Introduction: social role as a unit of analysis

Adolescence is probably the most controversial age period in the framework of the Cultural-Historical Theory. Though it regularly becomes the focus of research, there is still no consent even on such fundamentals as the leading activity and the new formations, as well as on the very character of this psychological age (critical or stable). In comparison with the other life periods, elaborated in CHT, its structure remains poorly designed and rather unclear [8, p. 72—74]. A possible explanation for this paradox might be the complexity of spotting the “ideal form” for the age, which lies on the boundary of childhood and adulthood. Obviously enough, the “ideal” form of adolescence should be connected with the process of socialization — that is, with the transition to the “world of adults”. However, revealing the developmental mechanisms behind this transition is challenging indeed.

For facing this challenge, a unit of analysis is needed that could be applied for analyzing both individual and social aspects of the transition. This unit of analysis was suggested by L.S. Vygotsky in his unfinished, thus little-known work “Concrete Human Psychology”, where he introduces the concept of social role and coins it as a mechanism that regulates the relationship between higher mental functions: “Social roles (judge, doctor) determine the hierarchy of functions: that is, functions change hierarchy in different spheres of social life. Their collision = drama” [15, p. 1030]. This short yet comprehensive remark indicates that social roles may be consid—
ered signs, which regulate human behavior. In the same text L.S. Vygotsky argues that studying the hierarchy of higher mental functions and, consequently, roles as their regulating mechanisms, represents a fundamental research aim in relation to adolescence: “The task in adolescents … to study different spheres of behavior (professional complex etc.), the structure and hierarchy of functions, their relations, and collisions” [15, p. 1031]. Thus, for L.S. Vygotsky, understanding the content of development in adolescence requires the analysis of “role dramas” that emerge when a child starts to get actively involved in the system of social relations. The question is: why the research aim, formulated by L.S. Vygotsky, has remained almost neglected by CHT scholars for over one hundred years?

The answer to this question is intricately linked with the history of the concept of “role” in Russia’s psychological tradition. For a long time, this term was literally forced out of developmental psychology (except for the role in children’s play), and its content was reduced exclusively to a set of social functions that an individual performs depending on the surrounding social context. The most vocal opponents ascribed to the concept a connotation of “hypocrisy” and “programmed behavior”, which still seems to persist in Russia’s psychology [8, p. 73–74].

The standpoint of the founder of the CHT was quite different. In his work [15] L.S. Vygotsky clearly indicated the regulating function of social roles as of cultural signs. And, since signs are interiorized, it is impossible to perceive roles as some kind of “masks” imposed on the individual “from the outside”. Moreover, exactly as “pereghivanije”, considered by L.S. Vygotsky as a unit of personality and environment, which reflects the unity of social and personal aspects of the developmental process, social roles act as double-facet units, directed both “in-ward” (individual plane) and “out-ward” (social plane). The “individual content” of the role is determined by the personality, while its “social content” relates to the cultural-historical context. Roles as social functions are thus never simply “played out” by the individual. They are always refracted through the personality and creatively “lived through”.

Thus, interpreting roles from L.S. Vygotsky’s perspective opens a new dimension for understanding the process of development in different psychological ages — particularly, in adolescence, which is apparently the sensitive period for interiorizing roles and role patterns. It is by acquiring new roles that adolescents “enter” the adult world and try to find their place in the complex system of social relationships existing in their culture. This complex system of relationships, represented by various social roles, may be regarded as the “ideal form” of adolescence. Interactions with this ‘ideal form’ presuppose adolescents’ acquiring (interiorizing) roles as specific cultural signs, which may be regarded as the main content of development during this age period [8].

Since any kind of sign interiorization does not happen immediately, certain time and space is needed for “trying the roles on” and experimenting with various patterns of role behavior. Experimenting with roles may be thus perceived as the leading activity of adolescence, where new formations of this age period (including theoretical thinking, reflection, and self-awareness) emerge and develop.

This point of view can be illustrated with the examples of adolescents’ everyday practices, as “role experimenting literally permeates them” [6, p.40]. In whatever interactions adolescents emerge — creating profiles and making friends in social networks, joining a subculture etc. — they seem to be testing images and piloting role patterns. These explorative, play-like activities are spaces for adolescents’ development, since it is through these practices that they give content to the roles they acquire and make them personally meaningful.

From this perspective, constructing the zone of proximal development in adolescence requires conditions where adolescents could creatively experiment with roles. Drama is one of the means for creating such environments in a school setting.

Methodology: drama as a tool for constructing the ZPD

In the last few decades different kinds of drama-based pedagogies have widely spread all over the world. Theater and drama are applied for resolving various developmental, educational, and cultural tasks [1], [2], [3], [4], [10], [12], [14]. They are also used as tools for socialization and rehabilitation of different groups of children and adolescents, including those with poor social backgrounds or special educational needs [9], [11], [13]. In many countries drama is step by step earning a place in the national curriculum, where it is applied both for teaching content in specific disciplines as well as for developing life competences and soft skills.

The growing popularity of drama may be explained by its demonstrated effectiveness, particularly in the work with adolescents. Research shows that adolescents are willing to engage in drama activities and are likely to remain motivated for participation for longer times in comparison with other learning formats [4]. However, there is not much evidence, why does this happen, and what psychological mechanisms determine this engagement.

We may assume, that attractiveness of drama for adolescents relates to the developmental content of this age period. As mentioned above, one of the main psychological tasks in adolescence consists in acquiring new cultural signs — social roles, which is done through experimenting with them. Theater and drama represent perfect spaces for these experiments, which allow to try on roles and role patterns. This basic feature of drama-based activities is often intuitively used by teachers and educators, who are in search for ways of engaging adolescents in the learning process. However, if we want to apply
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drama as a developmental tool, we need to understand how exactly it can create the zone of proximal development and deliberately use this knowledge in the work with adolescents.

A few words now need to be said about the concept of ZPD in relation to adolescence. Most often ZPD is considered in the context of child-adult interactions, where the adult, as the bearer of the “ideal form”, literally “guides” the child, and the child, in their turn, interiorizes the “ideal forms” of the adult [10]. In this context, while constructing a developing environment, the accent is put on interiorization, when external processes turn into internal functions.

There is yet another possible “reading” of ZPD, which is elaborated, particularly, by V.V. Rubtsov, and is exclusively interesting in relation to adolescence. This interpretation considers ZPD in terms of joint activity, which triggers profound changes in all the participants of the interaction, including the adult [7]. From this perspective the adult is not the one, who is “guiding” the child, but rather the one creating a space for an engaging interaction (here the Russian word “obschnost’”3, designating a particular kind of community, is appropriate to use). This approach emphasizes “pereghivanije”, emerging in the process of joint activity, and turns the interaction into a series of “micro-dramas”, which result in qualitative developmental shifts. It also allows to focus not exclusively on the process of interiorization, but also on that of exteriorization, paying attention to the inner contradictions and emotions that reveal themselves in the process of interaction (fig. 1).
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Fig. 1. Applying drama for constructing the ZPD

However, as O.V. Rubtsova and T.A. Poskakalova argue, not any kind of drama-based activities may be perceived as a developing environment [10]. Very often drama in school settings is reduced to a format, where the teacher chooses a scenario for a performance and distributes roles that adolescents are supposed to play out. Students are rarely given the chance to creatively contribute to writing of the scenario, or to the elaboration of characters.

To become a tool for constructing the ZPD in adolescence, it is essential that:

- **drama is regarded as a process-oriented, rather than a product-oriented activity**: this does not imply that the final product (performance, improvisation etc.) is not important; it rather implies, that the process of its preparation is not less important than the final product per se;
- **drama-making process allows to engage adolescents in different kinds of activity**, which means that adolescents do not just play out roles, but also contribute to play writing, costume making etc;
- **drama-making process provides opportunities for experimenting** — particularly, with various roles and means of interaction, which presupposes role exchanges during the drama-making process;
- **drama is perceived as a “safe” place**, which means that adolescents are encouraged to experiment, to express themselves, and are not afraid of a failure or of a bad mark;
- **sessions of reflection (reflexive communication) are included into the drama-making process**, which means that adolescents are encouraged to reflect upon their interactions, discuss what and how they are doing in the process of joint activity, and share their emotions from the process.

Thus, applying drama for constructing the ZPD in the work with adolescents requires creating a particular kind of setting, where different types of interactions are intentionally organized in a way, that could encourage for experiments. The more diverse opportunities for trying and experimenting are provided, the more powerful the setting is from the developmental perspective.

An attempt to create such a setting was made in the framework of a research project, operated by Moscow State University of Psychology and Education in 2019—2021.

**Research Project “Digital Storytelling Theater”**

_A brief overview_

In 2019 a multidisciplinary research project “Digital Storytelling Theater” was launched by MSUPE in the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Contemporary Childhood. The project aims at introducing drama technologies into secondary school settings and applying it as a powerful tool for learning and development in adolescence. Within the framework of the project, the research group seeks to trace the influence of drama activities on learning motivation, communicative skills, reflexive abilities, critical thinking, and academic performance. It also aims at revealing the potential of using drama for boosting adolescents’ well-being.

---
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In the framework of the project theater is perceived as a particular kind of communicative educational environment, where adolescents can experiment with social and psychological objects — roles, positions, and relationships. The elaborated model of the “Digital Storytelling Theater” does not focus on the final product (play/performance) per se, but rather on the very process of its creation. The participants of the project are involved in various types of activity, including playwriting, filmmaking, video montages, creation of costumes and scenery. The diversity of activities and the possibility of changing roles allows the participants to experiment and to “try out” different means of interaction, which is essential for constructing the ZPD in adolescence.

In the period from October 2019 to May 2021 the research group:
• organized over 100 drama sessions with 303 adolescents from 4 schools in Moscow and Moscow Region;
• put on 3 plays, based on the scenarios, written by adolescents;
• shot and analyzed over 150 hours of video recordings of the drama sessions, workshops and rehearsals;
• recorded and analyzed over 50 interviews with the participants of the project, including adolescents, teachers, and school psychologists;
• analyzed over 200 adolescents’ reflexive diaries.

Because of the space constraints, the present article focuses on the experience of organizing drama only in one of the schools and, particularly, on those aspects of the research, which are relevant to the issue of constructing the ZPD.

Research design.

The research was conducted in a secondary school in the town of Stoopino (Moscow Region) from October 30th, 2020, to May 14th, 2021. 89 adolescents aged from 12 to 16 (forms 8 “B”, 8 “G” and 6 “N”) participated in the experiment. The experimental program consisted of 40 drama sessions, in which students from different forms took part. The sessions took place once a week and lasted for 1 hour 30 min. The sessions were led by two facilitators (members of the research project).

Methods, applied in the framework of the research, included:
• participant observation;
• analysis of the interactions between adolescents at different stages of the playmaking process;
• analysis of the products of the activity (scripts of the plays, written by adolescents; videos, shot by adolescents and used in the performance; sketches of sceneries and costumes etc.);
• testing before and after the drama project in experimental and control groups (testing included questionnaires on learning motivation, communicative skills, emotional intelligence, critical thinking, reflective abilities etc.);
• interviews with students and teachers at different stages of the drama project;
• analysis of reflexive diaries, filled in by the participants after each session;
• analysis of the interim and final scripts of the plays, written by the students.

The project included 6 stages, with each stage having its aims and working strategies. The research group set concrete goals for each stage, as well as for each drama session. Working strategies were adjusted for each session based on facilitators’ feedback after the sessions and adolescents’ reflexive diaries.

Data, collected in the framework of the project, was analyzed from different perspectives and with the help of various tools, including quantitative and qualitative methods. The results of the testing before and after the experiment demonstrate tangible shifts in communicative skills, reflexive abilities and learning motivation of adolescents, who took part in the drama project. However, this analysis is out of the scope of the paper. The present article focuses exclusively on the ways, in which drama was applied for constructing adolescents’ ZPD.

Data analysis.

Stage 1. Introduction to the project. During the first stage of the project the research group organized regular meetings with the teachers and school administrators. The meetings were designed for discussing the main objectives of the project and receiving more information about the students, involved in it. The analysis of the interviews with the teachers and administrators, as well as the data, received from participant observation and adolescents’ reflexive diaries in the first weeks of the project, testified that many students demonstrated poor academic achievement and extremely low learning motivation; many of them also had problems in communication both with the teachers and classmates. Moreover, in one of the classes there was a rather tense confrontation between a group of the class “leaders” and an adolescent with special educational needs. According to the school psychologist, Olga V. Shvedova, before the start of the project “Form G. has been going through an exceedingly difficult period. Most of the students in the class seemed disengaged and demotivated, it was extremely difficult to raise their interest during the lessons. This situation was aggravated by the general stress, caused by the pandemic. Moreover, the class was split into small groups, with one adolescent with special needs being literally an “outcast” of the group. He was constantly ousted from the group, and made fun of, and we couldn’t succeed in changing this situation”. Thus, the major request from the school was to boost adolescents’ learning motivation and help in instilling a team spirit, particularly in form “G”.

The fact that the class was split into groups was evident from the character of interactions during the first drama sessions: adolescents refused to exchange parts of the ZPD for the participants of the project. It embraced:
1. overcoming contradictions between the classmates and creating a more positive learning environment;
2. exchanging experience of living through the pandemic and transforming it into a resource.

The work with adolescents started with a few introductory sessions, where they were provided with information about the project and the members of the research group. During the introductory sessions, the facilitators organized “warming-up” exercises, which included role playing improvisations, storytelling, “tableaux”, “hot-seating” etc. The aim of these sessions consisted in motivating adolescents for taking part in the project and bringing together the groups, which the classes were split into. There were also a few workshops aimed at teambuilding and development of communicative skills. The “warming-up” exercises were later embedded into the structure of the sessions at all stages of the project and proved to be efficient for engaging adolescents in the drama-making process.

Stage 2. Exchanging experience. At the second stage of the project adolescents were asked to share their experience of living through the pandemic in the spring of 2020. The first sessions within this stage turned out rather challenging for the participants. The analysis of the interactions at this stage of the project allowed to identify at least two groups of emerging difficulties:
• stiffness; fear to speak about personal feelings and emotions;
• communicative challenges: difficulties in formulating messages, receiving and providing feedback.

In reflective diaries adolescents often reported, that discussing something with classmates, formulating messages, providing feedback, and coming to a consensus was particularly challenging: “I find it difficult to express my ideas and make others understand, what I mean”; “I often fail to find the right words for explaining my point of view”; “It’s really difficult for me to listen to others in the process of discussion” etc.

For facilitating adolescents’ work at this stage, the members of the research group elaborated numerous tasks, including writing narratives on behalf of different inanimate objects, which surrounded adolescents during the lockdown (smartphone, pillow, refrigerator, chewing gum etc.). The participants wrote short stories and even scenarios (including role playing and improvisations based on their “pereghivanije” of the situation). Finally, the participants were challenged to find examples of artistic works (poetry, fiction, non-fiction), featuring outbreaks of diseases.

During the sessions, adolescents described the situation of lockdown in terms of “boredom”, “fear”, “anger” and “anxiety”. Many of them also gave negative feedback on distant learning, which they considered “badly organized” and “demotivating”. Data showed that the situation of lockdown was a truly “dramatic” experience for adolescents, who witnessed their relatives and friends being ill, going to hospitals and some of them dying. Sharing this personal experience with each other was at first rather difficult for the participants. Adolescents were not used to discussing their “pereghivanije” in a classroom and it took a few sessions before they started freely describing their feelings and emotions. However, that was a turning point for “breaking the ice” in the relationships between the groups. During the sessions the participants discovered a lot of new things about each other; they also found out that they often experienced the same feelings, and facilitators used this a basis for building mutual understanding between the confronting groups.

Stage 3. Writing of the scenario. The third stage of the project was devoted to creating a scenario for the play. Adolescents were invited to make up a plot, based on their experience of the lockdown. For assisting adolescents, the facilitators introduced the participants into some theoretical aspects of playwriting, illustrating them by examples from the course of literature. The participants were then split into small groups and each of the groups was working on one of the scenes for the future play. The work in groups alternated with general discussions with the class. Within two months adolescents created a scenario of an original play.

The plot of the play is centered on the experience of a young boy, who is bored by the lockdown and suffers from loneliness in his room. While reading a book for his literature class, he takes a pen and writes a poem about a girl whom he likes. Then he sends the poem to one of his classmates, who makes fun of him. Frustrated and angry, the boy tears apart the paper with the poem and sits down on the floor. While he is overwhelmed, Emotions and Feelings (Anger, Anxiety, Disgust) surround him and start arguing with each other, what he shall do (see Fig. 2, illustrating the episode, where Disgust is talking with the boy). Finally, the boy falls asleep. He dreams, that the famous Russian poet A. Pushkin comes into his room and tries to persuade the boy, that he must keep writing poems, no matter what the others think of that. Encouraged by the poet’s words, the boy wakes up and posts his poem on Facebook. At the end of the play, the objects in the boy’s room come into the light and tell their stories of living through the pandemic in the room of the main character.

It is important to highlight, that the play was written exclusively by adolescents. The facilitators’ role consisted in encouraging adolescents for discussing the plot with their classmates and motivating them for working in groups. The facilitators also gave ideas about how the narratives, created at the second stage of the project, could be introduced into the play. However, the final decision about what and how to include was always made by adolescents.

Data analysis at this stage echoes many findings of P. Smagorinsky and J. Coppock, who conducted research on applying drama in teaching literature. The researchers emphasize the role of dialogue in students’ collaboration, since the dialogue helps them mediate their understanding of the story: “The production of the text appeared to serve two complementary functions. On the one hand, the dramatic text represented the students’
thinking about the story as they interpreted it through their experiences and knowledge. ... At the same time, the creation of the dramatic text helped shape the students’ thoughts about the story” [12, p. 386]. Another important issue were the collisions, which frequently emerged between the participants in the process of discussing the plot. Exactly as mentioned by P. Smagorinsky and J. Coppock, “The interactions within the group suggested that collaborative learning is not always the harmonious interaction it is often portrayed to be” [12, p. 385—386]. In our research it was indeed full of dramatic contradictions between the students, arguing who was to play which role, what words would be more appropriate for this or that character etc. However, despite the frequent dissonance, the work of the groups turned out to be very productive, and the students were willing to find a solution and move forward in their work.

Stage 4. Play production. At this stage, the participants split into three groups with each of them concentrating on a particular task, connected with the play production. One group of adolescents was involved in the play as actors; the other one was responsible for costumes and scenery, the third one — for multimedia and digital effects. There were also smaller teams within the two groups, focusing exclusively on the light, sound etc. Each group was offered a series of workshops including those on acting, scenic speech, stage movement, digital media etc. Adolescents could decide, which of the groups they wanted to join. They could also contribute to different groups, with some of them performing a role and at the same time participating in the creation of scenery or making videos for the stage screen.

An important element of this stage were role exchanges. Adolescents were encouraged to “move” between groups, providing feedback on the works of the other groups, and coordinating efforts to make the performance a holistic piece.

At this stage of the project an interesting episode took place. During one of the sessions the class was given a creative task on expressing emotions. The task turned out rather challenging for adolescents. However, adolescent with special educational needs succeeded in completing the task in a very original and creative way. As adolescents wrote in their reflexive diaries after the session “N.’s creativity at the session was absolutely astonishing” and “No one could have expected N. to be such a talented person”. This episode was a turning point in changing the group’s opinion about N. It also was a turning point for N. himself, as he wrote in his reflexive diary after the session: “I’ve discovered something about myself today. I didn’t expect myself to be capable of things that I did today”. By the end of this stage qualitative shifts occurred in the character of interactions between the participants of the class. Adolescents became much more flexible in switching partners and moving within groups in the process of joint activity. There was also a change in the relation to N., whom adolescents started to include in their interactions.

Stage 5. Reflexive communication. At this stage of the project the participants were encouraged to reflect upon the work that they have been doing. In fact, this stage did not take place only once, but it was embedded in every session, since adolescents were constantly encouraged to share their thoughts and emotions, give feedback to the work of the classmates, and fill in reflexive diaries for each session. Reflexive communication was organized in different formats: adolescents exchanged ideas in small groups and in a big circle; they were also invited to take part in numerous activities, aimed at boosting their reflexive skills.

As a particular stage of the project, reflexive communication presupposed adolescents’ watching recorded fragments of the rehearsals and discussing them. At this stage adolescents changed roles again — from actors and play-producers they turned into spectators, assessing the work, which has been done.

Stage 6. Final performance. At the end of the school year the final performance took place. Students from other forms as well as teachers and school administrators were...
invited as spectators. Due to the pandemic restrictions parents and other guests were not allowed in the school. After the performance adolescents were awarded certificates.

After the performance, the research group also took final interviews with the participants, teachers, and school administration. Particularly interesting was the interview with the school psychologist, Olga V. Shvedova, who admitted being “very skeptical” about the project at the beginning. “In fact, I didn’t believe in this drama project at all. I thought that there was absolutely no way how drama sessions could help in a class of demotivated adolescents, with a few being quite aggressive. But I saw them changing in the course of the project. They started communicating, they started engaging in joint activities… I can see that they’re willing to do something together. Many students showed themselves from a totally unexpected perspective. I think that the project helped us discover these students. The results actually exceeded all expectations”.

Literature teacher: “It seems that the group has accepted N. It really worked, this drama project!”

In the process of data analysis the research group tried to trace, how the personal “dramas” of the participants were transformed into an artistic representation of their experience. At the beginning of the project the experience of living through the pandemic was an internalized “perezhivanije” of each adolescent. At the stage of exchanging experience, the research group created conditions for externalizing the “perezhivanije” and making it an object of communication. At the next stages, adolescents created a “meta-drama” based on their personal experience, making a complex representation of their “life dramas” by means of art (see fig. 3).

Particularly important changes and transformations took place on the stage of reflexive communication, when the participants were encouraged to switch roles and assess their joint work from a new perspective. Role exchanges created the basis for mutual understanding and qualitative shifts in adolescents’ perceptions of each other and their own experience (“re-positioning”). The movement towards the ZPD was reflected in adolescents’ reflexive diaries: “It was a fantastic experience. I’ve discovered that I’m surrounded by very interesting people”; “Now I know that my classmates have many talents; it’s really great to study together”.

Thus, the original aim to help adolescents in overcoming their contradictions and create a more positive learning environment was achieved.

Some concluding remarks.

The analysis of a two-years’ work clearly demonstrates that applying drama for constructing the ZPD — particularly, in the work with adolescents — requires creating a space for experiments. This setting should be perceived as “safe” by adolescents, which means, that the participants should feel free to express themselves without being afraid of “a failure” or a bad mark. The more diverse opportunities for trying and experimenting are provided, the more powerful the setting is from the developmental perspective. It is particularly important to emphasize the significance of role exchanges and reflexive communication in drama sessions, which largely contribute to participants’ reconsidering their experience, their relationships, and, eventually, to the development of their agency.

It is obvious that not any kind of drama-based activities is consistent with the principles of a developing environment in the framework of the Cultural-Historical Paradigm. Creating such a setting is a challenging task, which requires specialists, who could organize the interaction of adolescents with each other and with the teacher. It means that not only adolescents, but primarily teachers need to be trained how to create such a setting and what strategies to use for constructing the ZPD in the work with concrete classes of students. Our research group is looking forward to further research in the framework of the project and introducing drama technologies into school practice.

Fig. 3. Tracing the role of “perezhivanije” at different stages of the project
Ролевое экспериментирование в подростковом возрасте: применение драмы для конструирования зоны ближайшего развития
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В 2019 г. в Московском государственном психолого-педагогическом университете старательно исследовательский проект «Инновационная модель организации экспериментально-исследовательской деятельности подростков («Мультимедиа-театр»). Основная задача проекта заключается в разработке, оценке эффективности и последующем внедрении технологий драматизации в школьную практику, с целью их применения в качестве средства обучения и развития. В фокусе настоящей статьи находится анализ возможностей применения драмы для построения зоны ближайшего развития у учащихся подросткового возраста. Автор статьи утверждает, что не всякий тип драматизации в образовательном процессе отвечает принципам построения развивающей образовательной среды в контексте культурно-исторической парадигмы. Создание такой среды — это особая исследовательская задача, которая требует организации таких форм деятельности и взаимодействия участников, как ролевое экспериментирование и рефлексивная коммуникация. На примере школьного спектакля на тему ситуации локдауна в период пандемии COVID-19, поставленной с классом подростков, показано, как драматизация, основанная на ролевом экспериментировании, может быть эффективной для преодоления групповых противоречий, повышения учебной мотивации и трансформации индивидуального «переживания» у детей подросткового возраста.
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