The technological laws of education process are considered to be the main principles of the contemporary theory of sense and sense formation that give the possibility to analyze the educational process as the sense reality and determine the specific features of education components: technologies, methods, forms and ways of its organization.

Retargeting of methodological approaches, the change of theoretical constructs, search of the new principles of construction of practice-oriented educational programs that would be adequate to new understanding of the man as a complex self-organizing system extricate applied branches of psychology, and in the first place its directions connected to development of education at an absolutely new level, giving an impulse to such spheres as psychopedagogics (A.G. Asmolov, L.M. Fridman), practical psychology of education (A.G. Asmolov), human education (V.E. Klochko), sense pedagogics (A.G. Asmolov, M.C. Nirova), sense didactics (I.V. Abakoumova). These new branches of science that are frontier between psychology and pedagogics, have chosen as their perspective and practical direction—pedagogics, and as essential basis—psychology. However only psychological explanations of these and those approaches aren’t enough, the system of education itself should embody a real cognitive mechanism for a really cognoscitive child.

The objects (in the process of ontogenesis and cognition) surround a person before, they acquire any meaning for him and it is the main contradiction, “the development crisis” of child’s consciousness. The role of the adult is to deduce the studied object (process, phenomenon, objective regularity) to the border of sense field, to the border of transitional form of objective and subjective worlds, revealing sense, created by the object of cognition to cognoscitive subject. Sense formation is the main process happening in the combined psychological system. Situational senses and senses of the levels of values (superior senses) is the new dimension of human being, the level of his general and personal development. In this situation an adult, a teacher is a mediator in the relationship between the culture and the child, between civilization achievements and the pupil. That must be implemented into new didactic systems, new educational technologies.

The particular block of problems is related to motive—dynamic components of education, to rethinking of already existing and elaboration of new methods and edu-
cation technologies. The subject of an educational process is the content field that nourishes pupils’ sense formation and sense awareness, must receive a “life impulse”.

It must be placed in the space dividing it between the teacher and students, between students and groups. It must be located in time and differentiated, filling the sequence of procedures of the teacher’s and pupil’s actions. These are technological aspects of the educational process. The technologies of education are represented as a mechanism of content self-realization, and thus updating the content in any direction, including sense formation, it is also necessary to update technological culture in an adequate, synchronous way. The content and technologies turn out to be organically interconnected: if the content “nourishes” personality development, its sense structures, the technologies start, launch the development. If the technology is not adequate to content, it won’t work, due to the principle of isomorphic content accordance, the principle of inter correspondence is violated. However if content component of education has been recently filled with meaning, oriented to development of sense sphere of pupils, the technologies still remain representative and cognitive. This contradiction generates the necessity to find such technologies in educational process that will introduce it to the level of sense sphere through sense formation and sense discovering by the pupils themselves. The technology of educational activity must be revised according to mechanisms of sense formation, characteristic to this process. The interpretation of so called “sense problems”, which are regarded in personality psychology as a “try to find the true motives of the behaviour” is a subject of much current interest. Unconscious senses initiate multidirectional idea movement trying to find the way to conscious level interfering into thinking content. In the course of “sense problem” resolving there is an internal work of personality on corresponding motives in several intersecting planes: on motives that make personality overcome internal and external barriers to achieve the goal, on relation of this motive to the others that are displayed in the conscious, and could be the reasons of this activity, on assessing this motive and its relationship to adopted norms and ideals of the personality, on corresponding the motive with existing opportunities from the point of view of this personality, it means perceived Self image, comparing one's own motives with the other people’s motives. (A.G. Asmolov, V.V. Stolin). During the educational process the need of putting the new senses to conscious level is the catalyst (the contradiction between the desire to express his feelings and passions and the limited verbal skills to do it) induces introspection and self-studying.

The dialogue is the most significant technology of pupils’ sense formation. It was showed that interpersonal dialogue should be considered from internal and external sides. The dialogue can be pair between the teacher and the pupil on the outside. It has much more complicated structure when the teacher works with the group of students: their answers and questions, initiated by the teacher and closed to the teacher, repel the similar actions of the other pupils, come into contact with them, influence the cogitativity, maintaining it and enriching, or on the contrary, rejecting it, trying to get away. Such a dialogue is fairly called multiple, not meaning the multiple pairs of “teacher-pupil”, existing here, but complicated radial structure, starting from the
teacher and returning to him, permanently bending and changing its radial form. The dialogue between groups of pupils where the teacher plays the role of the unique arbiter is the most outstanding. The notion of “collective reasoning object” can be applied to this dialogue. The types of the dialogue can be endlessly multiplied “pupil-computer”, “educational programme-pupil” and others.

In the context of this research the essential in the dialogue is its internal side. Pupils’ judgement closed to the teacher, directed and verified by the general logic of the dialogue, the opinion of the other participants, and the possible deviations of their behaviour, for example, in the situation of misunderstanding are regulated not only by external motive of the teacher and pupils, but mainly by correspondence of the subjective internal pupils’ experience with the content of the discussed question, involuntary self-actualization of different mental elements under terms of interaction of dialogue participants. Reflexion of pupils is filled with sense- in pairs and situations of multiple dialogue and in the case of disagreement with other pupils, and when their opinion is changing. Personality “Ego” is communicating with “others” like the writer, in M.M. Bakhtin’s opinion, is associated with his main character. “The others” can be a teacher, classmates or somebody else who reflected in the child. The dialogue is spreading between personal and essential features, as an internal and external “Ego”, like existing personality and individual traits.

Sense formation, sense updating, sense rising are acts that permanently accompany the above-mentioned variants of dialogue of the pupil “with himself” (including the dialogue with “the other”), they take the form of their premises, an actualizing factor or their results.

The most significant characteristic of the dialogue in the education, thanks to which we achieve the above-mentioned spiritual product consists in the fact that the dialogue is developed and is organized on the equal parity basis for the parties concerned. That’s why in situations of subject–object type, that maximum limit children with their choice of sense priorities, the dialogue is impossible. The educational process acquires here the qualities of imposing ideas, not “bringing up” the meaning, the teacher’s pressure deprives the pupils of independent thinking and destroy the dialogue basis. Subject-subject model of education doesn’t only give such opportunity to pupils, but stimulates them.
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