i>	17

EMPIRICAL RESEARCHES

Psychometric approach to child animism <i>B.G. Mescheriakov</i>	18
--	----

THE PROBLEM OF DEVELOPMENT

Leading activity in developmental psychology: the concept and the principles <i>N.N. Veresov</i>	20
The concept of age psychological novel formations in modern developmental psychology <i>Ye.Ye. Kravtsova</i>	23

OT THE OCCASION OF THE 75th ANNIVERSARY OF V.V. DAVYDOV

Readiness for thinking <i>V.P. Zinchenko</i>	25
V.V. Davydov – founder of scientific school and director of the Psychological Institute <i>V.V. Rubtsov</i>	28
The problems of method in cultural-historical theory <i>F.T. Mikhailov</i>	30

ARCHIVE

The story of one Conference	32
-----------------------------------	----

MEMORABLE DATES

The editorial board of the journal congratulates honoured Gita L'vovna Vygotskaya with her anniversary and joins the best wishes of the author <i>K.M. Korepanova</i>	35
Centennial of Alexander Vladimirovich Zaporozhets (1905 – 1981) <i>V.P. Zinchenko</i>	36
90th anniversary of Mikhail Grigorievich Yaroshevsky (1915 – 2001) <i>T.D. Martsinkovskaya</i>	37
<i>Our Authors</i>	38