



---

## **DEVELOPING STUDENTS' THINKING PROCESSES THROUGH PSYCHODIAGNOSTICS AND PSYCHOCORRECTION IN SCHOOL PRACTICE**

Samarova Shohista Rabidjanovna

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology

Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Faculty of Pedagogy

---

### **Abstract**

This article discusses a practice-oriented framework for psychodiagnostics and psychocorrection of students' thinking processes in general secondary education. The paper conceptualizes thinking as a multi-component system (analytical reasoning, cognitive flexibility, executive regulation, and metacognitive control) that develops unevenly under the influence of learning conditions, emotional state, and communicative environment. The central problem addressed is the mismatch between curricular demands for higher-order thinking and the limited use of systematic school-based psychological assessment and correction programs. The article proposes a staged model that includes (1) screening and hypothesis-building, (2) targeted assessment of key thinking-related functions (attention control, working memory, cognitive flexibility, reasoning), (3) individual and group feedback, and (4) psychocorrection through structured cognitive training, metacognitive strategies, and classroom-integrated supports. To avoid "labeling" students, the framework emphasizes dynamic assessment principles, developmentally focused interpretation, and collaboration among psychologist, teacher, and parents. The expected outcomes of the proposed approach include clearer identification of learning-related cognitive barriers, improved self-regulation and task planning, reduction of avoidant academic behavior, and the formation of sustainable learning strategies. The article also highlights ethical and methodological requirements, including confidentiality, cultural and linguistic sensitivity, careful interpretation, and the prevention of diagnostic bias. The presented framework can be adapted to school resources and



---

may serve as a methodological basis for developing local psychodiagnostic protocols and intervention modules.

**Keywords:** Thinking processes; psychodiagnostics; psychocorrection; executive functions; metacognition; school psychology; cognitive development.

**O‘QUVCHILARNING FIKRLASH JARAYONLARINI MAKTAB  
AMALIYOTIDA PSIXODIAGNOSTIKA VA PSIXOKORREKSIYA  
ASOSIDA RIVOJLANTIRISH**

Samarova Shohista Rabidjanovna

Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti, Pedagogika fakulteti,

Psixologiya kafedrası, dotsent

**Annotatsiya:**

Mazkur maqolada umumta’lim maktabi sharoitida o‘quvchilarning fikrlash jarayonlarini psixodiagnostika qilish va psixokorreksiya orqali rivojlantirishga doir amaliy yo‘naltirilgan yondashuv yoritiladi. Fikrlash tahliliy mulohaza yuritish, kognitiv moslashuvchanlik, ijro funksiyalari (rejalashtirish, nazorat, inhibisiya) hamda metakognitiv boshqaruvdan iborat ko‘p komponentli tizim sifatida talqin qilinadi va bu tizimning rivojlanishi ta’lim sharoiti, hissiy holat hamda muloqot muhitiga bog‘liq holda notekis kechishi asoslanadi. Maqolada o‘quv dasturlarida yuqori darajadagi tafakkur ko‘nikmalariga talab ortib borayotganiga qaramay, maktab psixologik xizmatida muntazam diagnostika va tuzatish dasturlarining yetarli darajada yo‘lga qo‘yilmagani muammo sifatida ko‘rsatiladi. Taklif etilayotgan model 4 bosqichdan iborat: (1) skrining va gipoteza qo‘yish, (2) fikrlash bilan bog‘liq funksiyalarni maqsadli baholash (diqqat nazorati, ishchi xotira, moslashuvchanlik, mulohaza), (3) individual/guruhiy “feedback” va tushuntirish, (4) kognitiv mashqlar, metakognitiv strategiyalar hamda sinf jarayoniga integratsiyalashgan psixokorreksiya. Yondashuv “yorliq qo‘yish”ning oldini olish uchun dinamik baholash, rivojlanishga yo‘naltirilgan talqin, psixolog–o‘qituvchi–ota-onaning hamkorligini markazga qo‘yadi. Kutiladigan natijalar: o‘qishdagi kognitiv to‘siqlarni aniqroq ajratish, o‘zini-o‘zi boshqarish va rejalashtirishning



kuchayishi, akademik chekinish xatti-harakatlarining kamayishi, barqaror o‘qish strategiyalarining shakllanishi. Shuningdek, maxfiylik, madaniy-lisoniy moslik, ehtiyotkor talqin va diagnostik og‘ishlarning oldini olish kabi etik-metodik talablar yoritiladi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** fikrlash jarayonlari; psixodiagnostika; psixokorreksiya; ijro funksiyalari; metakognitsiya; maktab psixologiyasi; kognitiv rivojlanish.

### **Introduction**

In contemporary schooling, students are increasingly expected to analyze information, build arguments, compare alternatives, and solve novel problems. However, classroom reality often reveals an uneven development of thinking processes: some learners demonstrate strong factual knowledge but struggle with reasoning, planning, or flexible problem-solving; others show adequate reasoning potential but fail to regulate attention and persist on demanding tasks. School psychology can address this gap only when psychodiagnostics and psychocorrection are organized as a coherent development-focused system rather than as isolated one-time tests. The aim of this article is to propose a conceptual and practical framework for diagnosing and correcting thinking-related difficulties among school students in a manner that is feasible, ethically sound, and compatible with educational practice.

**Theoretical and methodological foundations:** Thinking is not a single ability but a structured system that includes several interrelated layers. The first layer is basic cognitive readiness: attention stability, processing speed, and working memory capacity that allow the student to hold task conditions and monitor steps. The second layer is reasoning operations: analysis, synthesis, abstraction, generalization, classification, and inference. The third layer is executive regulation: goal-setting, planning, inhibition of impulsive responses, cognitive flexibility, and error monitoring. The fourth layer is metacognitive control: awareness of one’s own understanding, choice of strategies, evaluation of effectiveness, and self-correction. In school practice, difficulties in “thinking” are often secondary—caused by weakness in attention control, limited working



---

memory, anxiety, low motivation, or negative academic experience. Therefore, a valid psychodiagnostic conclusion must integrate cognitive indicators with emotional-motivational context and learning history, avoiding simplistic “low ability” labels.

**The methodological position of the article is development-oriented.** Instead of treating assessment as a final verdict, psychodiagnostics is viewed as a tool for identifying developmental zones, selecting supports, and tracking progress. In this sense, dynamic assessment and guided performance tasks become especially important: they help differentiate between a stable deficit and a skill that emerges under scaffolding. Another key principle is ecological validity: the diagnostic picture should reflect the student’s real learning conditions. This requires combining standardized instruments with teacher observation, analysis of schoolwork, and structured interviews with parents and students.

**Psychodiagnostic toolkit:** A school-based assessment system should be built on a “minimum sufficient” toolkit that is reliable, time-efficient, and ethically appropriate. At the first (screening) level, the psychologist may use brief tasks that highlight risk zones: (a) attention and inhibition (e.g., interference tasks), (b) working memory load tasks, (c) basic reasoning patterns (matrix reasoning format), and (d) flexible set shifting tasks in simplified versions. Screening results are not used to make high-stakes decisions; they are used to formulate hypotheses and plan further assessment.

At the second (targeted) level, the toolkit should match the working hypothesis. If the primary concern is slow reasoning, the assessment focuses on analytical operations and abstraction; if the concern is impulsive responding and frequent mistakes, executive control and inhibition are prioritized; if the student “understands but cannot explain,” metacognitive monitoring and verbal mediation are assessed. In addition to performance tests, structured rating scales completed by teachers and parents (covering planning, organization, persistence, and emotional regulation) provide important contextual evidence. A crucial procedural element is triangulation: conclusions are made only when multiple sources converge (task performance + observation + schoolwork + interview).



---

When sources diverge, the psychologist should report uncertainty and propose additional observation rather than forcing a categorical label.

**Interpretation rules are central to preventing diagnostic bias.** First, scores (if used) should be interpreted cautiously, with attention to language proficiency, socio-cultural context, and test conditions. Second, the diagnostic narrative must separate “current performance” from “learning potential.” Third, the report should translate psychological findings into educationally meaningful recommendations: what to change in tasks, instructions, feedback, and support intensity. Fourth, confidentiality and respectful language are mandatory; the student’s dignity is protected by focusing on skills to be developed rather than on deficits to be fixed.

**Psychocorrection model and stages:** The proposed psychocorrection model is built as a four-stage cycle aligned with assessment results. Stage 1 (engagement and goal-setting): the student receives a clear, supportive explanation of the purpose of work (“to learn strategies and strengthen thinking skills”), and goals are formulated in behavioral terms (e.g., “plan steps before solving,” “check answers using a rule,” “keep attention for 10 minutes with breaks”). Stage 2 (strategy training): the psychologist teaches cognitive and metacognitive strategies using guided practice—problem decomposition, verbal self-instruction, error-check routines, and “if-then” planning. Stage 3 (skill automation and transfer): strategies are practiced on tasks similar to school content, with gradually reduced prompts, so that the student can use them in class and homework. Stage 4 (maintenance and monitoring): progress is tracked through brief repeated measures and teacher feedback; supports are adjusted, and the student learns self-monitoring tools (checklists, reflective questions, learning diary).

**In terms of content, psychocorrection may include three modules.** Module A (executive regulation): training inhibition, attention switching, time estimation, and planning. Module B (reasoning operations): exercises for classification, analogies, cause-and-effect reasoning, argument construction, and inference.



## *Modern American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*

ISSN (E): 3067-8153

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: [usajournals.org](http://usajournals.org)

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution  
4.0 International License.*

---

Module C (metacognition): developing awareness of understanding, predicting difficulty, selecting strategies, evaluating outcomes, and correcting errors. Importantly, psychocorrection should not be limited to “brain games.” Its effectiveness grows when strategies are embedded into real learning tasks and when teachers reinforce the same routines in classroom instruction.

**Implementation in the school context:** For sustainability, the framework requires coordination between the psychologist and teachers. The psychologist provides brief teacher-oriented guidelines: how to present tasks (clear steps, visual structure), how to scaffold thinking (questions that prompt analysis and justification), how to reduce cognitive overload (chunking, examples), and how to shape self-regulation (planning prompts, time cues, reflection). Parent involvement is also important, but it must remain realistic: parents can support routine, reduce stress, encourage constructive effort, and avoid punitive comparisons. A minimal implementation plan may follow a 6–8-week cycle with weekly small-group sessions (30–45 minutes) and short classroom-based supports; however, the framework is flexible and can be adapted to resource constraints.

Special attention should be paid to preventing “diagnostic stigma.” If a student is publicly treated as “weak,” anxiety and avoidance increase, and thinking performance deteriorates. Therefore, feedback should be private, strengths-oriented, and action-focused. Instead of “you have poor thinking,” the psychologist communicates: “you solve better when you plan steps; we will train a planning strategy,” or “your attention gets tired quickly; we will use short cycles and checks.” Such communication aligns with a growth mindset and improves engagement.

### **Discussion**

The main advantage of an integrated psychodiagnostic–psychocorrection approach is that it transforms assessment results into concrete developmental actions. In many schools, diagnostics remains descriptive (“attention low,” “memory weak”) without structured intervention. The proposed framework addresses this by linking each diagnostic hypothesis to specific correction



---

modules and classroom supports. Another advantage is methodological clarity: screening is separated from targeted assessment; conclusions are triangulated; interpretation emphasizes learning potential; and ethical safeguards are explicit.

**At the same time, limitations must be acknowledged.** First, schools differ in resources, and psychologists may have large caseloads; therefore, the toolkit must remain minimal and the intervention must prioritize the most impactful strategies. Second, standardized tests may not fully reflect classroom thinking; thus, ecological data and teacher observation remain indispensable. Third, comorbid emotional factors (anxiety, depressive symptoms, trauma, family stress) can substantially affect thinking performance; in such cases, psychocorrection of thinking must be combined with emotional support or referral.

### **Conclusion**

A school student's thinking processes can be effectively supported when psychodiagnostics is organized as a development-oriented system and psychocorrection is implemented through strategy training, metacognitive support, and classroom integration. The framework proposed in this article emphasizes staged assessment, careful interpretation, ethical safeguards, and collaboration between psychologist, teacher, and parents. Rather than "labeling" students, the approach aims to identify cognitive barriers and transform them into achievable developmental goals. As a result, students can improve self-regulation, reasoning quality, and learning persistence, which are crucial for academic success and personal growth.

### **References**

1. Vygotsky, L. S. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
2. Piaget, J. *The Origins of Intelligence in Children*. New York: International Universities Press, 1952.
3. Luria, A. R. *The Working Brain: An Introduction to Neuropsychology*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.



*Modern American Journal of Social Sciences  
and Humanities*

ISSN (E): 3067-8153

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: [usajournals.org](http://usajournals.org)

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution  
4.0 International License.*

- 
4. Sternberg, R. J. *Beyond IQ: A Triarchic Theory of Human Intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
  5. Raven, J., Raven, J. C., Court, J. H. *Manual for Raven's Progressive Matrices and Vocabulary Scales*. San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment, 1998.
  6. Beck, A. T. *Cognitive Therapy and the Emotional Disorders*. New York: International Universities Press, 1976.
  7. Meichenbaum, D. *Cognitive-Behavior Modification: An Integrative Approach*. New York: Plenum Press, 1977.
  8. Wechsler, D. *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (5th ed.)*. Bloomington, MN: Pearson, 2014.
  9. Stroop, J. R. Studies of Interference in Serial Verbal Reactions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1935, 18, 643–662.
  10. Diamond, A. Executive Functions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2013, 64, 135–168.