Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas

Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)

ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

PSYCHODIAGNOSTICS AND PSYCHOCORRECTION OF SCHOOL STUDENTS' THINKING PROCESSES: AN INTEGRATIVE SCHOOL-BASED FRAMEWORK

Samarova Shohista Rabidjanovna
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology,
Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Faculty of Pedagogy

Abstract

This article substantiates an integrative school-based framework for psychodiagnostics and psychocorrection of students' thinking processes in the context of increasing cognitive demands in contemporary education. The paper interprets thinking not as a single "ability," but as a system of interrelated processes (analysis, synthesis, comparison, generalization, inference, cognitive flexibility, and metacognitive regulation) that develop unevenly and are sensitive to learning conditions, emotional factors, and classroom interaction. The proposed framework connects three logically consistent stages: (1) multi-source psychodiagnostic assessment (screening, in-depth evaluation, and functional formulation), (2) targeted psychocorrection (strategy instruction, metacognitive scaffolding, executive-function support, and cognitive-behavioral elements), and (3) monitoring of dynamics with feedback to teachers and parents. Emphasis is placed on ethical and culturally sensitive assessment, the avoidance of rigid labeling, and the priority of developmental interpretation. The article offers a practical algorithm for school psychologists: defining the referral question, selecting tools, triangulating data, designing an individualized correction plan, and evaluating outcomes through repeated assessment. It is concluded that an integrated "diagnosis–intervention–monitoring" model can strengthen students'

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)

ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

reasoning, learning independence, and self-regulation while supporting inclusive and evidence-informed educational practice.

Keywords: Psychodiagnostics; thinking processes; cognitive assessment; school psychology; dynamic assessment; metacognition; executive functions; psychocorrection; learning difficulties; educational intervention.

O‘QUVCHILARNING FIKRLASH JARAYONLARI PSIXODIAGNOSTIKASI VA PSIXOKORREKSIYASI: MAKTAB AMALIYOTI UCHUN INTEGRATIV YONDASHUV

Samarova Shohista Rabidjanovna
Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti, Pedagogika fakulteti,
Psixologiya kafedrasi, dotsent

Annotatsiya:
Mazkur maqolada o‘quvchilarning fikrlash jarayonlarini psixodiagnostika qilish va psixokorreksiya orqali rivojlantirish masalasi ta’lim jarayonida ortib borayotgan kognitiv talablar sharoitida integrativ yondashuv asosida yoritiladi. Fikrlash bir butun “qobiliyat” sifatida emas, balki tahlil, sintez, taqqoslash, umumlashtirish, xulosa chiqarish, kognitiv moslashuvchanlik hamda metakognitiv boshqaruv kabi o‘zaro bog‘liq jarayonlar tizimi sifatida talqin qilinadi. Taklif etilayotgan model uch bosqichni birlashtiradi: (1) ko‘p manbali psixodiagnostika (skrining, chuqurlashtirilgan baholash va funksional xulosa), (2) maqsadli psixokorreksiya (strategiya o‘rgatish, metakognitiv “scaffolding”, ijro etuvchi funksiyalarni qo‘llab-quvvatlash va kognitiv-xulqiy elementlar), (3) dinamik monitoring va o‘qituvchi hamda ota-onaga qayta aloqa. Baholashda etik me’yorlar, madaniy moslik, “yorliq qo‘yish”dan saqlanish va rivojlantiruvchi talqinning ustuvorligi ta’kidlanadi. Maqolada maktab psixologi uchun amaliy algoritm (murojaat savolini aniqlash, vositalarni tanlash, ma’lumotlarni

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)
ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

triangulyatsiya qilish, individual korreksiya rejasini tuzish va natijani qayta baholash) taklif qilinadi. Xulosa sifatida “diagnostika–intervensiya–monitoring” integratsiyasi o‘quvchilarda mantiqiy fikrlash, o‘qishdagi mustaqillik va o‘z-o‘zini boshqarishni kuchaytirishi, inklyuziv va dalillarga tayangan pedagogik amaliyotni qo‘llab-quvvatlashi asoslanadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: psixodiagnostika; fikrlash jarayonlari; kognitiv baholash; maktab psixologiyasi; dinamik baholash; metakognitsiya; ijro etuvchi funksiyalar; psixokorreksiya; o‘qishdagi qiyinchiliklar; ta’limiy intervensiya.

Introduction

In modern schooling, students are expected to solve non-routine tasks, argue their opinions, transfer knowledge across contexts, and regulate their own learning. These demands highlight the practical importance of understanding thinking processes—not only as academic outcomes but as psychological mechanisms that can be assessed, supported, and developed. At the same time, schools often face two methodological risks: (a) reducing thinking to a single “IQ-like” score, and (b) separating diagnostics from intervention. In response, this article proposes an integrative school-based framework that links psychodiagnostics, psychocorrection, and monitoring into a coherent cycle.

Purpose and objectives: The purpose is to substantiate a practical and ethically grounded model for diagnosing and correcting thinking processes in students. The objectives are: (1) to clarify the psychological structure of thinking relevant to schooling; (2) to outline a multi-source diagnostic strategy suitable for school settings; (3) to describe evidence-informed psychocorrective directions that address identified functional difficulties; and (4) to propose a monitoring algorithm for evaluating progress and adjusting interventions.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)
ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

Conceptual foundations: Thinking in educational psychology is typically described as a complex functional system that includes reasoning operations (analysis, synthesis, comparison, abstraction, generalization), problem solving, and the regulation of cognitive activity. Cultural-historical and developmental perspectives highlight that higher mental functions develop through social interaction and mediated learning, while neuropsychological approaches emphasize the systemic organization of cognitive operations and their regulatory components. For school practice, these views converge on one important implication: thinking difficulties may reflect not only "low ability" but also insufficient strategy use, weak metacognitive control, limited language mediation, or executive-function deficits. Therefore, diagnostics must be oriented toward functional interpretation and development, not labeling.

Framework overview: The proposed model is structured as a continuous cycle: (1) psychodiagnostics (screening → in-depth evaluation → functional formulation), (2) psychocorrection (goal setting → intervention modules → classroom and family support), and (3) monitoring (reassessment → feedback → plan adjustment). Each stage is described below as a set of practical steps aligned with school constraints (time, resources, and the need for collaboration).

Psychodiagnostics of thinking processes: A school-oriented diagnostic strategy should start with a clearly formulated referral question. In practice, referrals may sound like: "The student solves tasks slowly," "cannot explain reasoning," "makes impulsive mistakes," "struggles with word problems," or "gets stuck and gives up." The psychologist's task is to translate such complaints into testable hypotheses about cognitive operations and regulation.

Step 1 (Screening and baseline data): Screening aims to quickly identify whether the difficulty is primarily cognitive, motivational, emotional, behavioral, or mixed. Recommended sources include: brief teacher interview, student self-

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)
ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

report (age-appropriate), review of notebooks and typical mistakes, and short screening tasks (e.g., simple classification, analogies, short reasoning items). The key principle is triangulation—no single source should dominate the conclusion.

Step 2 (In-depth assessment of cognitive operations): In-depth evaluation focuses on specific components of thinking. In school practice, nonverbal reasoning measures (e.g., Raven's Progressive Matrices) can help estimate abstract pattern recognition and inference under reduced language load. Selected subtests from standardized intelligence measures (e.g., Wechsler scales) can support a differentiated view of verbal comprehension, working memory, and processing speed. However, results should be interpreted cautiously, with attention to cultural and linguistic factors, fatigue, and test anxiety.

Step 3 (Assessment of executive functions and metacognition): Many "thinking problems" in learning are rooted in weak regulation: poor planning, reduced cognitive flexibility, limited inhibition, and fragile working memory. School psychologists can evaluate these aspects through structured observation (task approach, error correction behavior, persistence), simple planning tasks, switching tasks, and metacognitive interviews ("How did you decide?", "What was your plan?", "How did you check?"). This part of diagnostics often clarifies why a student "knows" the material but cannot apply it.

Step 4 (Dynamic assessment as a bridge to correction): A critical element of the integrative framework is dynamic assessment—evaluating how a student learns when prompted, scaffolded, and instructed in strategies during the assessment itself. Unlike static testing, dynamic assessment helps differentiate between (a) lack of prior knowledge, (b) weak strategy repertoire, and (c) deeper functional deficits. In school practice, even a simple mediated-learning procedure

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)
ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

(e.g., hinting, modeling, guided practice) can reveal the student's zone of proximal development and guide intervention planning.

Step 5 (Functional formulation and reporting): The diagnostic outcome should be expressed as a functional formulation rather than a rigid label. A functional formulation includes: (1) strengths (e.g., strong visual reasoning, curiosity, good vocabulary); (2) difficulties (e.g., weak inference in verbal tasks, slow planning, poor self-checking); (3) maintaining factors (e.g., anxiety, low motivation due to repeated failure, insufficient instruction in strategies); (4) recommended supports and correction goals; and (5) monitoring indicators.

Ethical and cultural considerations: School diagnostics should prioritize informed consent (as applicable), confidentiality, non-stigmatizing language, and fairness. If local norms for some tests are unavailable, the psychologist should avoid definitive claims and instead present results as qualitative indicators supported by multiple data sources. Importantly, any diagnostic conclusion should be actionable: it must directly inform intervention decisions.

Psychocorrection of thinking processes: In the proposed model, psychocorrection is not a generic "training" but a targeted set of modules aligned with the diagnostic formulation. The goal is to strengthen thinking operations and regulation in meaningful learning contexts.

General principles: (1) Developmental orientation—support growth rather than classify deficits; (2) strategy-based approach—teach "how to think" (planning, checking, reasoning steps); (3) metacognitive scaffolding—help students monitor their thinking; (4) gradual release—from guided practice to independence; and (5) transfer—apply strategies across subjects and real tasks.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)
ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

Module 1 (Strategy instruction for reasoning operations): Students may be taught explicit reasoning routines: identifying the task goal, extracting relevant information, selecting a method, executing step-by-step, and verifying the result. For example, in word problems, a structured method may include: "Read → underline key facts → restate in your own words → choose operations → solve → check with estimation." In language-based tasks, students may practice building arguments: claim → evidence → explanation → conclusion.

Module 2 (Metacognitive training): Metacognition can be strengthened through "think-aloud" protocols, self-questioning checklists, and reflection diaries. A practical tool is a short set of prompts: "What is my goal?", "What do I already know?", "Which strategy will I use?", "Am I stuck—what can I change?", "How will I check?". Over time, prompts are reduced as students internalize self-regulation.

Module 3 (Executive-function support): If diagnostics indicate regulation difficulties, correction should include planning and inhibition exercises embedded in meaningful tasks: sequencing activities, goal setting with sub-steps, time estimation, and switching between rules. Importantly, executive-function work is most effective when connected to real learning demands rather than isolated drills.

Module 4 (Cognitive-behavioral elements for unhelpful beliefs): Thinking difficulties are often accompanied by maladaptive beliefs ("I'm stupid," "I always fail," "It's useless to try"), which reduce persistence and learning engagement. Simple cognitive-behavioral techniques can help students reinterpret errors as feedback, practice adaptive self-talk, and set realistic effort-based goals. This module should be handled sensitively and within the psychologist's competence boundaries.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)
ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

Module 5 (Classroom and family collaboration): Psychocorrection becomes more effective when teachers and parents reinforce the same strategies. Teachers can integrate micro-scaffolds (worked examples, guided questions, structured feedback), while parents can support routine, homework planning, and emotional encouragement. Collaboration should be practical: short written recommendations, 10–15 minute check-ins, and shared monitoring indicators.

Recommended format and duration: In a typical school setting, a correction program may be designed as 8–12 sessions (individual or small group), with 30–45 minutes per session, plus brief teacher/parent consultations. The program should specify: target processes, session goals, materials, homework, and evaluation criteria. If school constraints require shorter formats, the framework still applies—modules can be prioritized based on the functional formulation.

Monitoring and evaluation: Monitoring is the stage that prevents psychocorrection from becoming "activities without outcomes." The framework recommends setting 3–5 measurable indicators at the start: (1) reduction of impulsive errors; (2) improved explanation of reasoning; (3) increased use of self-checking; (4) improved task persistence; (5) better transfer of strategies across subjects. Reassessment can combine repeated short tasks (parallel forms), structured observation, teacher ratings, and student self-reflection. If progress is insufficient, the plan should be adjusted by changing the module emphasis, increasing scaffolding, addressing emotional barriers, or coordinating with specialized services when necessary.

Discussion

The integrative "diagnosis–intervention–monitoring" model supports a modern understanding of school psychology as a developmental and collaborative practice. Its key advantage is functional coherence: every diagnostic hypothesis is linked to a correction target, and every correction target is linked to monitoring

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)
ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

indicators. At the same time, limitations must be acknowledged. First, the availability of standardized tools and local norms may be restricted; therefore, qualitative and dynamic assessment becomes especially important. Second, intervention effectiveness depends on teacher collaboration and the consistency of strategy reinforcement in the classroom. Third, some students' difficulties may reflect broader neurodevelopmental or emotional conditions requiring multidisciplinary support.

Despite these limitations, the framework remains practical because it is modular, scalable, and ethically oriented. It avoids the extremes of purely test-based labeling and purely "training-like" interventions without a diagnostic rationale. In inclusive education contexts, the model can also serve as a foundation for individualized educational planning.

Conclusion

An integrative school-based framework for psychodiagnostics and psychocorrection of students' thinking processes was substantiated as a coherent cycle that unites multi-source assessment, targeted intervention modules, and systematic monitoring. The proposed approach treats thinking as a system of operations and regulatory mechanisms that can be developed through mediated learning, explicit strategy instruction, metacognitive scaffolding, and collaborative support from teachers and parents. The model's practical value lies in linking diagnostic findings to actionable correction plans and measurable indicators of progress. Further work should focus on adapting assessment tools to local educational contexts, developing culturally sensitive norms where feasible, and evaluating intervention outcomes through school-based evidence collection.

Eureka Open Access Journals
Open Access | Peer Reviewed | International Journals | Multidisciplinary Areas
OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies (EJELT)

ISSN 2760-4918 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026

https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/2

References

1. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Harvard University Press.
2. Luria, A. R. (1980). Higher Cortical Functions in Man (2nd ed.). Basic Books.
3. Piaget, J. (1952). The Origins of Intelligence in Children. International Universities Press.
4. Wechsler, D. (2008). WAIS–IV: Administration and Scoring Manual. Pearson.
5. Raven, J., Raven, J. C., & Court, J. H. (1998). Manual for Raven's Progressive Matrices and Vocabulary Scales. Oxford Psychologists Press.
6. Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). Manual for the ASEBA School-Age Forms & Profiles. University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth & Families.
7. Beck, J. S. (2011). Cognitive Behavior Therapy: Basics and Beyond (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press.
8. Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34(10), 906–911.
9. Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. Annual Review of Psychology, 64, 135–168.
10. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. W. H. Freeman.